

January 17, 1975

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 479

fortunately, we never do; a few are counted twice, but a much larger number are missed altogether.

Following recent U.S. censuses, very sophisticated analytical and statistical work has been done at the Bureau of the Census to determine how many people were, in fact, not counted. Eventually this figure (usually showing about a 5 million undercount) is published, but it is not added to the official figure. Accordingly, the official population of the United States on July 1, 1974 (311.9 million) did not include the verified undercount of 5.3 million, nor did it account for those who immigrated illegally. The latter, we cannot count—we cannot even find—but they are here. (The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service estimates their number, in the last twelve months alone, to be between a million and 3 million.)

To a greater or lesser extent every other country has similar problems. In most developed countries, nearly all births and deaths are recorded. In the rest of the world, about two-thirds of all births and deaths are never recorded. (In Asia, the United Nations reported that in 1963, only 7% were recorded; in Africa, only 4%. The situation has not changed greatly since.)

In compiling these world population data, we have carefully consulted the official figures given by each country, the official U.N. estimates and the world population data for 1973 published by the International Statistical Programs Center of the United States Bureau of Census. Generally, we have used the U.N. estimates. Where we have found it necessary to deviate from these estimates, a footnote will explain why we have done so, together with the alternate sources used. See, for example, footnote No. 10 on China.

The reader is free to make his own choice.

FOOTNOTES

¹ All 1974 population data for this country derived from *World Population: 1973*, International Statistical Programs Center, U.S. Bureau of the Census, May, 1974.

² Birth and death rates taken from U.N. *Demographic Yearbook* for 1970, because these figures correspond almost exactly with those reported in *Egypt: Population Problems and Prospects*, edited by Abdel R. Osman, Carolina Population Center, Chapel Hill, N.C. 1973. The U.N. estimates in the 1972 *Yearbook* are 34.6 and 13.1 U.N. *Population and Vital Statistics Report*, Series A. Vol. XXVI, no. 3 makes no estimates. The U.N. birth rate, published in 1972, seems impossibly low. It would require a drop of 10 per thousand in a period of 10 years in a Muslim country. Birth rates in most Muslim countries continue to range between 45 and 60.

³ U.N. estimate of growth rate is 3.0, but the actual growth of the population reported by the U.N. from 1964 to 1972 was at the rate of 3.7.

⁴ Growth rate adjusted for net migration. Population reported in the 1972 U.N. *Demographic Yearbook* is 61 million, but the 1974 Nigerian Census indicates a population "close to 80 million." The Nigerian Embassy gives the figure of 79.8 million.

⁵ Population total derived from *World Population: 1973*, International Statistical Programs Center, U.S. Bureau of the Census, May 1974.

All figures derived from U.N. World Population Conference, *Summary Country Statements Concerning Population Change and Development*, June 21, 1974.

⁶ U.N. *Population and Vital Statistics Report*, Series A, gives a birth rate of 38 and death rate of 12. We have used the 1972 *Demographic Yearbook*, because they are reinforced by the figures given in *World Population Conference*, see footnote 7.

⁷ Includes population...

¹⁰ According to the 1972 U.N. *Demographic Yearbook*, the midyear population of China would be 829.8, with a growth rate of 1.7. We can find no student of Chinese population who agrees that these figures are realistic. Traditionally, birth and death rates in China have been high. The present regime claims to have made tremendous efforts to lower the death rate, and there is no indication that the birth rates were significantly lowered before 1970, if then. Even if we assume that near-miracles have been accomplished in the past 4 years, China would still have experienced 2 decades of high growth rates, unless, unlike most other Asian countries, it failed in its attempt to lower the death rate.

There has never been a reliable count of the Chinese. Under the present regime, there has been only one attempt at a census, and that was 21 years ago. By sophisticated census standards, it was primitive, and almost surely produced an undercount. However, on June 30, 1953, the Peking government reported that the population was 582.6 million, growing at an estimated rate of 2.29. That growth rate is believable for 1953. But while most other Asian countries were experiencing rising growth rates during the succeeding 20 years, the U.N. *Demographic Yearbook* has reported a decline. If the growth rate had remained the same, the population of China would be 932 million by mid-1974.

In 1956, the Chinese published an estimate of 627.3, and a growth rate of only 2.14. If this had continued, China's population would now be 919 million.

If the Chinese had been as successful as other Asian countries in lowering the death rate, the population of China would be well over 1 billion.

The distinguished authority on the subject, Dr. John S. Aird, Foreign Demographic Analysis Division, of the U.S. Bureau of the Census, has recently made 4 projections for the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress. These projections, based on various fertility assumptions, gave a low figure of 915.2, and a high figure of 918.2 as of July 1, 1974.

Aird also has calculated the population of China assuming a 5, 10 and 15% undercount in 1953. Assuming a 5% undercount, the January 1, 1974 population could be as high as 944 million; with a 10% undercount, it might be as high as 996 million, and with a 15% undercount, it would be 1.055 billion. ("Population Growth," reprinted from *Economic Trends in Communist China*, ed. by Eckstein, Galenson, and Liu; Aldine Publishing Co., 1968).

¹¹ Including Ryukyu Islands.

¹² The population of the United States on July 1, 1974 was, officially, 211,909,000, but this figure does not include the undercount of 5.3 million revealed since the 1970 census. Also, it takes no account of the number of illegal immigrants who have entered the country in the past year. Immigration officials estimate that there are from 1 to 3 million of these each year—about 90% of them from Mexico. As the lowest estimate we could find anywhere was 400,000, we have also added that number to the official population figures for the United States and subtracted it from the population of Mexico.

This requires that the U.S. population growth rate be increased from 3 to 1.6 and that the Mexican growth rate be decreased from 3.8 to 2.9.

¹³ Population and growth rate adjusted for emigration—see footnote no. 12.

¹⁴ Population base from 1970 U.N. *Demographic Yearbook*, reinforced by CECLADE estimate for 1970. *World Population Growth Trends*, Robert W. Fox, Inter-American Development Bank, Washington, D.C., 1974.

¹⁵ Growth rate not adjusted for net migration, because...

Summary Country Statements Concerning Population Change and Development, Addendum, July 16, 1974.

¹⁶ Population from official 1974 North Vietnam Census as reported to U.S. Census Bureau, September 18, 1974. Census reveals that average rate of population growth from 1960 to 1974 was 2.9%. The report notes that high birth rates have continued throughout the period. As public health measures have lowered the death rate, the population growth rate must have increased, in which case, in the early 1960's it was well below 2.9, and is now well above it. The U.N. *Demographic Yearbook* estimated the average growth rate 1963-1970 as 2.4 and the average growth rate 1963-1972 as 2.3—as so often happens, a considerable under-estimate.

LLM

CORRECTION OF ERROR IN THE JOINT STATEMENT OF MANAGERS ON THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1974

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to correct an error appearing in the joint statement of managers which accompanied the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974. The conference report was passed by the Congress in December, was subsequently signed by the President, and has entered into law—Public Law 93-559. This correction of the explanatory statement which accompanied that conference report is intended simply to set the record straight.

The error may be found on page 42 of the conference report document, House Report No. 93-1610, which contains both the conference report and the joint statement of managers. Under the heading "Limiting Intelligence Activities," there is a description of the conference committee's action on the differing Senate and House provisions regarding congressional approval of covert intelligence operations abroad. The error appears in the second sentence of the second paragraph, in the description of the House provision, which was the provision agreed to by the conference committee. In that sentence, the phrase "prohibited the use of Foreign Assistance Act funds only," should not have been included. I ask unanimous consent that this portion of the explanatory statement be printed in the RECORD at this point, with the phrase which should be excised shown in italic.

There being no objection, the portion of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMITING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

The Senate bill contained a provision which added a new section 661 to the Foreign Assistance Act prohibiting the use of funds appropriated under any act by, or on behalf of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), or any other agency of the U.S. Government, for the conduct of operations in foreign countries other than operations intended solely for obtaining intelligence, unless the President finds that such operations are important to the national security and transmits a report of his findings to the committee of the Congress having jurisdiction to monitor and review the activities of the U.S. Government. These restrictions would not apply during a declared war or during an exercise of power under the War Powers Resolution.

BEST COPY
Available

the Senate measure. The basic differences were that the House section prohibited the use of Foreign Assistance Act funds only, applied to the CIA but not to other government agencies, and specifically required that the reports be transmitted to the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees, among the committees with relevant jurisdiction. The House amendment also provided that the restrictions should not apply during a declared war or during an exercise of power under the War Powers Resolution.

The Senate receded.

The committee of conference agreed that strict measures should be taken to insure maximum security of the information submitted to the Congress pursuant to this provision.

Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. President, I ask further that there appear at this point the actual text of section 32 of Public Law 93-559, to which this explanation refers.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES AND EXCHANGES OF MATERIALS

SEC. 32. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end of part III the following new sections:

"Sec. 662. Limitation on Intelligence Activities.—(a) No funds appropriated under the authority of this or any other Act may be expended by or on behalf of the Central Intelligence Agency for operations in foreign countries, other than activities intended solely for obtaining necessary intelligence, unless and until the President finds that each such operation is important to the national security of the United States and reports, in a timely fashion, a description and scope of such operation to the appropriate committees of the Congress, including the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply during military operations initiated by the United States under a declaration of war approved by the Congress or an exercise of powers by the President under the War Powers Resolution.

"Sec. 663. Exchange of Certain Materials.—(a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, whenever the President determines it is in the United States national interest, he shall furnish assistance under this Act or shall furnish defense articles or services under the Foreign Military Sales Act pursuant to an agreement with the recipient of such assistance, articles, or services which provides that such recipient may only obtain such assistance, articles, or services in exchange for any necessary or strategic raw material controlled by such recipient. For the purposes of this section, the term 'necessary or strategic raw material' includes petroleum, other fossil fuels, metals, minerals, or any other natural substance which the President determines is in short supply in the United States.

"(b) The President shall allocate any necessary or strategic raw material transferred to the United States under this section to any appropriate agency of the United States Government for stockpiling, sale, transfer, disposal, or any other purpose authorized by law.

"(c) Funds received from any disposal of materials under subsection (b) shall be deposited as miscellaneous receipts in the United States Treasury."

when it comes to governmental power. It depends upon whose ox is gored.

That is true even when it comes to something as basic as the first amendment.

Marcus Cohn, a Washington communications lawyer and former staff member of the Federal Communications Commission, tied those two ideas together in a recent article for the Outlook section of the Washington Post.

Writing in defense of first amendment rights for broadcasters, Mr. Cohn shows how the White House in the past has used the fact of governmental control over broadcasters to its own advantage. He also shows how some liberals—this Senator included—have changed their minds about freedom for broadcasters.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 22, 1974] HOW LIBERALS REDISCOVERED FREE SPEECH (By Marcus Cohn)

On Sept. 25, 1970, Charles W. Colson sent a memo to H. R. Haldeman in which he proposed that the White House get a ruling from the Federal Communication Commission on the "rule of the President, when he uses TV." This, he argued, would have "an inhibiting impact on the networks." Probably the last thing he ever expected was that this memo—and others—would end up helping to ignite a flurry of judicial and congressional dedication to broadcasters' First Amendment rights.

Broadcasters, of course, have been delighted—indeed, amazed—to find a growing number of liberals as their new defenders. There is, for example, Democratic Sen. William Proxmire of Wisconsin, who 15 years ago played a central role in requiring the FCC to judge how stations handled controversial issues. This Fairness Doctrine notion had been kicking around for a number of years by then, but it was Proxmire who proposed and pushed through the amendments to the Communications Act. Today the same Sen. Proxmire is delivering Senate speeches declaring that the doctrine is unconstitutional. He now describes it as the "unfairness doctrine," an "Orwellian double think" procedure, and the subversion of Voltaire to mean "I will defend to the death your right to agree with me."

PLENTY OF COMPANY

Proxmire is certainly not alone in his sharp change of heart; he has plenty of company among federal judges, other liberal members of Congress and intellectuals who have similarly reversed course in the wake of Watergate and other events on a wide range of issues.

Historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., for example, has spent a good deal of his career supporting a strong presidency, illustrating his case with studies of President Franklin Roosevelt, and then growing even more enthusiastic about the strong, activist President when he actually got the chance to play a role in the Kennedy White House. In those days, Prof. Schlesinger has written, President Kennedy was too often deflected from noble purposes by reluctant bureaucrats and elected congressmen who checked his power. Now, however, Schlesinger argues his book "The Impact Presidency" that the President has too much power.

Department employee Otto Otepka tried to tell Congress a few pertinent facts about how the department was doing its business, many distinguished liberals who happened

to think Otepka and his congressional colleagues were on a Communist witch hunt—that the State Department should exercise executive "privilege" and withhold Otepka's information. Many of these liberals had very different ideas about the administration's right of executive privilege.

Then there is the case of scholar and diplomat Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who once stridently warned the country that scholars are at their weakest in describing massive government programs and have, in fact, sold the country large quantities of "snake oil." Scholars should study studying results, said Moynihan. Not a year or so after he wrote this warning Moynihan became the czar of domestic policy in the Nixon administration and proposed what he said was the most far-reaching social reform (a guaranteed annual income) since the 1930s.

These and other turnabouts can be explained in a number of ways. We all know that a foolish consistency is the hallmark of little minds. It is also possible, and hopefully true, that men learn by experience and change their preconceptions.

But there is yet another potential explanation: Is it possible that despite some of the most scholarly formulations about the relationships within government and between government and the governed those who are really decided, perhaps unconsciously on the basis of just who has the power? More bluntly, do some people think that lots of government power is fine when the "good guys"—their people—are in charge and government power must be drastically reduced when the "bad guys"—the "other" people—get elected?

JUDICIAL SANCTIFICATION

Obviously, our fundamental rights should be decided on firmer ground than when politicians to our liking are in power at the moment. The Constitution and our laws are not so easy to change that we can alter our notions on the basis of who won the last election. And yet, as Prof. Philip H. Land, a constitutional scholar at the University of Chicago Law School, has pointed out: "When it is a President with what has to be called 'charisma,' a Franklin D. Roosevelt or a John Fitzgerald Kennedy, some of us have applauded the exercise of power by the President. When that power is occupied by one whose objectives are not to our tastes, we deplore the power that has become his to exercise."

One of the most striking examples of this phenomenon has occurred in the area of freedom of speech, and particularly in the air waves. Suddenly liberals started to argue that broadcasters should have the same First Amendment rights as newspapers, and that the FCC should get out of programming matters—a far cry from their earlier position.

In the 1940s, such FCC commissioner James Lawrence Fly, Clifford Walker, Paul Porter and Frieda Harman devoted New Dealers—consistent greater government involvement in programming. They argued that radio had a responsibility to engage in new programming; it was euphemistically called "meaningful" programming.

Those were the days when Lewis L. Walker, a determined and brilliant lawyer, represented the interests of the radio Tribune and other violently anti-Communist licensees. He argued repeatedly that the mission was violating the First Amendment when it stepped into the programming area. But the commissioners and the court were not such a notion.

The commission position received support from some generalists. The famous language that Justice Brandeis included in a 1940 opinion on a unanimous Supreme Court. He said the mission, not only had the duty

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, many persons are prone to change their minds

Mr. Steed with Mr. Gray.
 Mr. Litton with Mr. Hastings.
 Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Towell of Nevada.
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Hanna.
 Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Madigan.
 Mrs. Burke of California with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Adams with Mr. Zwach.
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Mills.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Owens.
 Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Hollifield.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3394, AMENDING THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. MORGAN, Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 3394) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 17, 1974.)

Mr. MORGAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume that time will be taken to explain what transpired in the conference; is that correct?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Since I was passed over in the selection of the conference committee and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I hope the chairman will make some time available to me. I would not expect, under the circumstances, to get time on this side. I would like a few minutes, at least, to ask a few questions concerning what transpired in the conference.

Mr. MORGAN. I will assure the gentleman from Iowa that he will have time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his kindness. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the con-

ference report which we bring today before the House represents a good compromise.

The managers on the part of the House have worked very hard for 8 days in trying to uphold the position of this body and to bring back a report which reflects the will of the House.

We have had over 70 items in disagreement with the Senate.

The Senate yielded on 36 items and the House receded on 34.

Three major items were resolved by compromise.

The total amount authorized in the report is \$2,696 million.

This is \$31 million less than was authorized in the Senate bill, and \$39,900,000 more than the House approved.

The total amount is \$550 million less than the request of the executive branch.

In addition to reducing the Executive request by a very substantial amount, this conference report places many restrictions on the way in which the funds can be used.

There are specific ceilings in the allocations for various countries.

There is a ceiling on Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

In addition, there are specific limits on different programs for each of those countries.

Over and above this, Mr. Speaker, the report tightens congressional control by prohibiting transfers between various accounts, and between countries.

Among the allocations, the bill earmarks \$625 million for Israel and smaller amounts for such countries as Egypt and Jordan.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that these money provisions—and the restrictions in the report—express a compromise which can be accepted by the House.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the conference report deals with a number of sensitive issues.

The suspension of aid to Turkey is in the report with a waiver which the President can exercise until February 5.

This particular compromise was worked out first here in the House with the sponsors of the Turkey aid amendment and is acceptable to them.

It is necessary to allow the President some flexibility to work out the Cyprus problem.

The conference report also retains the House-approved limitation on aid to Korea and a very effective provision on aid to Chile.

Both of these involve issues of human rights on which the House had earlier expressed its will.

On some of the issues where the Senate bill was more stringent, we have worked out compromises for this fiscal year.

For example, the Senate yielded on the issue of terminating the military assistance program.

In place of a fixed deadline, we have agreed to a Presidential study which has to be submitted to the House during the first session of the 94th Congress.

At that point, each House will be able to take a very thorough look at this program and reach its own conclusion.

A similar compromise was worked out with regard to the training of foreign

law enforcement officials in the United States.

That program is allowed to continue through fiscal year 1975—after which time it will be up to the Congress to decide whether any part of it should be continued.

Let me add a word about a few other issues:

During the House debate, I had discussion with the distinguished gentlemen from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) regarding food assistance for the poorest and most needy countries.

The conferees have agreed upon language which will move that program in that direction.

The House also adopted an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. MILLER) proposing to barter Foreign Aid for materials needed by the United States.

We were able to keep that amendment.

The House also approved an amendment by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) relating to the repayment of debts by countries receiving our aid.

Again, we were able to preserve the House language.

We did this as well with respect to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) and the amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

We tried our best on other issues, and we were successful in most instances.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the major provisions of the conference report which was printed in full in this morning's record.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very sound conference report.

I urge its adoption by the House.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the committee mentioned the colloquy with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) with regard to "Food for Peace," which occurred on the floor of the House when the bill was before us, and there is a similar colloquy between Senators HATFIELD and HUMPHREY as reflected in yesterday's RECORD on page S21794 with regard to the percentage of the title I Food for Peace which will be allocated to the countries which are not on the U.N. list of 32 countries "most seriously affected" by the current world food crisis.

I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if he is in agreement with the interpretation contained in the remarks of Senator HATFIELD with regard to the provisions in the conference report.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman remembers, the House bill had no similar provision dealing with food aid.

Mr. BROWN of California. That is right.

Mr. MORGAN. Our committee of conference, however, adopted the Senate language favoring more food for those who need more help. We believe the language in the conference report

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 353 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

AUTHORIZING CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS ON SAME DAY REPORTED OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER DURING REMAINDER OF 2D SESSION, 93D CONGRESS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1512 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 1512

Resolved, That during the remainder of the second session of the Ninety-third Congress it shall be in order to consider conference reports on the same day reported or any day thereafter, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule X, VIII.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING).

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

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, those Members of the House who heard the reading of the resolution know that it provides that it shall be in order to consider conference reports on the same day reported, or any day thereafter, during the remainder of the 2d session of the 93d Congress. It is essential that we do this at this time. I know of no serious objection to the matter.

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

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

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is necessary in order that we might reach an early adjournment. The matter was up under suspension of the rules, and it failed under this procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, while my opposition may not be considered serious, I am very much opposed to this type of legislation because it certainly short-circuits the orderly consideration of the business of the House.

It makes a travesty of the disposal of important legislation and would be totally unnecessary had the House of Representatives conducted its business on a consistent basis of attention to its duty since it opened the session last January.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 42, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 703]

YEAS—351

- | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abdnor | Conable | Gubser |
| Abzug | Conlan | Gunter |
| Alexander | Conte | Guyser |
| Anderson, Calif. | Conyers | Haley |
| Anderson, Ill. | Corman | Hamilton |
| Andrews, N. Dak. | Cotter | Hammer- |
| Annunzio | Cronin | schmidt |
| Aspley | Culver | Hanley |
| Aspin | Daniel, Dan | Hanrahan |
| Badile | Daniel, Robert | Harrington |
| Baker | W., Jr. | Harsha |
| Barrett | Daniels, | Hawkins |
| Beard | Dominick V. | Hays |
| Bell | Danielson | Hébert |
| Bennett | Davis, Ga. | Hechler, W. Va. |
| Bergland | Davis, S.C. | Heckler, Mass. |
| Beyll | de la Garza | Heinz |
| Biaggi | Delaney | Helstoski |
| Blesler | DellaPBACK | Henderson |
| Bingham | Denholm | Hicks |
| Blatnik | Dent | Hillis |
| Boggs | Devine | Hinsaw |
| Boland | Dickinson | Hogan |
| Bolling | Diggs | Holtzman |
| Bowen | Donohue | Horton |
| Brademas | Dorn | Hosmer |
| Bray | Downing | Hudnut |
| Breaux | Drinan | Hughate |
| Breckinridge | Duncan | Hunt |
| Bripkley | du Pont | Hutchinson |
| Brooks | Edwards, Ala. | Ichord |
| Broomfield | Edwards, Calif. | Jarman |
| Brotzman | Elberg | Johnson, Calif. |
| Brown, Calif. | Erlenborn | Johnson, Colo. |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Esch | Johnson, Pa. |
| Broyhill, Va. | Evans, Colo. | Jones, Ala. |
| Buchanan | Evins, Tenn. | Jones, Okla. |
| Burgener | Fascell | Jordan |
| Burke, Fla. | Findley | Karth |
| Burke, Mass. | Fish | Kastenmeier |
| Burleson, Tex. | Fisher | Kazen |
| Burlison, Mo. | Flood | King |
| Burton, Phillip | Flowers | Kluczynski |
| Butler | Flynt | Koch |
| Byron | Foley | Kuykendall |
| Carney, Ohio | Ford | Kyros |
| Carlier | Forsythe | Landrum |
| Casey, Tex. | Fountain | Latta |
| Cederberg | Fraser | Leggett |
| Chamberlain | Frelinghuysen | Lehman |
| Chappell | Frenzel | Lent |
| Chisholm | Froehlich | Long, La. |
| Clancy | Fulton | Long, Md. |
| Clark | Fuqua | Lott |
| Clausen, Don H. | Gaydos | Lujan |
| Clay | Gettys | Luken |
| Cleveland | Gibbons | McClory |
| Cochran | Gilman | McCloskey |
| Cohen | Ginn | McCollister |
| Collier | Goldwater | McCormack |
| Collins, Ill. | Gooding | McDade |
| | Green, Oreg. | McEwen |
| | Green, Pa. | McFall |
| | Griffiths | McKay |

- | | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| McKinney | Price, Tex. |
| McSpadden | Pritchard |
| Madden | Quie |
| Mahon | Quillen |
| Mallary | Railsback |
| Mann | Randall |
| Maraziti | Rangel |
| Martin, Nebr. | Rees |
| Mathias, Calif. | Regula |
| Mathis, Ga. | Reid |
| Matsunaga | Reuss |
| Mayne | Rhodes |
| Mazzoli | Riegle |
| Meeds | Rinaldo |
| Melcher | Roberts |
| Metcalf | Robison, N.Y. |
| Mezvinsky | Rodino |
| Michel | Roe |
| Milford | Rogers |
| Miller | Roncalio, Wyo. |
| Minish | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Mink | Rooney, Pa. |
| Minshall, Ohio | Rosenthal |
| Mitchell, Md. | Rostenkowski |
| Mitchell, N.Y. | Roush |
| Mizell | Roy |
| Moakley | Roybal |
| Mollohan | Runnels |
| Montgomery | Ruppe |
| Moorhead, Pa. | Ryan |
| Morgan | St Germain |
| Mosher | Sandman |
| Moss | Sarasin |
| Murphy, Ill. | Sarbanes |
| Murphy, N.Y. | Scherle |
| Murtha | Schneebeli |
| Natcher | Schroeder |
| Nedzi | Sebellus |
| Nelsen | Seiberling |
| Nichols | Shriver |
| Nix | Shuster |
| Obey | Sikes |
| O'Brien | Sisk |
| O'Hara | Slack |
| O'Neill | Smith, Iowa |
| Passman | Smith, N.Y. |
| Patman | Spence |
| Patten | Staggers |
| Perkins | Stanton, |
| Pettis | J. William |
| Peyster | Stanton, |
| Pickle | James V. |
| Pike | Stark |
| Poage | Steele |
| Powell, Ohio | Steelman |
| Preyer | Steiger, Ariz. |
| Price, Ill. | Stephens |

- | |
|--------------------|
| Stokes |
| Stratton |
| Stubblefield |
| Stuckey |
| Studds |
| Sullivan |
| Symington |
| Talcott |
| Taylor, N.C. |
| Teague |
| Thompson, N.J. |
| Thompson, Wis. |
| Thone |
| Thornton |
| Tiernan |
| Traxler |
| Treen |
| Udall |
| Ullman |
| Van Deerin |
| Vander Veen |
| Vanik |
| Veysey |
| Vigorito |
| Waggonner |
| Walde |
| Walsh |
| Ware |
| Whalen |
| White |
| Whitehurst |
| Whitten |
| Widnall |
| Wiggins |
| Williams |
| Wilson, Bob |
| Wilson, |
| Charles H., Calif. |
| Wilson, |
| Charles, Tex. |

NAYS—42

- | | |
|---------------|--------------|
| Andrews, N.C. | Derwinski |
| Archer | Frey |
| Armstrong | Gonzalez |
| Ashbrook | Gross |
| Bafalis | Gude |
| Bauman | Holt |
| Blackburn | Huber |
| Brown, Ohio | Kemp |
| Camp | Ketchum |
| Clawson, Del | Lagomarsino |
| Collins, Tex. | Landgrebe |
| Coughlin | Martin, N.C. |
| Crane | Moorhead, |
| Davis, Wis. | Calif. |
| Dennis | Myers |

NOT VOTING—41

- | | | |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Adams | Grasso | Mills |
| Addabbo | Gray | Owens |
| Arends | Grover | Pepper |
| Braico | Hanna | Podell |
| Brown, Mich. | Hansen, Idaho | Roncallo, N.Y. |
| Burke, Calif. | Hansen, Wash. | Rose |
| Burton, John | Hastings | Shipley |
| Carey, N.C. | Holifield | Shoup |
| Dellums | Howard | Steed |
| Dingell | Jones, N.C. | Towell, Nev. |
| Duisli | Jones, Tenn. | Vander Jagt |
| Eckhardt | Lifton | Zion |
| Eshleman | Macdonald | Zwach |
| Gialmo | Madigan | |

So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- Mr. John L. Burton with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
- Mr. Pepper with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
- Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Arends.
- Mr. Dellums with Mr. Vander Jagt.
- Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Eshleman.
- Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Shoup.
- Mr. Shipley with Mr. Grover.
- Mr. Rose with Mrs. Grasso.

moves in that direction. It puts emphasis on food assistance to the poorest countries.

The interpretation worked out by Senators HUMPHREY and HATFIELD is somewhat confusing to me, but I believe the language in the report is pretty clear. If the gentleman will follow the language in the report, I think he will find it spells out the details of what the conferees agreed upon.

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentleman will yield further, may I inquire as to whether or not the specific percentage limitation which is referred to appears in the conference report. In other words, does the language state that not more than 30 percent of title I concessional food assistance is authorized for those countries which are not among the "most seriously affected" according to the U.N.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it refers to the list of countries that are included in the U.N. definition of the poorest countries. Thirty percent of our concessional food aid is to go to such countries.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee for his explanation, and his assurance that the language in the conference report refers to title I congressional food aid and does not include the Public Law 480, title II grant program.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report while I have strong reservations about certain provisions. In my opinion the agreement reached represents a reasonable compromise of the difficult issues that were in conference.

One of the key issues in conference concerned the situation on Cyprus. The question of how to resolve this difficult issue—especially the matter of military aid to Turkey—has been debated at length. The conferees decided to suspend all military assistance and sales upon enactment of the bill, but to allow President Ford to lift the suspension until February 5, subject to certain conditions. I trust that during this short period the United States can play a useful role in facilitating movement toward a settlement.

While the Cyprus negotiations continue, it is important to remember the thousands of homeless refugees who are the innocent victims of this tragedy. I am pleased to report that the Senate accepted the House language earmarking \$25 million for famine and disaster relief to Cyprus.

The conferees discussed the proposed restrictions on aid to Cambodia including the ceiling of \$200 million on military assistance, and agreed to exempt from the MAP ceiling up to \$75 million in emergency assistance under the President's special drawdown authority. I trust that these funds may be sufficient to enable the Cambodian armed forces to meet their minimum requirements for

the remainder of this fiscal year. I personally am deeply concerned, however, at the effect on the situation in Cambodia of sharply reduced American assistance.

The Senate conferees accepted the House language on aid to South Korea, which had been the subject of much discussion and compromise before passage of the House bill.

I was pleased that a spirit of compromise marked the conference discussions. Overall, I believe the results were constructive. I urge approval of this conference report.

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

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and commend the conferees for a job well done.

This does seem to constitute a good balance between political and humanitarian considerations, but I am especially interested in the humanitarian aspect.

With reference to food aid, the conference report properly focuses, in my judgment, on the food needs of the countries most seriously affected by the world economic crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New Jersey, the ranking minority member of our committee, who is retiring, for all his outstanding work and for his good representation in this conference.

I would like to thank him for his support of the proposition that a large proportion of our development assistance and food aid will go to the countries most seriously affected by the food crisis.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I should like to say that the report seeks to reflect a balance between political and humanitarian considerations. As has just been indicated, we have provided that agricultural development aid should be concentrated on countries with per capita income of less \$300.

In section 55 of the conference report, which is found on page 28, we have directed that:

Not more than 30 percent of concessional food aid should be allocated to countries other than those which are most seriously affected by current food shortages.

In my opinion, this language clearly directs that the President should provide to the countries most seriously affected by the food crisis at least 70 percent of all food assistance. This aid includes both grants and credit sales, under title I and title II of Public Law 480.

The House conferees agreed to these provisions, to assure that the gentleman's humanitarian concerns are met.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey very much for yielding and I also thank him for his explanation and his leadership.

Can I seek to find out something noted

on page 16 of the conference report, section 37, that portion of the conference report entitled, "Assistance to South Vietnamese Children."

In fiscal year 1974, it was my recollection—and I do not have my file with me—that there was a specific earmarking for assistance to South Vietnamese children through private voluntary agencies.

The language found on page 16 of the conference report, while it does specifically earmark \$10 million for carrying out sections (1) and (2) of section 37(a), does not continue the specific earmarking of funds to be available through voluntary agencies; is my understanding correct?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I might say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that, if he will look at the last sentence of section 37(b) that specific protection is provided. The language is as follows:

Assistance provided under this section shall be furnished, to the maximum extent practicable, under the auspices of and by international agencies or private voluntary agencies.

The importance and the reason for this language is quite clear. What has been done has been successful in large measure because of the activities of private agencies, and we would like to see this kind of assistance continued and supported to the extent that authorization is provided in this bill for private agencies.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield still further, as I recall the figure, the Congress last year in the foreign aid appropriation earmarked \$5 million for assistance to South Vietnamese children through the private agencies and Dan Parker, as the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, took the lead in upping that to \$7.5 million. Is it the understanding of the conferees that the amount to be available shall be at least what was available last year for the private volunteer agencies?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the authorizing committee is not in a position to designate how much money is actually to be made available. But it is our hope that sufficient appropriations will be available to allow at least as much support for the efforts which private agencies have been making as has been the case in previous years.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey very much. I do want to say that I am deeply grateful to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for their sensitivity to and their leadership on behalf of efforts to increase the kind of aid that goes to assist the children of Vietnam.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, 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. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsyl-

vanis, Mr. MORGAN, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for his consideration in giving me this 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask someone conversant with this conference report the total figure now in the bill?

Mr. MORGAN. Two billion, six hundred ninety-seven million dollars.

Mr. GROSS. Two billion, six hundred ninety-seven million dollars?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. That is an increase, is it not, over the bill as it left the House?

Mr. MORGAN. It is \$39.9 million more.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder where those "doves," who suddenly became anti-Turkish warriors, are this afternoon in the consideration of this bill.

The effective cutoff date for aid to Turkey when this bill left the House last week was to be effective with the enactment of the bill. I now understand that the date has been extended to February 5.

Where are those warriors that were in full cry last week on the floor of the House, and who got a 3-to-1 vote in favor of an immediate cutoff?

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

Mr. GROSS. And what happened, I might ask, when Secretary of State Kissinger made a foray over to Capitol Hill on Monday night of this week to confer, I do not know with whom, but obviously he did not confer with many Members of the House. Are we, the ordinary Members of the House, going to be let in on the secret of what happened that suddenly turned the anti-Turkish warriors around?

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I would be happy to answer any specific question the gentleman has.

Mr. GROSS. I thought I propounded a couple of questions.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I followed this matter very closely, as the gentleman knows. There have been a series of discussions over the last 3 days taking into account the complex parliamentary situation the House found itself in, that is, consideration and passage of this bill, consideration and passage of the continuing resolution, and consideration of the House adjourning sometime this week.

Mr. GROSS. I can read all of that into the manipulations that apparently took place, but what I would like to have are a few specifics of what happened when the Secretary of State came up here and made his deal with the gentleman or the gentleman made his deal with him. Give us a quick fill-in, if the gentleman can do so.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. If the gentleman will yield, I would be very happy to do that. But I also have to point out that one of the significant advantages of those who took the position in favor of the cutoff is that the cutoff in the Foreign Assistance Act is permanent legislation so that we do not have this burden again in February or at any other time to add it onto the continuing resolution or an

additional appropriation. This will be permanent law, and it was considered in the interest of not only the Members of this body but of the people on Cyprus, taking into account all the events.

Mr. GROSS. There were those in the House last week who tried to reason with the gentleman in that respect, but it had no effect at all because the House voted 3 to 1 for his position for an immediate cutoff of aid to Turkey.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. If the gentleman will yield, that is precisely right. The distinction is that this is permanent law and will not have to be brought up again in continuing resolutions. That is a very significant event.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but the gentleman does not get his immediate cutoff; does he? He gave them a month and 5 days; did he not?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. If the gentleman will yield further, the cutoff is permanent law, suspended under certain provisions. The provisions are that Turkey will obey the cease-fire and that there is no transshipment of American military equipment.

Mr. GROSS. I still do not know who capitulated.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Nobody capitulated. Reasonable men discussed this.

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

Mr. GROSS. I will yield briefly to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The fact of the matter is, what this provision now accomplishes is that the cutoff with respect to aid to Turkey becomes a permanent part of U.S. law. It is allowed to be suspended until the 5th of February, but for the first time the cutoff, which was previously only on temporary legislation which expired of its own accord on a certain date, now becomes permanent, and the gentleman in the well knows it.

Mr. GROSS. The cutoff would have been immediate under that bill, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. SARBANES. The gentleman in the well recognizes the difference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I notice on page 38 of the conference report the following language:

... unless the President reported to Congress that the Government of South Korea had made substantial progress in the observance of international standards of human rights.

What are "international standards of human rights?" Are they the standards set in Russia, or where?

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman knows this is the exact language that passed this body last Wednesday. It is not changed at all.

Mr. GROSS. That may be, but what are "international standards of human rights?" Does anyone want to make a contribution to the cause of definition?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The international standards of human rights are spelled out and defined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. And they are the human rights in Uganda, in Burundi, in Ethiopia, in Russia, in Czechoslovakia, in Poland. Are those the human rights the gentleman is talking about? These are the international standards?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Those are the violations—

Mr. GROSS. And these "international standards" are now being applied to South Korea to the exclusion of all the nations I have mentioned and more that could be conjured up. The fact of the matter is there is no "international standard of human rights" except those to fit any and every occasion.

This conference report ought to be defeated. We ought to put an end now to this business of spewing out the resources of the people of this country and increasing the debt, deficit and inflation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when I discussed H.R. 17234 on the House floor on December 10, I made the comment that any resemblance between that measure and the bill which was originally presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee last June was purely coincidental. The substantial changes between the original bill and the one which we considered last week were achieved largely as a result of the actions of a group of members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who met periodically prior to the bill's markup to try to make some order out of chaos. This group prepared and introduced 29 amendments, and 26 of these amendments were adopted by the Foreign Affairs Committee during its deliberations.

These amendments, Mr. Speaker, fell into three areas.

First. They achieved substantial net reductions in the authorization requests.

Second. They limited transferability of funds.

Third. They presented a very strong human rights posture in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the House conferees for preserving the House position which we took in the Foreign Assistance Act. Indeed, I think the conference committee strengthened the bill in the three areas which I mentioned. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and urge that my colleagues vote affirmatively for it.

Mr. Speaker, I think I would be remiss if I did not take note of the fact that two of the gentlemen who are sitting with me at the committee table will be working for the last time on Foreign Affairs Committee legislation. I am referring of course to the ranking minority

member, Congressman PETER FRELINGHUYSEN from New Jersey and our friend Al Westphal who is leaving the committee at the end of the year. I take this opportunity to wish both of them well and to wish them a very pleasant and productive retirement.

I would also note one other member of our group, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), but since he received so many accolades in the special order the other day I did not wish to presume further upon his time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to compliment the conferees and the chairman on the excellent job they have done. I think we have a good bill before us. I am particularly pleased to note that the provisions with respect to the cutoff of the funds from UNESCO which I offered on the floor of the House have been suitably broadened.

I would like to ask the chairman just one or two questions. If I may have the attention of the chairman, I note there was a withdrawal of certain earmarkings for Middle Eastern funds but that the conference report states clearly what is the intention of the Congress with respect to the use of those funds.

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct. It is spelled out.

Mr. BINGHAM. In other words, it is expected that the figures specified would be followed out exactly.

The only additional point I would like to make is that I am a little unhappy about a change the conferees made with respect to the veto powers which the Congress will have with respect to cash arms sales. The conferees apparently changed the time limit for such congressional vetoes from 20 legislative days to 20 calendar days. I would like to have the chairman assure us that the staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee will be alerted to watch this very carefully because 20 calendar days is often a very short time within which Congress may act.

Mr. MORGAN. I can assure the gentleman that it will be so. The only reason for the change accepted in conference is that next year, after consultation with the leadership on both sides, it has been decided that we will take several recesses. This could unduly prolong congressional action with respect to some sales. The conferees agreed, therefore, that 20 calendar days would be better. But I assure the gentleman from New York that we will be watching this carefully.

Mr. BINGHAM. In other words, if this provision does not give Congress enough time to act if it wants to exercise the veto power, I presume we will reexamine that at a future date.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON).

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to refer again to the food-for-peace provisions of the bill. The record is now explicit with respect to what is meant by concessional food aid, in section 55(a)(5).

It is clear from the colloquy that occurred in the other body, and here, that what is meant by that subsection is that not more than 30 percent of title I concessional food sales may be allocated to countries other than those most seriously affected by food shortages.

The word concessional is a term of art. It only refers to title I sales for foreign currency. It means sales on concessional terms. It is not used redundantly in this or any other section. It is not used with respect to title II, the title which deals with grant programs.

It is quite important that we nail this down for the record. We are not talking about 30 percent of the total of food aid under title II plus concessional aid under title I, but only of title I concessional food aid. For the coming fiscal year, this would be restricted to the amount of \$255 million. I am glad both bodies have accepted this interpretation.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON).

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, if I could, I would like to direct some questions to the chairman concerning the \$377 million ceiling on aid to Cambodia, which was contained in both the House and Senate bills.

The Senate and the House both adopted nearly identical provisions, which fixed a definite dollar limit on the amount of aid to Cambodia. Furthermore, the Senate bill contained a provision repealing the entire drawdown authority, and the House report specified no drawdown funds were to be used for Cambodia. As a result, I fail to understand the basis for the conference providing Cambodia with up to \$75 million above the \$377 million ceiling from the drawdown authority, since this action seems to me clearly opposed to the obvious intent on the part of both Houses to set an absolute ceiling on U.S. aid to Cambodia.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, the gentleman knows, he attended many of the markup sessions, the House bill contained \$250 million drawdown authority. The Senate bill repealed the drawdown authority. On the first day of the conference, the conferees agreed to extend the drawdown authority but to reduce the level to \$150 million. At this point the issue of the use of the drawdown authority in Cambodia was opened.

The House bill would have permitted the use of all the agreed-on \$150 million drawdown in Cambodia. The Senators objected on the grounds that although their bill only applied to military assistance, Public Law 480 and economic assistance, they did not want to give the authority to increase the Cambodia program another \$150 million.

It was recognized, however, that in the absence of any new language regarding drawdown, the executive branch would

likely to have used the entire \$150 million for Cambodia.

As a result, conferees agreed to limit the amount of drawdown authority which could possibly be used in Cambodia to \$75 million. In doing so, they were acting entirely within their competence.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, one further question, if I may. My understanding was that we adopted by a rather sizeable margin of an absolute limit of \$377 million for Cambodia. The House maintained its intent not to allow any other funds to be used for that purpose. I am wondering why the conferees did not take that into account in voting as they did?

Mr. MORGAN. The committee of conference did place a \$75-million limit on the use of the drawdown for Cambodia. Otherwise the entire \$150 million could have been used.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Is it the intent of the conferees not to allow that drawdown authority to apply to Cambodia, in view of the absolute limit?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, as far as the chairman is concerned, on the use of the drawdown authority, the language of the conference report speaks for itself.

Mr. HARRINGTON. And that will apply to Southeast Asia as directed?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I really want to particularly commend the conferees on providing a resolution on a very difficult question with regard to negotiating a peaceful settlement in the Cyprus situation. I think they have done a very commendable job and it is in the best interest of our Nation, as well as the best interest of Turkey and Greece and peace in the world.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting the conference report on foreign aid, I am pleased to note that the Congress has effected a careful review of our entire program of economic and military aid.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to note that my votes in support of a cutoff of aid to Turkey are consistent with our efforts to assist in a negotiation of the Cyprus situation.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give my support to this conference report to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974. I congratulate the conferees and I am particularly pleased that they have placed as one of their key priorities the restoration of peace in the war ravaged nation of Cyprus.

I was gratified that my amendment to provide \$25 million in urgently needed emergency aid to Cyprus was retained. As I indicated last week during consideration of this bill in the House, this aid is critical if the nation and people of Cyprus are to recover from the devastating effects of 5 months of civil strife and occupation by the nation of Turkey. This aid will assist in answering the most urgent needs of the Cypriot people, namely for food, medical assistance and

housing for the quarter of a million men, women, and children refugees on the island.

The nation of Cyprus is indeed in her darkest hour of need. We the Congress have responded to their plight in the best humanitarian tradition, and I recommend that this legislation be passed today.

I am also pleased to see this report contains the thrust of the intention of the House with respect to the continued providing of aid to Turkey under the Foreign Assistance Act. Under the compromise agreement all military assistance and sales will be suspended on the date of enactment of the bill, but allows the President to lift the suspension until February 5 if he determines that such action will further negotiations for a peaceful solution of the Cyprus conflict and only if during that time Turkey observes the cease-fire and does not increase her forces on Cyprus or divert any U.S. military aid for use on the island.

I feel this represents an effective and workable arrangement and one which should help further the cause of peace. I feel this will give the administration the leverage they need, but at the same time makes it clear to Turkey that any continued aggressions against Cyprus will result in a complete and irrevocable cutoff of aid.

The goal of peace and the future security of Cyprus stand to be the ultimate beneficiaries of this legislation. We have fought long and hard on the Cyprus issue, yet we have remained steadfast in our convictions concerning Turkey and her illegal use of our aid. What we are considering today represents the culmination of our efforts, and a successful one at that. It is legislation which we should be proud of and pass without any further delay.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974.

Many of the programs authorized by this bill are of great importance to the effective operation of the foreign policy of the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, I also wish to take time to address myself to one aspect of the Foreign Assistance Act with respect to which, as my colleagues know, I have been especially concerned as have many other Members of the House, and I here refer particularly to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

I refer, of course, to the provision in the bill under consideration that would make mandatory a suspension of all military sales and assistance from the United States to Turkey after February 5, 1975, unless and until:

First. Turkey complies with the Foreign Assistance Act, the Foreign Military Sales Act, and any agreement entered into by Turkey under such acts; and

Second. Substantial progress toward agreement has been made regarding military forces in Cyprus.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should note that the effect of the inclusion of this amendment in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974 is to incorporate the cutoff language, commonly known as the Rosen-

thal-Eagleton amendment, into permanent law. My colleagues, Mr. ROSENTHAL and Mr. SARBANES, and I, as well as Senator EAGLETON, regard such incorporation as a most important and significant development.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, explain why I make this observation. Until the approval of the conference report under consideration, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, this cutoff language was a part of the continuing appropriations resolution, which is a temporary funding measure.

With the incorporation of the cutoff language into permanent law, however, the language may be changed only by a bill passed by Congress.

In my own judgment—and in the judgment of my colleagues, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, and Senator EAGLETON—it is highly unlikely that Congress would support another delay in the suspension of aid to Turkey unless and until:

First. The Government of Turkey—in accord with the Rosenthal-Eagleton amendment—complies with the Foreign Assistance Act, and any agreement entered into by Turkey under such acts; and

Second. Substantial progress toward agreement has been made regarding military forces in Cyprus.

In the absence of both these conditions as of February 5, 1975, U.S. military aid and sales to Turkey will be cut off on that date.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I voice the view of every Member of the House when I say that I hope that there will be a speedy and just resolution of the problems, both humanitarian and political, that have arisen in Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the text of the statement of yesterday, December 17, 1974, of Senator EAGLETON, Congressman ROSENTHAL, Congressman SARBANES, and me on the matter of the cutoff of U.S. military aid to Turkey.

The statement follows:

CUTOFF OF U.S. MILITARY AID TO TURKEY

The conferees have completed their work on the Foreign Assistance Act. There has been a compromise on the cut-off of military aid to Turkey. We accept the compromise embodied in the Conference Report. In reaching this position we considered the interests of all of the parties to the Cyprus dispute, the action of the Senate on this legislation, and the complex parliamentary situation the Congress is facing in considering, at this time, both the Foreign Assistance Act and a Continuing Resolution.

We take this position for the following reasons:

1. Although the bill permits the temporary sending of aid until February 5, the cut-off language of the Rosenthal-Eagleton Amendment now becomes permanent law instead of a rider on temporary Continuing Appropriations Resolutions.

That language suspends all U.S. military aid to Turkey unless and until:

(a) Turkey complies with the Foreign Assistance Act, the Foreign Military Sales Act and any agreement entered into under such Acts; and

(b) substantial progress toward agreement has been made regarding military forces in Cyprus.

We regard the incorporation of the cut-off

language into permanent law as a very important and significant development. The language will, of course, be incorporated in the Continuing Resolution.

2. The bill requires that during the temporary period of suspension of the cut-off, Turkey shall:

(a) observe the ceasefire on Cyprus;
(b) not increase its forces on Cyprus; and
(c) not transfer to Cyprus any U.S. supplied implements of war.

3. The Conference Committee Report makes clear that there must be no accelerated obligations and delivery of military aid during the extension period.

4. The Conference Report authorizes \$25 million for aid to refugees in Cyprus, and it is our understanding that the Continuing Appropriations Resolution and any subsequent appropriations measures will also contain \$25 million for this vital humanitarian purpose.

5. We are hopeful that meaningful progress concerning all matters of interest to Cyprus, both humanitarian and political, will commence shortly.

6. The Foreign Assistance Bill contains a number of programs important to U.S. policy in many parts of the world.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 189, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 704]

YEAS—209

Abzug	Clay	Gilman
Addabbo	Cohen	Gonzalez
Alexander	Collins, Ill.	Green, Pa.
Anderson, Ill.	Conable	Grover
Annunzio	Conte	Gubser
Arends	Corman	Gude
Armstrong	Cotter	Guyer
Ashley	Coughlin	Hamilton
Aspin	Cronin	Hanley
Badillo	Culver	Hanrahan
Baker	Daniels,	Harrington
Barrett	Dominick V.	Hawkins
Bell	Danielson	Hays
Bergland	Dellums	Hébert
Biaggi	Dennis	Heckler, Mass.
Bieber	Derwinski	Heinz
Bingham	Diggs	Helstoski
Blackburn	Dingell	Hillis
Boggs	Donohue	Hogan
Boland	Drinan	Hollifield
Bolling	du Pont	Holtzman
Brademas	Eckhardt	Horton
Breaux	Edwards, Calif.	Hosmer
Breckinridge	Ellberg	Johnson, Pa.
Brooks	Erlenborn	Jones, Ala.
Broomfield	Esch	Jordan
Brotzman	Evans, Colo.	Kluczynski
Buchanan	Fascell	Koch
Burke, Calif.	Findley	Kuykendall
Burke, Fla.	Fish	Kyros
Burke, Mass.	Flood	Leggett
Burton, John	Foley	Lehman
Burton, Phillip	Ford	Lent
Carney, Ohio	Forsythe	Long, Md.
Cederberg	Fraser	Lukan
Chamberlain	Frelinghuysen	McClary
Chisholm	Frenzel	McDade
Clark	Froehlich	McFall

December 18, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 12215

McKay
McKinney
Madden
Mallory
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Metcalfe
Mezvinisky
Michel
Minish
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Moakley
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Parris
Patman
Patten
Peysner
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Quie
Rallsback

NAYS—189

Abdnor
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Archer
Ashbrook
Baffals
Bauman
Beard
Bennett
Bevill
Bowen
Bray
Brinkley
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Burgener
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Butler
Byron
Camp
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Chappell
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Cochran
Collier
Collins, Tex.
Conlan
Conyers
Crane
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Denholm
Dent
Devine
Dickinson
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edwards, Ala.
Ewins, Tenn.
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt
Fountain
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys

NOT VOTING—38

Adams
Blatnik
Brasco

Rangel
Rees
Regula
Relyard
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rinaldo
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Schneebeil
Selberling
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stanton, J. William
Stanton, James V.
Stark
Steele
Stelger, Wis.
Stokes
Stratton
Symington

Teague
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Traxler
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Ware
Whalen
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Winn
Wolf
Wyatt
Wylder
Yates
Yatron
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki

Natcher
Nichols
Obey
Passman
Perkins
Pettis
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Powell, Ohio
Price, Tex.
Pritchard
Quillen
Randall
Rarick
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Rogers
Roncallo, Wyo.
Rose
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Satterfield
Scherle
Schroeder
Sebelius
Shriver
Shuster
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Snyder
Spence
Steelman
Stelger, Ariz.
Stubblefield
Studds
Sullivan
Symms
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Towell, Nev.
Treen
Veysey
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wylie
Wyman
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.
Young, S.C.
Zion

Grasso
Gray
Griffiths
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hastings
Howard
Jones, N.C.

Landgrebe
Litton
McCloskey
Macdonald
Mills
Owens
Pepper
Podell
Roncallo, N.Y.

Rooney, N.Y.
Shipley
Shoup
Staggers
Steed
Stevens
Stuckey
Wright
Zwach

So the conference report was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Howard for, with Mr. Shipley against.
Mr. Carey of New York for, with Mr. Steed against.
Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Stephens against.
Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. Stuckey against.
Mr. Wright for, with Mr. Owens against.
Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.
Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Staggers against.
Mr. Brown of Michigan for, with Mr. Frey against.
Mr. McCloskey for, with Mr. Landgrebe against.
Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Roncallo of New York against.
Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Eshleman against.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington for, with Mr. Hastings against.

Until further notice:
Mr. Adams with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Dellenback with Mrs. Grasso.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Litton with Mr. Mills.
Mr. Zwach with Mr. Shoup.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?
There was no objection.

EASTERN WILDERNESS AREAS ACT OF 1974

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3433) to further the purposes of the Wilderness Act by designating certain acquired lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, to provide for study of certain additional lands for such inclusion, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. HOSMER. Reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of inquiring of the gentleman as to the general features of the legislation as he desires it to be brought before the House at this point.

Mr. MELCHER. If the gentleman will yield, we are asking for the considera-

tion of the Eastern Wilderness bill. It involves designating that wilderness as constituting 16 areas in the East and 17 to be designated as study areas, all in the Eastern United States. It is a Senate-passed bill.

It was approved unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and it is a bill that has been co-sponsored by over 100 Members of the House.

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

I fully approve of its nature and of the purpose of the legislation and withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.
The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3433

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be known as the "Eastern Wilderness Areas Act of 1974".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—
(1) in the more populous eastern half of the United States there is an urgent need to identify, study, designate, and preserve areas for addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System;
(2) areas of wilderness in the more populous eastern half of the United States are increasingly threatened by the pressures of a growing and more mobile population, large-scale industrial and economic growth, and development and uses inconsistent with the protection, maintenance, and enhancement of the areas' wilderness character;
(3) the national forests in the eastern United States consist predominantly of acquired lands where the impact of man's past activity has been substantial, and the restoration of such lands for conservation purposes and specifically for wilderness purposes requires considerable effort;
(4) there is a growing need for the broad range of recreational opportunities which can be provided within the national forest system; and
(5) among these opportunities is the opportunity for present and future generations to enjoy primitive recreation in a spacious, natural, and wilderness setting.

(b) Therefore, the Congress finds and declares that it is in the national interest that areas hereinafter cited in the eastern half of the United States be promptly designated as wilderness within the National Wilderness Preservation System, and that additional areas be promptly studied. These actions are required in order to preserve such areas as an enduring source of wilderness which shall be managed to promote and perpetuate the wilderness character of the land and its specific values of solitude, physical and mental challenge, scientific study, inspiration, and primitive recreation for the benefit of all of the American people of present and future generations.

DESIGNATION OF AREAS PURSUANT TO THIS ACT

SEC. 3. Only national forest areas east of the one hundredth meridian may be designated pursuant to this Act as wilderness areas or wilderness study areas.

DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS

SEC. 4. In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 890), the following lands (hereinafter referred to as "wilderness areas") located east of the one hundredth meridian and as generally depicted on maps appropriately referenced, dated April 1974, are hereby designated as

wilderness and, therefore, as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System—

- (1) certain lands in the Bankhead National Forest, Alabama, which comprise about twelve thousand acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Sipsey Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Sipsey Wilderness;
- (2) certain lands in the Ouachita National Forest, Arkansas, which comprise about fourteen thousand four hundred and thirty-three acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Caney Creek Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Caney Creek Wilderness;
- (3) certain lands in the Ozark National Forest, Arkansas, which comprise about ten thousand five hundred and ninety acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Upper Buffalo Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Upper Buffalo Wilderness;
- (4) certain lands in the Appalachian National Forest, Florida, which comprise about twenty-two thousand acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Bradwell Bay Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Bradwell Bay Wilderness;
- (5) certain lands in the Chattahoochee and Cherokee National Forests, Georgia, and Tennessee, which comprise about thirty-seven thousand three hundred acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Cohutta Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Cohutta Wilderness;
- (6) certain lands in the Daniel Boone National Forest, Kentucky, which comprise about five thousand five hundred acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Beaver Creek Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Beaver Creek Wilderness;
- (7) certain lands in the Hiawatha National Forest, Michigan, which comprise about six thousand six hundred acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Big Island Lake Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Big Island Lake Wilderness;
- (8) certain lands in the Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri, which comprise about sixteen thousand four hundred acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Glades Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Glades Wilderness;
- (9) certain lands in the Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri, which comprise about nineteen thousand one hundred acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Irish Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Irish Wilderness;
- (10) certain lands in the White Mountain National Forest, New Hampshire, which comprise about twenty thousand three hundred and eighty acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Presidential Range-Dry River Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Presidential Range-Dry River Wilderness;
- (11) certain lands in the Nantahala and Cherokee National Forests, North Carolina and Tennessee, which comprise about fifteen thousand acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Joyce Kilmer-Slickrock Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Joyce Kilmer-Slickrock Wilderness;
- (12) certain lands in the Sumter, Nantahala, and Chattahoochee National Forests in South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia, which comprise about three thousand six hundred acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Ellicott Rock Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as Ellicott Rock Wilderness;
- (13) certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest, Tennessee, which comprise about two thousand five hundred and seventy acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Lye Brook Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Lye Brook Wilderness;
- (14) certain lands in the Green Mountain National Forest, Vermont, which comprise about six thousand five hundred acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Bristol Cliffs Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Bristol Cliffs Wilderness;
- (15) certain lands in the Green Mountain National Forest, Vermont, which comprise about fourteen thousand three hundred acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Lye Brook Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Lye Brook Wilderness;
- (16) certain lands in the Jefferson National Forest, Virginia, which comprise about eight thousand eight hundred acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "James River Face Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the James River Face Wilderness;
- (17) certain lands in the Monongahela National Forest, West Virginia, which comprise about ten thousand two hundred and fifteen acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Dolly Sods Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Dolly Sods Wilderness;
- (18) certain lands in the Monongahela National Forest, West Virginia, which comprise about twenty thousand acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Otter Creek Wilderness Study Area", and shall be known as the Otter Creek Wilderness; and
- (19) certain lands in the Chequamegon National Forest, Wisconsin, which comprise about six thousand six hundred acres, are generally depicted on a map entitled "Rainbow Lake Wilderness Area—Proposed", and shall be known as the Rainbow Lake Wilderness.

DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS

SEC. 5. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act and in accordance with the procedures specified in section 3(d) of that Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall review, as to its suitability or nonsuitability for preservation as wilderness, each area designated by or pursuant to subsection (b) of this section.

(b) Areas to be reviewed pursuant to this section (hereinafter referred to as "wilderness study areas"), located east of the one hundredth meridian and as generally depicted on maps appropriately referenced, dated April 1974, include—

- (1) certain lands in the Ouachita National Forest, Arkansas, which comprise approximately five thousand seven hundred acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Belle Starr Cave Wilderness Study Area";
- (2) certain lands in the Ouachita National Forest, Arkansas, which comprise approximately five thousand five hundred acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Dry Creek Wilderness Study Area";
- (3) certain lands in the Ozark National Forest, Arkansas, which comprise approximately two thousand one hundred acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Richland Creek Wilderness Study Area";
- (4) certain lands in the Ocala National Forest, Florida, which comprise approximately ten thousand acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Alexander Springs Wilderness Study Area";
- (5) certain lands in the Appalachian National Forest, Florida, which comprise approximately one thousand one hundred acres and are generally depicted as the "Sopchoppy River Wilderness Study Area" on a map entitled "Bradwell Bay Wilderness Area—Proposed";
- (6) certain lands in the Shawnee National Forest, Illinois, which comprise two thousand eight hundred acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "LaRue-Pine Hills Wilderness Study Area";
- (7) certain lands in the Shawnee National Forest, Illinois, which comprise approximately fifteen thousand acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Lusk Creek Wilderness Study Area";
- (8) certain lands in the Hoosier National Forest, Indiana, which comprise approximately thirty thousand seven hundred and fifty acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Nebo Ridge Wilderness Study Area";
- (9) certain lands in the Kisatchie National Forest, Louisiana, which comprise approximately ten thousand acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Kisatchie Hills Wilderness Study Area";
- (10) certain lands in the Kisatchie National Forest, Louisiana, which comprise approximately five thousand acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Saline Bayou Wilderness Study Area";
- (11) certain lands in the White Mountain National Forest, Maine, which comprise approximately twelve thousand acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Caribou-Speckled Mountain Wilderness Study Area";
- (12) certain lands in the Hiawatha National Forest, Michigan, which comprise approximately five thousand four hundred acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Rock River Canyon Wilderness Study Area";
- (13) certain lands in the Ottawa National Forest, Michigan, which comprise approximately thirteen thousand two hundred acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Sturgeon River Wilderness Study Area";
- (14) certain lands in the Clark National Forest, Missouri, which comprise approximately seven thousand six hundred and forty acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Bell Mountain Wilderness Study Area";
- (15) certain lands in the Clark National Forest, Missouri, which comprise approximately six thousand eight hundred acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Rockpile Mountain Wilderness Study Area";
- (16) certain lands in the White Mountain National Forest, New Hampshire, which comprise approximately ten thousand acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Carr Mountain Wilderness Study Area";
- (17) certain lands in the White Mountain National Forest, New Hampshire, which comprise approximately fourteen thousand four hundred acres and are depicted as the "Great Gulf Wilderness Extension Study Area" on a map entitled "Presidential Range Wilderness Area—Proposed";
- (18) certain lands in the White Mountain National Forest, New Hampshire, which comprise approximately sixteen thousand acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Kilkenny Wilderness Study Area";
- (19) certain lands in the White Mountain National Forest, New Hampshire, which comprise approximately twenty thousand acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Wild River Wilderness Study Area";
- (20) certain lands in the Pisgah National Forest, North Carolina, which comprise approximately one thousand one hundred acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Craggy Mountain Wilderness Study Area";
- (21) certain lands in the Croatan National Forest, North Carolina, which comprise approximately seventeen thousand acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Pocosin Wilderness Study Area";
- (22) certain lands in the Wayne National Forest, Ohio, which comprise approximately nineteen thousand acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Archers Fork Wilderness Study Area";
- (23) certain lands in the Allegheny National Forest, Pennsylvania, which comprise approximately eleven thousand two hundred acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled "Hickory Creek Wilderness Study Area";