

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 122—PART 8

APRIL 1, 1976 TO APRIL 8, 1976

(PAGES 8957 TO 10206)

Mr. Chairman, I think my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. WIRTH), has done a very fine thing in adding the 6,000 acres in the East Meadow area to this park. The primary question at issue here is not the water supply of Denver. That will be worked out in conference. It is a question of retaining the acreage just added. It would be a great mistake now to subtract 8,000 acres from this park. That, I believe, is far more than is needed for Denver's water purposes.

Therefore, I hope the Members of the Committee will support the committee position and will vote in opposition to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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

Mr. OTTINGER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I note that in the amendment in the nature of a substitute that was offered we have now another dated map, and that date is May 1975. The committee presented one map, and there was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. WIRTH). We accepted a different map, and now the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) is offering a substitute amendment which presents a third map.

I think the situation is very confusing, and I hope the amendment in the nature of a substitute is voted down so we can go to conference and get a decent bill.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, with 136,000 acres now in the bill, we are in the best possible position to go to conference and resolve any remaining doubts. I do hope the Committee will support the committee position and vote in opposition to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the Eagles Nest Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

SEC. 3. The Eagles Nest Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 4. The previous classification of the Gore Range-Eagles Nest Primitive Area is hereby abolished.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3863) to designate the Eagles Nest Wilderness, Arapaho and White River National Forests, in the State of Colorado, pursuant to House Resolution 1127, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1127, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 268) to designate the Eagles Nest Wilderness, Arapaho and White River National Forests, in the State of Colorado.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MELCHER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MELCHER moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill S. 268 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 3863, as passed, as follows:

That, in accordance with subsection 3(b) of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 891; 16 U.S.C. 1132(b)), the area classified as the Gore Range-Eagles Nest Primitive Area, with the proposed additions thereto and deletions therefrom, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Eagles Nest Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1973, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, is hereby designated as the "Eagles Nest Wilderness" within and as part of the Arapaho and White River National Forests comprising an area of approximately one hundred and thirty-six thousand seven hundred and fifty acres.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the Eagles Nest Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

SEC. 3. The Eagles Nest Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be

deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 4. The previous classification of the Gore Range-Eagles Nest Primitive Area is hereby abolished.

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 3863) was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

#### POSTPONING FOR 6 MONTHS THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN CHILD DAY CARE CENTER STANDARDS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 94-440)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I am returning without my approval, H.R. 9803, a bill which would perpetuate rigid Federal child day care standards for all the States and localities in the Nation, with the cost to be paid by the Federal taxpayer.

I cannot approve legislation which runs directly counter to a basic principle of government in which I strongly believe—the vesting of responsibility in State and local government and the removing of burdensome Federal restrictions.

I am firmly committed to providing Federal assistance to States for social services programs, including child day care. But I am opposed to unwarranted Federal interference in States' administration of these programs.

The States should have the responsibility—and the right—to establish and enforce their own quality day care standards. My recently proposed Federal Assistance for Community Services Act would adopt this principle, and with it greater State flexibility in other aspects of the use of social services funds available under Title XX of the Social Security Act.

H.R. 9803 is the antithesis of my proposal. It would make permanent highly controversial and costly day care staff-to-children ratios. And it would deny the States the flexibility to establish and enforce their own staffing standards for federally assisted day care.

This bill would not make day care services more widely available. It would only make them more costly to the American taxpayer. It would demand the expendi-

ture of \$125 million over the next six months, and could lead to \$250 million more each year thereafter.

H.R. 9803 would also specify that a portion of Federal social services funds be available under Title XX of the Social Security Act for a narrow, categorical purpose. In the deliberations leading to enactment of Title XX, a little over a year ago, the States and the voluntary service organizations fought hard to win the right to determine both the form and the content of services to be provided according to their own priorities. This bill would undermine the Title XX commitment to State initiative by dictating not only how day care services are to be provided, but also how they are to be financed under Title XX.

It would introduce two additional Federal matching rates for some day care costs that are higher than the rates for other Title XX-supported services, thereby further complicating the States' administration of social services programs. My proposal would, on the other hand, eliminate State matching requirements altogether.

Moreover, H.R. 9803 would create an unfair situation in which some child day care centers would operate under a different set of standards than other centers within the same State. Those day care centers in which fewer than 20 percent of those served are eligible under Title XX could be exempt from Federal day care standards. This provision would have the probable effect in some instances of reducing the availability of day care services by encouraging day care centers to reduce the proportion of children in their care who are eligible under Title XX in order to meet the "quota" set by H.R. 9803. In those centers not choosing to take advantage of this loophole, the effect could well be to increase day care costs to families who use these centers on a fee-paying basis. In effect, they would be helping to subsidize the high cost imposed on day care providers serving Title XX-eligible children.

There is considerable debate as to the appropriateness or efficacy of the Federal day care standards imposed by H.R. 9803. In fact, the bill recognizes many of these questions by postponing their enforcement for the third time, in this case to July 1 of this year. Fewer than one in four of the States have chosen to follow these standards closely in the administration of their day care programs. The Congress itself has required by law that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conduct an 18-month study ending in 1977, to evaluate their appropriateness.

Rather than pursue the unwise course charted in this bill, I urge that the Congress extend, until October 1, 1976, the moratorium on imposition of Federal day care staffing standards that it voted last October. This would give the Congress ample time to enact my proposed Federal Assistance for Community Services Act, under which States would establish and enforce their own day care staffing standards and fashion their social serv-

ices programs in ways they believe will best meet the needs of their citizens.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 6, 1976.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the veto message from the President on the bill H.R. 9803 be postponed until Tuesday, May 4, 1976.

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

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1941, ANIMAL WELFARE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1976

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1941) to amend the act of August 24, 1966, as amended, to assure humane treatment of certain animals, 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 29, 1976.)

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

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the committee of conference I am pleased to bring back to the floor of the House, virtually intact, the bill passed by the House in February by a vote of 335 to 34. This bill strengthens the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Animal Welfare Act to deal with the serious and growing problem of mistreatment of animals in connection with their transportation in commerce.

At public hearings conducted during 1974 and again last fall, the Committee on Agriculture developed an extensive record which shows that the problem is particularly acute in the case of air transportation. Solution of the problem has been impeded by the confusion occasioned by the ill-defined and, heretofore, incomplete jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Federal Aviation Administration. The record developed during the hearings demonstrates that, de-

spite the attention focused on the problem by our hearings and by the 1973 report by the Committee on Government Operations, no progress has been made toward solution of this problem. This bill will give to the Secretary of Agriculture the responsibility and the authority to solve it.

This bill also comes to grip, for the first time, with the vexing problem of animal fighting ventures, particularly dog fighting, which has spread throughout the United States. A dog fight is an ugly, dehumanizing spectacle in which dogs, either trained for the purpose or maddened by drugs and abuse, are deliberately set upon each other in a pit or ring to fight usually to the death. Large sums of money are frequently bet on the outcome and the dogs are horribly mutilated in the process. Testimony before the committee indicated, that in addition to high-stakes gambling, other criminal activities, such as prostitution, frequently take place at dog fighting conventions.

For the benefit of the Members, I will restate in brief outline, the principal provisions of the bill. First, it brings carriers and intermediate handlers within the class of persons regulated under the Animal Welfare Act and requires that they adhere to humane standards promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the transportation in commerce of all animals protected by the act.

Second, dealers, exhibitors, auction sale operators, and Federal, State, and local agencies are required to obtain a veterinarian's certificate before delivering any dog, cat, or other animal designated by the Secretary for transportation in commerce; and dogs, cats, and other animals may not be transported at less than the minimum age established by the Secretary.

Third, COD transportation of animals is prohibited unless the shipper guarantees payment of roundtrip fare and any out-of-pocket expenses of the carrier or intermediate handler for care of animals not claimed at destination.

Fourth, this bill extends the Secretary's investigative authority to intermediate handlers and carriers and authorizes the Secretary to impose upon such handlers and carriers a civil penalty of up to \$1,000 for each violation of the standards of humane care.

Fifth, this bill revises the present penalty provisions of the act and provides a uniform civil penalty of up to \$1,000 for violations by any person regulated under the statute.

Finally, the bill adds to the statute an entirely new section which makes it a crime, punishable by fine and imprisonment, knowingly to sponsor, participate in, or use the mails to promote fights between live dogs or other mammals, except man. With a limited exception, which I will note in a few minutes, this new section would also outlaw such activities in connection with fights between gamefowl or other live birds.

The conference substitute adopts, with minor modifications, the provisions of H.R. 5808, as passed by the House, but