

antismuggling, antipollution, and offshore fisheries.

With these many and varied responsibilities, it is absolutely mandatory that the facilities necessary to implement these responsibilities be maintained in an adequate number and efficient operating capability. The purpose of the bill before the House today is to provide the annual authorization for the acquisition of vessels and aircraft and for the construction of facilities, as well as the authorization for Federal funds to alter obstructive bridges, and to establish certain personnel ceilings.

In addition to the replacement program for one of the major aircraft fleets of the Coast Guard, the bill provides for several items involving vessels. The first of these is the procurement of 20 port safety boats which are required to perform harbor safety and pollution controls, boarding, searching, and surveillance of special interest vessels, and escorting particularly hazardous cargo ships in harbor areas. A second item continues a replacement program for tenders which service the aids to navigation along our inland waters. The third item involves the acquisition of a new type of small aids to navigation boat, in order to more efficiently utilize available facilities. The fourth item is for the acquisition of 30 utility boats, 41 foot in length which are utilized in the search and rescue mission. The fifth item authorizes the replacement of one harbor tugboat which type of vessel is used in domestic icebreaking, search and rescue, boat safety, aids to navigation servicing, and general support.

With the exception of the new small aids to navigation boat, all of these items involve continuing replacement programs for existing aging equipment. In addition, for the transition period of July-September 1976, there is one vessel procurement item which authorizes an additional six search and rescue utility boats.

The items relating to construction falls into several categories, consisting of the construction of new search and rescue station in areas where boating activity requires them, the construction of various buildings on existing stations, the relocation of existing facilities to new and better sites, and the continuation of construction of public family quarters necessary in areas where adequate housing is not available for Coast Guard personnel and their dependents. New shore stations are authorized for Bradenton and Destin, Fla.; continued construction for new aviation stations are included for Sitka, Alaska and St. Petersburg, Fla.; and renovation of existing stations is provided for Piney Point, Md., Traverse City, Mich., and Kodiak, Alaska. The expansion of training and support facilities for Yorktown, Va., and Elizabeth City, N.C. are provided for, and the authorization of funds for the relocation of the second Coast Guard district office in St. Louis, Mo., and floating units in Seattle, Wash. is included.

Finally, the construction authorization includes \$22.6 million in fiscal year 1976, and \$2.8 million in the transition period following, for the continuation of construction necessary to implement the national navigation plan to provide loran-C navigational coverage throughout the coastal confluence zone, covering the coastal waters along the shorelines. The first phase of this plan was begun in 1974, and it is expected to be completed in 1980. Under this bill, the authorization covers two new stations in Alaska, the completion of final outfitting at five west coast stations, and the construction and equipping of a station near Elmira, N.Y., as well as the procurement of lead time material and site acquisition for east coast and Gulf of Mexico service.

The items in this bill are absolutely necessary. As has been the experience in past years, the authorization requests are very conservative, and it may well be that future years will require a speed-up of present plans to meet expanding services. For the present, the committee is content to endorse the administration request as contained in its authorization submission to the Congress, and urges all Members to support the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to lend my support to the fiscal year 1976 Coast Guard authorization.

It is essential in these financially troublesome times we adhere to fiscal restraint whenever possible.

The \$2.2 million increase above the fiscal year 1975 authorization is modest. The subcommittee on Coast Guard Navigation along with the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee were careful to maintain those vital areas of funding under the specific categories which must receive full fundings.

All too often the Coast Guard is thought of as merely another branch of our Armed Forces. The Coast Guard, upon declaration of war, would become a service in the Navy. However, at all other times, it operates as an agency under the Department of Transportation. Some of its primary duties as an agency under DOT include maintenance of aids to maritime navigation, icebreaking, and rescue facilities, promulgate and enforce safety regulations involving various vessels in interstate and foreign commerce, enforcement of offshore fisheries laws, oceanographic research, and the licensing of personnel and supervision of vessel operations. I am privileged to sit as ranking minority on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation. During the course of our recent Coast Guard and National Transportation Safety Board hearings, we learned of the increasing vessel congestion in our inland waterways and harbors. Further, we learned of the enormous increase in serious vessel accidents over the past 3 years.

The Coast Guard is shouldered with enormous responsibility in these areas. They must be provided with funding to obtain the necessary equipment and

facilities to carry out their responsibilities. This bill does provide for the procurement of badly needed vessels, aircraft and facilities needed to enable the Coast Guard to properly administer their responsibilities.

Fellow Members—this is a responsible bill which enables the Coast Guard to perform their safety and enforcement responsibilities without any reductions in essential programs. I urge my colleagues to adopt this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5217, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the bill H.R. 5217, just passed.

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

There was no objection.

MARINE PROTECTION, RESEARCH, AND SANCTUARIES ACT AUTHORIZATION

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5710) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1976 for the purpose of carrying out titles I and II of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5710

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 111 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended (33 U.S.C. 1420), is amended by striking out "and not to exceed \$5,500,000 for fiscal years 1974 and 1975", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "not to exceed \$5,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, not to exceed \$5,300,000 for fiscal year 1976, and not to exceed \$1,325,000 for the transition period (July 1 through September 30, 1976)."

Sec. 2. Section 202(a) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1442(c)) is amended by striking out "January" and inserting in lieu thereof "March".

Sec. 3. Section 204 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1444) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$1,500,000 for the transition period (July 1 through September 30, 1976)."

Sec. 4. Section 304 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1434) is amended to read as follows: "Sec. 304. There are authorized to be ap-

propriated not to exceed \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1973, 1974, and 1975, not to exceed \$6,200,000 for fiscal year 1976 and not to exceed \$1,550,000 for the transition period (July 1 through September 30, 1976) to carry out the provisions of this title, including the acquisition, development, and operation of marine sanctuaries designated under this title."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER) is recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, in enacting the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, better known as the Ocean Dumping Act, the Congress participated in the making of an important commitment—the protection of the oceans and U.S. coastal waters from unregulated dumping of all materials.

Prior to the passage of that act, the range of ocean dumping included radioactive materials, nerve gas, sewage sludge, dredged material, a variety of industrial chemicals, and a variety of other miscellaneous and unknown debris. In order to protect the world's oceans from such activities and in order to try to develop alternatives to the dumping of these waste materials in these waters, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported and the Congress enacted in 1972 the Ocean Dumping Act.

Title I of that act gives to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency the right to regulate the dumping of all types of material into the ocean waters—except for dredged material, which is regulated by the Corps of Engineers under EPA standards where applicable—and the power to prevent or strictly limit the dumping into the ocean waters of any material which would adversely affect human health, welfare, the marine environment, ecological systems, or economic potentialities.

The authorization for funding under title I of the act expires June 30, 1975. Section 1 of the bill would extend title I of the act until September 30, 1976, and would authorize to be appropriated an amount not to exceed \$5,300,000 for fiscal year 1976 and \$1,325,000 for the transition period from July 1, 1976 through September 30, 1976.

Mr. Speaker, title II of the act authorizes and directs the Secretary of Commerce to carry out comprehensive and continuing programs of research on both the short range and long range effects of the dumping of waste materials into our ocean waters and the waters of the Great Lakes.

The authorization for funding under title II of the act expires June 30, 1976.

Section 3 of the bill would extend title II of the act until September 30, 1976, and would authorize to be appropriated during the transition period an amount not to exceed \$1,500,000.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has consulted with the Committee on Science and Technology concerning their interest in any environmental research and development money contained in this authorization for the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to title II of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-532).

As a result of this consultation, the Committee on Science and Technology felt that the small amount of research and study funds under this authorization for the transition period—from July 1, 1976 through September 30, 1976—was not sufficient in this case to warrant a separate referral for their consideration. Further, both committees agreed to maintain a close and continuing liaison in such matters in an effort to coordinate their common interests.

Mr. Speaker, title III of the act authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to designate certain areas in our ocean waters and the waters of the Great Lakes as marine sanctuaries which are deemed necessary for the preservation or restoration of such areas for their conservation, recreational, ecological, or esthetic values.

The authorization for funding under title III of the act expires June 30, 1975. Section 4 of the bill would extend title III of the act until September 30, 1976, and would authorize to be appropriated an amount not to exceed \$6,200,000 for fiscal year 1976 and \$1,550,000 for the transition period from July 1, 1976, through September 30, 1976.

Mr. Speaker, in its hearings on this legislation, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries discovered that the Federal agencies charged with the administration of this act were extremely miserly in carrying out their responsibilities under the act. For instance, only one marine sanctuary—at a cost of \$60,000—has been designated under title III during the 3-year life of this act. With respect to title II, no funds whatsoever have been appropriated. With respect to title I, funds have been appropriated, but in the opinion of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, these funds have been grossly inadequate. They amounted to \$290,000 in fiscal year 1973; \$1,296,000 in fiscal year 1974; and \$1,320,000 in fiscal year 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that this is important and necessary legislation if we are to succeed in our goal of protecting the oceans and our U.S. coastal waters. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has analyzed the performance of the Federal agencies charged with carrying out this act and their expenditures to date under this act and we think H.R. 5710, as reported by the committee, adequately reflects the level of funding that is needed if we are serious about the goals to which we have committed ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5710 was unanimously ordered reported by the Commit-

tee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I urge its prompt passage.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his action as chairman of the subcommittee on reporting out this important piece of legislation. As the gentleman has noted, while the bill is titled "An Act to extend titles I and III," it does deal with title II, the research and development portion of the program, in a minimal way, through the transitional quarter funding.

Under the rules of the House, the Committee on Science and Technology has been granted the jurisdiction over environmental research and development. It is the desire of the Committee on Science and Technology to work very closely with the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in seeking an equitable way and a proper way to handle the authorization for this kind of research and development.

As the gentleman has indicated, as a result of our discussions we have agreed that there is no point in any further referral for consideration by the Committee on Science and Technology. I think the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, both the subcommittee chaired by the gentleman, and the full committee, has done an excellent job. I merely wanted to take this time to point out the minor jurisdictional duplication that exists here.

Mr. LEGGETT. I want to thank the gentleman for his cooperation. Certainly our committee is jealous of its prerogatives and jurisdiction, and I do appreciate the fact that we are encroaching in part on an active jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee. This is, as the gentleman indicated, a nominal encroachment.

Mr. Speaker, I think later on this afternoon we will have a bill of more significant proportions which I hope the gentleman will address himself to.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

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

I think I should say, as a member of both committees, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Science and Technology, that I certainly associate myself with the comments of both gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT and Mr. BROWN).

I think this is a situation in which the committees have worked together very well.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS).

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

I would just like to know how much this exceeds the administration's budget.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, to answer the gentleman, this is an authorization bill. Were appropriations made and

were outlays made by the administration under the full authorization that we envision under this act, it might have the effect of increasing the total budget that we are talking about. I say that candidly and in all frankness. However, considering the fact that we are in a position where we are probably \$15 billion out of phase with the President at this point, considering the fact that we are probably directly out of phase by \$8 billion, and we have different priorities than he does, I think that the few million dollars that we are fighting for here to accentuate some of the lost causes in the environmental area are critically required and should be one of the places where the Congress takes a look and reasserts its interest. This would, then, be one of the items that we would balance up in a separate readjustment period where all of the things to happen, to wit, authorization, appropriation, and an indication by the administration that they would, in fact, spend the money.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I would just like to add further that I think the real problem that we have insofar as the environment is concerned is that pollution has taken place with respect to our money, which is probably much more serious than anything else that is happening. I would hope that this thing could be kept within the budget so that we do not have to use the printing press to pay for it, by further inflating our currency.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comment.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is true that the authorization requested here is somewhat larger than that requested by the administration. However, the authorizations we are requesting here, in title I and title III, are no more—in fact, they are a little bit less—than the previous authorizations.

The testimony before the committee more than justifies these authorization levels. Even though the Committee on Appropriations may not see fit in this fiscal year to increase the appropriations—and, frankly, I hope that they might increase them—we in our committee feel so strongly that the evidence warrants these authorizations that we take the position that it is completely meritorious to ask for them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for passage of H.R. 5710, to continue authorizations for the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972.

When our committee was considering this legislation in 1971, I was impressed by the testimony of the well-known oceanographer, Capt. Jacques Cousteau. I would like to share some of his words with you:

Because 96 percent of the water on earth is in the oceans, we have deluded ourselves into thinking of the seas as enormous and indestructible. We have not considered that the earth is a closed system. Once destroyed, the oceans can never be replaced. . . .

The sea is a source of all life. If the sea did not exist, man would not exist. The sea is fragile and in danger. We must love and protect it if we are to continue ourselves.

Congress took the initiative to protect our waters when we enacted the "Ocean Dumping Act" into law. We cannot turn our backs now. During the past several years, we have been able to control only limited amounts of disposal pollution into our ocean environment. While there has been some success, but we have learned that much more is necessary before our ultimate goals are achieved. It is not fully known what affects many types of waste disposal have on the marine ecosystem.

These answers can only be provided through further research. H.R. 5710 would provide the necessary authorizations for the continuance of studies by the Environmental Protection Agency and the other responsible agencies involved.

By authorizing \$5.3 million for title I, EPA and others could continue their programs. I hope much more vigorously than now, their programs of site evaluations and baseline studies on existing and proposed disposal areas. They could also utilize these funds to establish badly needed criteria to ascertain which materials are harmful to our ocean waters. To authorize less funds would be tantamount to neglecting our responsibilities under the law which we envisioned and enacted.

The \$6.2 million authorization level for title III would provide the Department of Commerce with the necessary funds to acquire, develop, and restore areas of our oceans and Great Lakes. Through the process of marine sanctuary designation, we have an important mechanism for preserving valuable marine areas for our future enjoyment.

Mr. Speaker, as a representative from the Great Lakes area, I am well aware of how pollution can destroy our valuable natural resources. We have significantly expanded efforts to protect and enhance our Great Lakes and we must not abandon these efforts now.

I urge this House to approve H.R. 5710.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN).

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the passage of legislation in the 92d Congress which resulted in the enactment of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act—commonly known as the Ocean Dumping Act—represented a national commitment to protect the oceans and the coastal waters of the United States from uncontrolled dumping of all waste materials.

There is also in existence today an international treaty covering the same general subject of which this country was a principal sponsor. If we are to live up to our obligations, both under the statute and under the treaty, we must act favorably on this legislation.

The purpose of the legislation under consideration today, H.R. 5710, is to extend until September 30, 1976, all three titles of the Ocean Dumping Act at levels of funding which my Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries think are necessary for the Federal agencies concerned to adequately carry out their re-

sponsibilities under this act. It is only in this way that we can ever expect to prevent or strictly limit the dumping into the oceans and our coastal waters of any material which would adversely affect human health and our valuable marine resources.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of all Members for the prompt passage of H.R. 5710.

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a result of joint hearings between two subcommittees of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment and the Subcommittee on Oceanography.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) and I cochaired the hearings on this important measure. I rise today to speak in support of this bill and of his request that it be acted upon favorably by Members here today. I cannot overemphasize the urgency and need for sustaining this bill before us.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FORTNEY), who is also a member of the committee that heard the legislation, and I, are acutely aware of the ocean-dumping problem as it relates to the coastlines of our respective States—New York and New Jersey. There is an urgent need for better site locations for ocean dumping, for increased surveillance, and increased enforcement of this act.

The Environmental Protection Agency is currently studying projected new dumping sites on the northern and southern edges of the Hudson Canyon. The northern edge of this is off the State of New York, and the southern edge of this is off the State of New Jersey. While the so-called creeping glob is creeping toward our eastern shoreline, the Environmental Protection Agency does not have all the resources it needs to study both sites simultaneously to see which one of the two is best suited for ocean-dumping purposes and eventually best for the eastern coast of the United States.

I might say further, Mr. Speaker, that we voted the Environmental Protection Agency some \$7.5 billion in the last Congress for sanctuary plans, and for separation sewage. The primary treatment wastes are dumped off all of our coasts involving some 34 of our States, and they certainly should be greatly aware that that dumping point is now starting to move toward the shorelines. We learned that from some of our satellite pictures.

There are dozens of sites that must be studied by the Environmental Protection Agency, and also dozens of baseline studies that must be made before the U.S. coastlines can begin to emerge from the quagmire of sludge, garbage and other materials, the total mess out of which this legislation was supposed to lift our coastal waters.

This legislation and the funds appropriated therein constitute the absolute

minimum necessary to keep this program going, and to give to the appropriate agencies involved the wherewithal to make a reasonable attempt to clean up our oceans by the 1980's.

I support my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) in the specific remarks the gentleman has made concerning this legislation, and wish to add my voice in strong support of a program that is of such great import to the people, to our 34 coastal States, and especially to the States of New York and New Jersey.

I urge all Members to concur with my distinguished colleague and with the combined membership of our two subcommittees, and with the membership of the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and adopt this legislation unanimously.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I want to congratulate the gentleman who is now in the well for cochairing these hearings. I might say that we did work synergistically in the development of this bill. Is it not a fact that we did hear testimony that we need more money to make this act workable, that we were running into real problems, and that we needed, as indicated by the gentleman in the well, more than \$1.3 million in administrative costs required for personnel and contracts, and for interagency agreements; \$2.2 million for projected costs to conduct 11 site surveys on existing designated dumping areas, and that the fact that we do not have dumping areas is holding up the necessary dredging which produces commercially and which becomes part of the GNP; and that it is estimated we need \$1.6 million for projected costs necessitated to conduct two baseline surveys; and \$200,000 additional personnel costs to augment the 26 positions currently operative?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. The answer is yes, as I pointed out in my earlier remarks, unless we come in with this minimal research, and hopefully it gets funded, we will just be kidding ourselves by spending \$7.5 billion for sewerage wastes and sludge, and then where do we dump these sewerage wastes and sludge? We know every coastal State that is affected is waiting for us to come in with a sensible program such as the gentleman from California has recommended to the Congress, and without this it would be just a waste of our technical ability and also our ability to clean up our own waters.

Mr. LEGGETT. If the gentleman will yield still further, I know that the gentleman took testimony with respect to the need for further funds for sanctuaries.

We have the coral reef area in Florida, and the Florida Keys area, the "Talcott area" in California which spans four counties, in Alaska the Bristol Bay area, and in Washington the Puget Sound area, and the Chincoteague area. So these areas are spread all over the country. We have only spent about \$60,000 on this total program over the past several years, and is this not a rather reasonable need and reasonable priority?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Mc-

FALL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. It certainly would be probably the greatest economy vote we could cast in this Congress to support this very modest authorization for these purposes.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of both the gentleman from California and the gentleman from New York. I think this is an extremely modest authorization bill for a very large and important program. I certainly hope that the House will see fit to pass it overwhelmingly.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FORSYTHE).

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, I would like also to compliment the gentleman from California and the gentleman from New York, the chairmen of the two subcommittees, for their work on this legislation. It certainly, I think, is so highly important to this Nation if we are going to even touch this problem of ocean dumping. We have entered into this international agreement to assure that we solve these problems worldwide, and yet doing our job here within our own borders is very, very minimal. Even the authorization that we have in this bill, I think, really hardly touches the problem, most particularly so far as the east coast, in the New York-New Jersey area, where some 80 percent of this problem exists.

We are very concerned as to whether we are really making a mark in solving the problem of ocean dumping and ocean pollution. I do hope that this legislation does pass with the overwhelming vote of this House. While I recognize that the authorization is above the budget requested by the President, I think this is an investment that is highly important for the future of this Nation.

I urge full support for the legislation.

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

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank the gentleman for the accolades. Certainly I want to point up to the House the work of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey in sparkplugging the minority side on the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment. We have no majority-minority on that subcommittee. We move ahead with the interests that we have in common, looking towards the protection of the subject matter which is in the jurisdiction of the subcommittee. The gentleman has been a real sparkplug, has attended the meetings, and has done his homework. In fact, the fact that we are supporting here

today the Talcott Sanctuary Area of California certainly speaks of the bipartisan nature of the way the subcommittee is operating.

Mr. FORSYTHE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act. Only through clear regulation of permits and frequent evaluations can we expect to properly control the dumping of certain materials into our oceans. With waste dumping sites becoming scarce, cities as well as many industries, and even Government agencies are looking to our oceans to rid themselves of waste materials. If we do not develop strong controls and specific regulations, the massive increases in materials poured into our oceans may soon cause a severe adverse environmental problem in our oceans.

This legislation is important. However, there is another difficulty I would like to bring up that is not covered under this legislation, that should receive considerable congressional action, and that is the dumping of fuel into our rivers and oceans. This is of extreme importance to me as a representative of a shoreline district in Connecticut, and of importance to any person who uses an ocean beach or inland water recreational facility.

The Department of the Navy recently dumped what they called "contaminated fuel" into the Thames River, ignoring the pollution aspects, and advising that this was cheaper than reclaiming the fuel. It is also known that the Navy recently disposed of 7,500 gallons of aviation fuel into the ocean. One report estimates that during fiscal year 1974, 6.2 million gallons of fuel were disposed of in our seas. The Department advised that they will halt all fuel and waste discharges from naval vessels not later than the end of this decade. However, this is not soon enough. We need regulations that are strong, and studies and evaluations that will show the effect of what has already been dropped into our oceans, as well as increased controls that would preclude this unnecessary pollution of our streams, harbors, rivers, and oceans in which this activity takes place.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5710, as amended.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 3 of rule XXVII and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

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