

materials on amnesty, and acts as a clearing-house for people seeking suggestions and ideas on implementing local amnesty work.

FORA, Families of Resisters for Amnesty, has been organized with the aid of Safe Return. Several hundred family members have already joined and a number of chapters are in formation in cities like San Francisco, Portland, Detroit, New York, Seattle, and New Jersey. FORA chapters are conducting petitioning and letter-writing campaigns, distributing the new FORA resister-bracelets, and in some towns, working on local electoral referendums on amnesty. Safe Return may be reached at 156 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1003, New York, N.Y. 10010.

#### SUTTON BLASTS REVENUE SHARING

#### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Citizens Task Force on Revenue Sharing, a group involved in analyzing this new fiscal policy, recently held hearings in New York City to consider the efficacy of revenue sharing as it relates to our city.

The Task Force listened to testimony from the distinguished president of the Borough of Manhattan, Percy Sutton. I now submit excerpts from President Sutton's remarks for the information of my colleagues.

The success of revenue sharing may well influence and reflect the future success of our cities and our Nation. We would do well to carefully scrutinize this fiscal policy before we accept it.

Mr. Sutton's testimony, as reported by the New York Voice on June 1, 1973, follows:

#### GOOD IN THEORY BUT NOT PRACTICE: SUTTON BLASTS REVENUE SHARING

Following are excerpts from testimony on Revenue Sharing by Manhattan Borough President Percy Sutton before the Citizens Task Force on Revenue Sharing at hearings held last week at the Association of the Bar, 42 West 44th St.

Revenue sharing, as it is now structured and as it is presently funded, is not adequate to meet the most elementary needs of the people of the Borough of Manhattan.

The concept of revenue sharing is a necessary one. The trend in American government for decades has been to centralize and super-centralize at all levels.

It is the super-centralization of power at the Federal level in the hands of the President that has helped to create a climate in which a Watergate could occur. It is the super-centralization on a local level which has resulted in vast inefficiency and unresponsiveness in city government.

So the concept of revenue sharing is a good one—to return the power of decision making to the local units of government to implement and deliver the services of government at that level where they might be most efficiently and accountably delivered.

Revenue sharing is the wave of the future.

But Revenue sharing as it is now being implemented is nothing short of a major disaster for the City of New York and for my Borough of Manhattan. At the same time that the Nixon administration is launching a revenue sharing program, it is also causing the cutback of some 13 major social services in the Borough of Manhattan.

The much-heralded Federal Revenue Sharing Plan will result in a net loss of funds for New York City. This is because of a number of sweeping cutbacks—the moratorium on Federal housing subsidy funds; the new legislative ceiling on federal social service spending; the discontinuation of the model cities program; the tightening of income eligibility grants for day care and food stamps; the seven provisions of the proposed Federal budget for 1974 halting the O.E.O. Community Action Emergency Employment Act Assistance, halting urban renewal funding and halting the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

For the City of New York, and for cities across America, the funds thus held back by the Nixon budget substantially exceed the new monies available for revenue sharing. The result is a net loss.

I and my colleagues are left, therefore, with the choice of drastically cutting back services or else petitioning the Legislature for a State takeover of certain municipal services. I find it very ironic that a revenue sharing program which was originally conceived as a device for maximizing decision making at the local level should instead result in vastly increased pressures for the centralization at the State level of what are essentially local services.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 19, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Let not mercy and truth forsake thee;  
bind them about thy neck; write them  
upon the table of thine heart.—Proverbs 3:3.*

"Send down Thy truth, O God;  
Too long the shadows frown;  
Too long the darkened way we trod;  
Thy truth, O Lord, send down.

"Send down Thy love, Thy life,  
Our lesser lives to crown,  
And cleanse them of their hate and  
strife;  
Thy living love send down.

"Send down Thy peace, O Lord;  
Earth's bitter voices drown  
In one deep ocean of accord;  
Thy peace, O God, send down."

EDWARD R. SILL,

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 470. An act to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to regulate the transactions of members of national securities exchanges, to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to define certain duties of persons subject to such Acts, and for other purposes;

S. 907. An act to authorize the appropriation of \$150,000 to assist in financing the Arctic winter games to be held in the State of Alaska in 1974; and

S. 1386. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water program for fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes.

#### PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

JESSE McCARVER, GEORGIA VILLA McCARVER, KATHY McCARVER, AND EDITH McCARVER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1315) for the relief of Jesse McCarver, Georgia Villa McCarver, Kathy McCarver, and Edith McCarver.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1315

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following persons the amount shown opposite his or her name:*

Jesse McCarver.....	\$1,500
Georgia Villa McCarver.....	12,500

Kathy McCarver.....	1,000
Edith McCarver.....	2,000

The amounts paid under this Act shall be in full settlement of all claims of the named individuals against the United States arising out of the automobile accident which occurred on June 12, 1965, near McMinnville, Tennessee, on State highway numbered 8, between an auto driven by Georgia Villa McCarver and a vehicle driven by a member of the Tennessee National Guard while on weekend training maneuvers.

Sec. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That notwithstanding the time limitations of section 715 of title 32, United States Code, or of any other statute of limitations, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to consider, settle, and if found meritorious, to pay in accordance with otherwise applicable law the claims of Jesse McCarver, Georgia Villa McCarver, Kathy McCarver, and Edith McCarver arising out of an automobile accident which occurred on or about June 12, 1965, near McMinnville, Tennessee, on State highway numbered 8, involving a military vehicle driven by a member of the Tennessee National Guard; and the claims filed on or about April 24, 1970, in behalf of the said Jesse McCarver, Georgia Villa McCarver, Kathy McCarver, and Edith McCarver with

the Department of the Army based upon that accident are to be held and considered to have been timely filed."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BAKER TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAKER to the committee amendment: At the end of the committee amendment add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. No amount paid under the authority provided in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, 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.

#### MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2535) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### COL. JOHN H. SHERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2633) for the relief of Col. John H. Sherman.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### LEONARD DIAMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2771) for the relief of Leonard Diamond.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF THE LATE RICHARD BURTON, SFC, U.S. ARMY (RETIRED)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3533) for the relief of the estate of the late Richard Burton, SFC, U.S. Army (retired).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ROGER STANLEY, AND THE SUCCESSOR PARTNERSHIP, ROGER STANLEY AND HAL IRWIN, DOING BUSINESS AS THE ROGER STANLEY ORCHESTRA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4589) for the relief of Roger Stanley, and the successor partnership Roger Stanley and Hal Irwin, doing business as the Roger Stanley Orchestra.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2508) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### GUIDO BELLANCA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 464) for the relief of Guido Bellanca.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### SLOBODAN BABIC

The Clerk called the bill (S. 666) for the relief of Slobodan Babic.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO APPOINT VICE ADM. HYMAN G. RICKOVER, U.S. NAVY (RETIRED) TO THE GRADE OF ADMIRAL ON THE RETIRED LIST

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1717) to authorize the President to appoint Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy (retired) to the grade of admiral on the retired list.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that this has laid over under the rules of the objectors committee for 7 days. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This ends the call of the Private Calendar.

#### COMMISSION ON THE BANKRUPTCY LAWS

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 499) providing for an extension of the term of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 499

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of the first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution to create a commission to study the bankruptcy laws of the United States" approved July 24, 1970 (84 Stat. 468), is amended to read as follows:*

*"(c) The Commission shall submit a comprehensive report of its activities, including its recommendations, to the President, the Chief Justice of the United States, and the Congress prior to July 31, 1973. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after the date of the submission of its final report."*

*Sec. 2. Money appropriated for the purposes of carrying out the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to create a commission to study the bankruptcy laws of the United States" approved July 24, 1970 (84 Stat. 468), shall remain available until expended or until the Commission established under such joint resolution ceases to exist.*

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on the Judiciary, by unanimous voice vote, with no dissenting vote, reported out favorably House Joint Resolution 499.

The purpose of this resolution is to extend the period of time for the submission of the report of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States from June 30 to July 31, 1973. In addition, it would extend the life of the Commission 30 days beyond the date of the submission of the report to close its office, answer press inquiries, and circulate copies of the report. Further, this resolution would allow the Commission to expend funds for its operation during the 60-day closeout period which have been previously appropriated.

Let me explain that the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States was established by Public Law 91-354, 84 Stat. 468 on July 24, 1970. As enacted, this law provided for a 2-year term for the Commission. Appointments to the Commission were not completed until late May 1971, and the Commission was unable to open an office until June 1, 1971. So, 10 months elapsed before the Commission and staff were able to commence the study contemplated by the legislature.

Because of this late start, we extended the life of the Commission 1 year by House Joint Resolution 1006 in the 92d Congress, and increased the authorization for funds.

I can fully attest, as can my colleague Mr. WIGGINS, how hard this Commission has worked. Mr. WIGGINS and I have



served as Commissioners since its inception. Regular meetings have been scheduled on a monthly basis as all members of the Commission have other professional responsibilities and must travel some distance to attend these meetings. Lately, it has been necessary to meet quite often on weekends.

Our task has been a complete examination of existing bankruptcy law, a full scale study of the Bankruptcy Act and the results of our endeavors will, in fact, be a completely new suggested Bankruptcy Act. We are almost finished with this enormous task. We strove to meet the June 30 deadline for the submission of our report, but rather than sacrifice the quality of all of our months of study and work and also because it was necessary to schedule the last meeting of our Commission for June 7-12, 1973, we felt it necessary to give our staff 30 additional days to complete their task of rewriting and editing all of our work. It also made sense to give the Commission 30 days after the submission of their report to close up the office and complete the numerous housekeeping chores that need to be completed. In fact, most commissions contain that language and this one should have.

In addition, \$826,000 was authorized and appropriated for the operation of this Commission through June 30, 1973, or fiscal year 1973. As of June 30, 1973, the Commission estimates it will have \$59,240 of unused but authorized and appropriated funds. The Commission estimates that it will need to expand \$31,500 for July and \$3,750 for August or a total of \$35,250, leaving an unexpended sum of \$23,990 when the Commission expires to be returned to the U.S. Government.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 499.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this constitutes the second extension, does it not, to July 31?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. The gentleman is correct. Congress extended the life one previous time because of a delay of 10 months in appointing members to the Commission.

Mr. GROSS. Whatever the reason, the second extension is to July 31 and the House, in effect, makes a third extension to August 31. Is that not correct?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. That is correct, in order to close up the office.

Mr. GROSS. Does it take a month to do that? Where are these headquarters?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. These headquarters are located downtown at 1060 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. GROSS. Why does it take a month to close down an office? Is this in order to keep some people on the payroll?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. This is not in order to keep people on the payroll. As I pointed out in my remarks, the total money to be spent in August is \$3,750. People are already being released. It takes just about that amount of time to close down the offices and take care of the paperwork after 3 years of hard work by a dedicated staff.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not want to make a serious case out of this, but it does seem to me if this committee is going out of business on July 31, it ought to be able to close it out on that date, headquarters and all, but again I am not going to make a serious issue of it.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS). I will attest to the hard work which he and my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. WIGGINS), and the other Commission members and Commission staff have put into this important project.

I think we should recognize that the Bankruptcy Commission has performed a comprehensive review of the complicated and lengthy Federal bankruptcy laws, many of which date back a century or more in slightly less than 2 years. It is extremely important that the final report of the Commission be fully completed, and a 1-month extension for this purpose seems reasonable. The Commission has performed very well. I am happy to support this short extension of time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 499).

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7447, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 7447) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when is it proposed to call up the conference report?

Mr. MAHON. We have a heavy schedule for the remainder of the week. I think the chances are it will be called up on Monday. If we are able to file the conference report tonight it would be in order on Friday, but we have a very heavy schedule for Friday.

Mr. GROSS. If it is called up next week we will have ample opportunity to look at the changes that were made in conference?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 93-295)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7447) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 12, 16, 26, 29, 31, 32, 36, 37, and 47.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 9, 10, 14, 15, 21, 24, 27, 28, 30, 33, 44, 48, 49, 50, 52, 57, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, and 82, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$41,399,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$151,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,248,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$243,510,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$35,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$87,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,972,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$471,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$255,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows:

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RADIO  
BROADCASTING

International Radio Broadcasting Activities

For an additional amount for "International radio broadcasting activities", \$1,150,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$475,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows:

Salaries and Expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$2,250,000.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$95,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 34, 35, 38, 42, 43, 45, 46, 51, 60, 68, 81, 83, and 84.

GEORGE MAHON,  
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
JOE L. EVINS  
(except amendment No. 83),  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
TOM STEED,  
JOHN M. SLACK,  
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
JOHN J. MCFALL,  
E. A. CEDERBERG,  
JOHN J. RHODES,  
ROBERT H. MICHEL,  
LOUIS C. WYMAN,  
BURT L. TALCOTT,  
ROBERT C. MCEWEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN L. MCCELLELLAN,  
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
JOHN O. PASTORE,  
ALAN BIBLE,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
GALE W. MCGEE,  
WILLIAM PROXMIER,  
JOSEPH M. MONTTOYA,  
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
BIRCH BAYH,  
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,  
MILTON E. YOUNG,  
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,  
NORRIS COTTON,  
CLIFFORD P. CASE,  
HIRAM L. FONG,  
TED STEVENS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COM-  
MITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the dis-

agreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7447) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

CHAPTER I.—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
Agricultural Programs

Agricultural Research Service

Amendment No. 1: Deletes the item of \$18,000 proposed by the Senate.

Environmental Programs

Soil Conservation Service

Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$20,000,000 for flood restoration work as proposed by the Senate instead of \$12,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation  
Service

Emergency Conservation Measures

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$15,000,000 for flood restoration work as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the House.

The Conferees are in agreement that these funds shall be available for restoration of leased government-owned lands in reservoir areas, in cooperation with the lessees, so as to restore their value.

Consumer Programs

Food and Nutrition Service

Child Nutrition Programs

Nonfood Assistance

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$6,000,000 for school lunch facilities instead of \$18,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER II. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY  
Military personnel, Navy

Amendments Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8: Appropriate \$41,399,000 instead of \$34,606,000 as proposed by the House and \$46,597,000 as proposed by the Senate for three fiscal years in which overobligations were made. The amount agreed to is distributed by fiscal years as follows: For fiscal year 1969, \$151,000 instead of \$50,000 as proposed by the House and \$165,000 as proposed by the Senate; For fiscal year 1971, \$20,000,000 instead of \$16,958,000 as proposed by the House and \$23,834,000 as proposed by the Senate; and for fiscal year 1972, \$21,248,000 instead of \$17,598,000 as proposed by the House and \$22,598,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Includes new title "General Provisions" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Includes language "or in or over Laos" as proposed by the Senate as addition to House language providing that none of the funds in the bill can be expended to support combat activities in, over or from off the shores of Cambodia by United States forces.

Amendment No. 11: Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which provides an increase in transfer authority from \$750,000,000 to \$825,000,000, an increase of \$75,000,000 instead of an increase of \$170,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Includes Senate language providing that none of the funds transferred may be used in support of combat activities in, over or from off the shores of Cambodia or in or over Laos by United States forces.

The Managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

CHAPTER III. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Amendment No. 12: Deletes the appropriation of \$8,500,000 for "Federal Payment to

the District of Columbia" proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are agreed that all programs in the next fiscal year's budget for which there is a demonstrable need and are fully and completely justified to the satisfaction of the Committees on Appropriations will be approved.

CHAPTER V. VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$20,000,000 for Assistance for Health Manpower Training Institutions, instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference is agreed that \$15,000,000 is to be applied to the pilot program for assistance in the establishment of new State medical schools, authorized by subchapter I of Public Law 92-541, and \$5,000,000 may be used by the Administrator to implement any part of the aforementioned legislation.

CHAPTER VI

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$18,500,000 for "Bureau of Land Management, Management of Lands and Resources", as proposed by the Senate instead of \$17,177,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$2,900,000 for "Bureau of Indian Affairs, Resources Management", as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,036,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Deletes appropriation of \$34,000,000 for "Bureau of Mines, Helium Fund" proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides \$3,100,000 for "National Park Service, Construction".

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

Amendment No. 18: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment appropriating \$39,563,000 instead of \$38,425,000 as proposed by the House and \$38,948,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to transfer \$3,179,000 from "Forest research" to "Forest land management" instead of \$3,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,429,000 as proposed by the Senate. Projects not approved for transfer, in addition to those not approved by the Senate, include: wildlife habitat research, Fresno, California, \$50,000; and fire research, Macon, Georgia, \$200,000. In addition, the Department is directed not to reprogram within "Forest land management" the following projects: Wildlife habitat management, Sierra National Forest, \$65,000; Wildlife habitat management, Clark and Mark Twain National Forests, \$300,000. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides language to prohibit the use of funds currently available or made available under the supplemental bill for realigning the regional boundaries of the Forest Service.

Historical and Memorial Commissions

American Revolution Bicentennial  
Commission

Amendment No. 21: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical



disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides \$2,868,000 for "American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, Salaries and Expenses."

*Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation*

Amendment No. 23. Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides \$350,000 for "Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, Salaries and Expenses".

CHAPTER VII

*Department of Labor*

*Departmental Management*

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$40,000 for "Salaries and expenses", as proposed by the Senate.

*Manpower Administration*

Amendment No. 25: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which will make \$44,500,000 heretofore appropriated for "Manpower training services", available until September 30, 1973 to carry out the provisions of section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, instead of appropriating an additional amount of \$44,500,000 for this purpose, as proposed by the Senate.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conferees reached the conclusion that additional appropriations for the summer jobs program are not needed at this time since a total of \$1,595,297,000 is available for obligation in fiscal year 1973 under the appropriation for "Manpower training services", of which the Department of Labor currently plans to obligate only \$1,220,000,000. It is clear that ample funds are currently available within this appropriation to fully support the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer jobs program for the coming summer. It is the intent of the conferees that at least as many Neighborhood Youth Corps summer job opportunities should be provided from this source as were provided in last summer's program.

*Department of Health, Education, and Welfare*

*Health Services and Mental Health Administration*

Amendment No. 26. Deletes appropriation of \$2,000,000 for "Mental health", proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agreed to the deletion of this appropriation with the understanding that the projects for combating alcoholism among Alaskan natives which the Senate amendment was designed to support have been approved for funding and will be funded from appropriations currently available for fiscal year 1973.

Amendment No. 27. Inserts citation of title IX of the Public Health Service Act, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28. Appropriates \$17,000,000 for "Health services planning and development" as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29. Deletes appropriations of \$20,000,000 for regional medical programs and \$15,000,000 for construction of outpatient facilities proposed by the Senate.

In agreeing to delete these additional appropriations, the conferees take note of the fact that \$150,000,000 has already been appropriated for fiscal year 1973 for regional medical programs and \$70,000,000 has been appropriated for construction of outpatient

facilities. The Congress is clearly opposed to the termination of these programs. Legislation to extend the authorizations for them through June 30, 1974 has been passed by overwhelming majorities in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. The conferees urge that the funds which have been appropriated for the regional medical programs and the Hill-Burton program be released for obligation, in accordance with Congressional intent.

*National Institutes of Health*

Amendment No. 30. Inserts heading, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31. Deletes appropriation of \$60,000,000 for "National Cancer Institute", proposed by the Senate. In deleting this additional appropriation, the conferees take note of the fact that \$492,205,000 has been appropriated for the National Cancer Institute for fiscal year 1973, of which the Administration currently plans to obligate only \$432,205,000. The full appropriation is available until June 30, 1974, and the conferees are agreed that the entire amount should be obligated and spent for the Cancer program, as intended by the Congress.

Amendment No. 32. Deletes appropriation of \$5,000,000 for "National Eye Institute", proposed by the Senate.

In deleting this appropriation, the conferees take note of the fact that \$38,562,000 has already been appropriated for fiscal year 1973 for the National Eye Institute, of which the Administration currently plans to obligate only \$34,397,000. The conferees believe that the full amount appropriated should be obligated, and spent, in accordance with Congressional intent.

Amendment No. 33. Inserts heading, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34. Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which will appropriate \$100,000 for "Health Manpower" to remain available until expended to carry out the Family Practice of Medicine Act, as proposed by the Senate, and will delete an appropriation of \$27,300,000 proposed by the Senate for aid to schools of the various health professions.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

In deleting the funds for assistance to the schools of the health professions, the conferees take note of the fact that ample appropriations for fiscal year 1973 for this purpose have already been enacted, but have not been released for obligation. The conferees believe that the full amounts appropriated should be made available to the schools, and urge that the funds be obligated and spent as intended by the Congress.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which appropriates an additional amount of \$2,000,000 for "Health manpower" to carry out the Physician Shortage Area Scholarship program.

Amendment No. 36. Deletes appropriation of \$13,900,000 for "General research support grants", proposed by the Senate.

In deleting this appropriation, the conferees take note of the fact that \$60,700,000 has already been appropriated for general research support grants for fiscal year 1973, of which only \$26,124,000 has been released for obligation. The conferees are agreed that these funds can and should be used for the support of biomedical research, and urge that the full appropriation be obligated and spent.

Amendment No. 37. Deletes appropriation of \$24,100,000 for "Research training programs", proposed by the Senate.

In agreeing to delete this appropriation,

the conferees take note of the fact that \$192,345,000 has already been appropriated for fiscal year 1973 for research training programs, of which only \$149,842,000 has been released for obligation. The conferees believe that the full appropriation should be obligated and spent for the training of biomedical researchers, and urge the Administration to release these funds.

*Office of Education*

Amendment No. 38: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which will appropriate \$13,800,000 for "Education for the Handicapped" to remain available until September 30, 1973 instead of \$26,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate. The conferees recognize that other funds amounting to \$12,500,000 are available within the amount of \$143,609,000 already appropriated for "Education for the Handicapped" for fiscal year 1973 which the Department is not planning to spend. It is the intent of the conferees that a total of \$26,300,000 should be used for the purpose intended by the Senate amendment, which is to prevent cuts in programs for education of the handicapped as a result of administrative errors by officials of the Office of Education.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$243,510,000 for "Higher education" instead of \$226,510,000 as proposed by the House and \$260,510,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The increase over the amount provided in the House bill includes \$3,000,000 for special services for disadvantaged students, \$12,500,000 for developing institutions, and \$1,500,000 for foreign language training and area studies.

Amendments Nos. 40 and 41: Provide that \$35,500,000 of the \$87,500,000 for strengthening developing institutions shall be available through December 31, 1973, instead of \$23,000,000 of the \$75,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$48,000,000 of the \$100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which extends availability through September 30, 1973 of fiscal year 1973 appropriations for language training and area studies, university community services, land-grant colleges, college library programs, and veterans' cost-of-instruction payments, with an amendment which will provide \$13,860,000 for language training and area studies under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act instead of \$15,360,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The managers on behalf of both the House and Senate are highly critical of the Department's actions with respect to items proposed for rescission. Little was done in the way of anticipating Congressional action on these items. As a result, those who wish to apply for funding are required to do so on extremely short notice. The conferees are aware that to date the Department has acted with less than alacrity, and expects that all possible considerations be given to applicants.

*Social and Rehabilitation Service*

Amendment No. 43: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will make available \$590,000,000 instead of \$610,000,000 as proposed by the Senate for grants under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act; provide that allotments to States under section 2 shall not exceed \$600,000,000, instead of

\$645,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide that \$5,000,000 previously appropriated for fiscal year 1973 shall remain available until expended for the construction of the National Center for Deaf/Blind Youths and Adults, as proposed by the Senate.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$100,000,000 for "Nutrition program for the elderly" as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which extends availability through December 31, 1973 of fiscal year 1973 appropriations for Title III of the Older Americans Act, as amended by the Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments of 1973.

#### Related Agencies

Amendment No. 46: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment providing language which extends availability until expended of \$8,000,000 of the sum previously appropriated for Action under the heading "operating expenses, domestic programs". The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

#### CHAPTER VIII

##### Legislative branch

Amendment No. 47: Deletes the appropriation of \$289,000 for "Office of Technology Assessment, salaries and expenses", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 48 and 49: Correct spelling error and add word "further" omitted in "Provided further" in language for "Modifications and enlargement, Capitol Power Plant", as proposed by the Senate.

#### CHAPTER IX. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

##### Department of the Army

##### Corps of Engineers—Civil

##### Flood control and coastal emergencies

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates \$103,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$70,500,000 as proposed by the House.

##### Water Resources Council

##### Water resources planning

Amendment No. 51: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment appropriating \$250,000, to remain available until expended, instead of \$500,000, to remain available until expended, as proposed by the Senate for the National and regional assessment program. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

#### CHAPTER X. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### Participation in United States expositions

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,500,000 as proposed by the House.

##### The judiciary

##### Representation by Court-Appointed Counsel and Operation of Defender Organizations

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$2,972,000 instead of \$2,900,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,043,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54: Provides that not to exceed \$471,000 shall be available for the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed by judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and by judges of the Superior Court of the

District of Columbia instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House and \$543,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Commission on Revision of the Federal Court Appellate System of the United States

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$255,000 instead of \$240,000 as proposed by the House and \$270,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Related agencies

##### Commission on International Radio Broadcasting

International radio broadcasting activities

Amendment No. 56: Restores the language of the House and appropriates \$1,150,000 instead of \$1,650,000 as proposed by the House.

#### Small Business Administration

##### Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 57: Provides for the transfer of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House.

##### Disaster Loan Fund

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates \$475,000,000 instead of \$150,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$500,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### United States Information Agency

##### Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates \$2,250,000 instead of \$2,600,000 as proposed by the House.

#### CHAPTER XI. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Amendment No. 60: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to reprogram \$2,000,000 to carry out the provisions of the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act (Public Law 92-513), and to extend to June 30, 1974, the availability of the funds reprogrammed.

#### CHAPTER XII. DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

##### Internal Revenue Service

Amendment No. 61: Deletes the appropriation of \$164,000 for Salaries and Expenses, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Provides \$5,600,000 for Temporary Employment for Accounts, Collection and Taxpayer Service as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,124,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates \$9,600,000 for Accounts, Collection and Taxpayer Service, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$9,748,000, as proposed by the House.

##### Executive Office of the President

##### Economic Stabilization Activities

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates \$4,400,000 for Salaries and Expenses, as proposed by the Senate.

#### Independent agencies

##### General Services Administration

Amendment No. 65: Appropriates \$900,000 for Operating Expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

#### CHAPTER XIII. CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

Amendment No. 66: Inserts language identifying additional Senate documents transmitting requests for appropriations for Claims and Judgments not considered by the House.

Amendment No. 67: Appropriates \$23,108,029 for Claims and Judgments as proposed by the Senate instead of \$20,368,059 as proposed by the House.

#### Title II. Increased pay costs

##### Legislative Branch

Amendment No. 68: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate

to insert a center head and provide \$276,240 for "Contingent Expenses of the Senate, inquiries and investigations" to be derived by transfer.

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates \$186,000 for Senate Office Buildings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70: Appropriates \$3,100 for Senate Garage as proposed by the Senate.

#### Department of Defense—Military

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates \$175,651,000 for Military Personnel, Army, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$180,651,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 72: Appropriates \$7,924,000 for Reserve Personnel, Army, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$8,119,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 73: Deletes appropriation of \$4,509,000 for National Guard Personnel, Air Force, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74: Appropriates \$95,000,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Navy, instead of \$93,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$103,068,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 75: Deletes appropriation recommended by the House of \$620,000 for Secretary of Defense Activities.

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates \$18,000 for Armed Forces Institute as proposed by the Senate instead of \$67,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 77: Deletes appropriation recommended by the House of \$140,000 for Defense Nuclear Agency.

Amendment No. 78: Appropriates \$3,045,000 for Defense Mapping Agency as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,712,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 79: Appropriates \$3,000 for Defense Investigative Service as proposed by the Senate instead of \$225,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 80: Appropriates a total of \$23,002,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$23,700,000 as proposed by the House.

#### Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

##### Office of Child Development

Amendment No. 81: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate providing \$150,000 for Child Development to be derived from transfer as proposed by the Senate.

#### Department of the Treasury

##### United States Secret Service

Amendment No. 82: Appropriates \$2,050,000 for Salaries and Expenses, of which \$300,000 shall be derived from transfer as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,125,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 83: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 84: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to validate obligations incurred beginning June 5, 1973, if otherwise in accordance with the provisions of the bill. The Senate language expands a present provision prohibiting the use of appropriated funds designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress, except in presentations to the Congress.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

#### Conference total—With comparisons

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1973 recommended by the committee of conference, with comparisons to the budget estimate total, and the House and Senate bills follows:



Budget estimate <sup>1</sup> .....	\$3,607,105,504
House bill.....	2,855,542,209
Senate bill.....	3,699,239,279
Conference agreement <sup>2</sup> .....	3,362,845,279
Conference agreement compared with:	
Budget estimate.....	-244,260,225
House bill.....	+507,303,070
Senate bill.....	-336,394,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$444,225,070 in budget estimates not considered by the House.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$21,274,000 for 1972, \$20,000,000 for 1971, and \$151,000 for 1969.

GEORGE MAHON,  
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
JOE L. EVINS  
(except amendment  
No. 83),

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
TOM STEED,  
JOHN M. SLACK,  
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
JOHN J. McFALL,  
E. A. CEDERBERG,  
JOHN J. RHODES,  
ROBERT H. MICHEL,  
LOUIS C. WYMAN,  
BURT L. TALCOTT,  
ROBERT C. McEWEN,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,  
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
JOHN O. PASTORE,  
ALAN BIBLE,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
GALE W. MCGEE,  
WILLIAM PROXMIER,  
JOSEPH M. MONTROYA,  
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
BIRCH BAYH,  
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,  
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,  
NORRIS COTTON,  
CLIFFORD P. CASE,  
HIRAM L. FONG,  
TED STEVENS,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

**TO PROHIBIT MISUSE OF NAME OR SYMBOL OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN COLLECTION OF DEBTS**

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 689) to amend section 712 of title 18 of the United States Code, to prohibit persons attempting to collect their own debts from misusing names in order to convey false impression that any agency of the Federal Government is involved in such collection, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6C9

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 712 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:*

"§ 712. Misuse of names, words, emblems, or insignia.

"Whoever, in the course of collecting or aiding in the collection of private debts or obligations, or being engaged in furnishing private police, investigation, or other private detective services, uses or employs in any communication, correspondence, notice, advertisement, or circular the words 'national', 'Federal', or 'United States' the initials 'U.S.', or any emblem, insignia, or name for the purpose of conveying and in a manner reasonably calculated to convey the false impression that such communication is from a department, agency, bureau, or instrumentality of the United States or in any manner represents the United States, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

(b) The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out of the item designated

"712. Misuse of names by collecting agencies to indicate Federal agency."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"712. Misuse of names, words, emblems, or insignia."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on the Judiciary, by unanimous voice vote, with no dissenting vote, reported out favorably H.R. 689 with a committee amendment.

The thrust of this bill is to close the loophole in section 712 of title 18 of the United States Code. Section 712 in its present form only speaks to persons in the business of collecting debts and exempts individuals collecting private debts. The committee amended the bill merely as a matter of draftsmanship so as to include the purpose in one paragraph and to eliminate any question as to whether oral communication was included within the scope of the section. The author, Mr. KOCH, agreed that these drafting changes would make the bill more effective.

Mr. Mike McKeivitt, our former colleague and now Assistant Attorney General for Legislative Affairs, in a statement before subcommittee No. 4 on May 24, 1973, submitted the Justice Department's strong support of H.R. 689, as amended. Mr. McKeivitt pointed out that this statute, section 712 of title 18, in its present form, was passed in 1959 in response to numerous complaints about a common practice among unscrupulous collection agencies for determining the whereabouts of delinquent debtors.

The forms used would be drafted in such a manner as to suggest that a payment would be forthcoming if the individual would submit the needed information on the delinquent debtor. The firms would use names such as "Reverification Office," "Claims Office," "Treasury Department," or "Disbursement Office" on their correspondence.

The interpretation that section 712 only applies to persons who are "in the business of" collecting debts was upheld in the recent case of United States against Boneparth, in the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. Boneparth, a Harlem furniture merchant would send an impressive form to delinquent debtors from the "Location and de-Disbursement Department," bearing the legend "U.S. Bureau," adorned with curlicues, embossed with an eagle, and having a Washington, D.C., return address. Although the court thought that these were unconscionable practices by the merchant, it could not stretch section 712 to cover the collecting practices of merchants collecting their own debts.

This bill, H.R. 689, as amended, would bring the Boneparth situation within its coverage and end those collection abuses.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 689, as amended.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLOREY).

Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in what the gentleman from California has stated. I urge a favorable vote on this measure.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, as the original sponsor of the bill we are now considering, H.R. 689, I would simply point out that this is a simple bill, but one that would go far to extend prohibitions against unconscionable practices to all individuals collecting debts owed to them.

This legislation is designed to close a loophole in our Code of Crimes and Criminal Procedure that become evident in the Second U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals decision on February 23, 1972, dismissing the indictment against a Harlem furniture company for fraudulent collection practices. The court of appeals' action reversed a previous conviction by a lower court.

The ruling, U.S.A. against Boneparth, written by Judge Wilfred Feinberg, while acknowledging that the appellants' practice was unconscionable, held that the Federal statute did not apply to merchants collecting their own debts.

My bill would clarify section 712 of title 18 to specifically bring persons attempting to collect their own debts under its prohibition against misusing official sounding names in order to convey the false impression that any agency of the Federal Government is involved in the collection. The court of appeals' decision limited the application of this section to collection agencies.

The Harlem furniture company involved in the case that has pointed to the need for corrective legislation used financial disclosure forms purportedly issued by the U.S. Fund Bureau headquartered in Washington, D.C.

Judge Feinberg is quoted in the New York Law Journal of February 24, 1972, as having stated in his decision:

We reached this conclusion with a heavy heart because the record reeks from the unconscionable practices of (the) appellants.

The company operated a furniture and appliance store in Harlem. Most of the sales were made on credit, so that liquidation of accounts receivable was a constant problem.

The company did not use a collection agency but collected its own bills. Collections were pursued with understandable persistence. But when all else seemed to fail the company chose to resort to sheer trickery.

Mr. Speaker, while the present law, enacted in 1959 may have originally been aimed at unscrupulous practices of collection agencies, there surely was no intent to give immunity to those making their own collections. It is important that the Congress act promptly to close this loophole, and I urge my colleagues to vote "aye" on this measure.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly endorse the purpose of H.R. 689 as reported from the House Committee on the Judiciary, and I congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH), a valued member of my Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, for initiating this legislation.

This bill closes a loophole which apparently has permitted firms and individuals seeking to collect their own debts to use a reprehensible device which has been illegal since 1959 when used by a debt collection agency or a detective agency. The device is to use forms or return addresses, or a firm name, or the initials "U.S." or similar stratagems to give the false impression that a communication is from an official agency of the Federal Government.

This practice has been widespread, and I hope the passage of H.R. 689 will not only close a glaring loophole in the criminal code dealing with this kind of deception but will also stimulate the Department of Justice to enforce the law effectively.

During hearings of the National Commission on Consumer Finance in 1970 into the general subject of debt collection practices, we received extensive testimony from an assistant U.S. attorney in New York of the prevalence of this practice after I cited a case called to my attention by a Missouri banker whose debt collection business had been solicited by a firm which used the name "U.S. Bureau of Collections" with a Washington, D.C., return address. An investigation which I initiated through the Federal Trade Commission brought out the information that the Washington address was that of an answering service.

Although the firm used a St. Louis post office box number as its "Midwest Regional Office" the answering service disclosed to the FTC that its client was actually located in a town in Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I am old fashioned enough to believe that people should pay their legitimate debts, and I hold no brief for deadbeats and chiselers. In writing the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968, I worked hard for the enactment particularly of title III dealing with garnishment, the first Federal law ever written on this subject, not because I felt that debtors should not have to pay what they owed, but because the methods used in many of the States for collecting debts through garnishment were cruel and one-sided in the extreme. Not all debt claims are "legitimate," by any means. One of the most important chapters of the final report of the National Commission on Consumer Finance proposed many far-reaching changes in debt collection practices, and I strongly support most of those changes and reforms. But this is not to say that I think the creditor is always wrong and the debtor always right. There must be fairness to both sides.

But to misrepresent a communication from a credit or a debt collection agency as coming from a Federal agency—perhaps in such a way that it implies that a response will bring a tax refund or a payment of some kind—is to stoop to an unconscionable trick.

As the Judiciary Committee points out in its report on H.R. 689, this trickery is a violation of the Federal criminal code when indulged in by a firm in the business of collecting debts. It should also be outlawed for anyone who attempts to use it in collecting debts or in tracking down individuals for private purposes.

The bill should pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 689, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. SEBELIUS. 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 pro tempore. 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 399, nays 0, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

YEAS—399

Abdnor	Conyers	Haley
Abzug	Corman	Hamilton
Adams	Cotter	Hammer-
Addabbo	Coughlin	schmidt
Alexander	Crane	Hanley
Anderson,	Cronin	Hanrahan
Calif.	Culver	Hansen, Idaho
Anderson, Ill.	Daniel, Dan	Hansen, Wash.
Andrews, N.C.	Daniel, Robert	Harrington
Andrews,	W., Jr.	Harsha
N. Dak.	Daniels	Harvey
Annunzio	Dominick V.	Hastings
Archer	Davis, Ga.	Hawkins
Arends	Davis, S.C.	Hays
Armstrong	Davis, Wis.	Hébert
Ashley	de la Garza	Hechler, W. Va.
Aspin	Delaney	Heinz
Bafalis	Dellenback	Henderson
Baker	Dellums	Hicks
Barrett	Denholm	Hillis
Beard	Dennis	Hinshaw
Bell	Dent	Hogan
Bennett	Derwinski	Holifield
Bergland	Devine	Holt
Bevill	Dickinson	Holtzman
Biaggi	Dingell	Horton
Blester	Donohue	Hosmer
Bingham	Dorn	Howard
Blackburn	Downing	Huber
Boggs	Drinan	Hudnut
Boland	Dulski	Hungate
Bolling	Duncan	Hunt
Bowen	Eckhardt	Hutchinson
Brademas	Edwards, Ala.	Ichord
Brasco	Edwards, Calif.	Jarman
Bray	Ellberg	Johnson, Calif.
Breaux	Erlenborn	Johnson, Colo.
Breckinridge	Esch	Johnson, Pa.
Brinkley	Eshleman	Jones, Ala.
Brooks	Evans, Colo.	Jones, N.C.
Broomfield	Evins, Tenn.	Jones, Okla.
Brotzman	Fascell	Jones, Tenn.
Brown, Calif.	Findley	Jordan
Brown, Mich.	Fish	Karsh
Brown, Ohio	Flood	Kastenmeier
Broyhill, N.C.	Flowers	Kazen
Broyhill, Va.	Flynt	Keating
Buchanan	Foley	Kemp
Burgener	Ford, Gerald R.	Ketchum
Burke, Fla.	Ford,	King
Burke, Mass.	William D.	Kluczynski
Burleson, Tex.	Forsythe	Koch
Burlison, Mo.	Fountain	Kuykendall
Burton	Fraser	Kyros
Butler	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Byron	Frenzel	Lehman
Camp	Frey	Lent
Carey, N.Y.	Froehlich	Litton
Carney, Ohio	Fulton	Long, La.
Carter	Fuqua	Long, Md.
Casey, Tex.	Gaydos	Lott
Cederberg	Gettys	Lujan
Chamberlain	Gialmo	McClory
Chappell	Gibbons	McCloskey
Clancy	Gilman	McCollister
Clark	Ginn	McCormack
Clausen,	Gonzalez	McDade
Don H.	Goodling	McEwen
Clawson, Del.	Grasso	McFall
Clay	Green, Oreg.	McKay
Cleveland	Green, Pa.	McKinney
Cochran	Griffiths	McSpadden
Cohen	Gross	Macdonald
Collier	Grover	Madden
Collins, Ill.	Gubser	Madigan
Collins, Tex.	Gude	Mahon
Conable	Gunter	Malliard
Conte	Guyer	Mallory

Mann	Randall	Stratton
Maraziti	Rangel	Stubblefield
Martin, Nebr.	Rees	Stuckey
Martin, N.C.	Regula	Studds
Mathias, Calif.	Reuss	Sullivan
Mathis, Ga.	Rhodes	Symington
Matsunaga	Riegle	Symms
Mayne	Rinaldo	Talcott
Mazzoli	Roberts	Taylor, Mo.
Meeds	Robinson, Va.	Taylor, N.C.
Melcher	Robison, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Metcalfe	Rodino	Teague, Tex.
Mezvisky	Roe	Thomson, Wis.
Michel	Rogers	Thone
Millford	Roncallo, Wyo.	Thornton
Miller	Roncallo, N.Y.	Tiernan
Millis, Ark.	Rooney, Pa.	Towell, Nev.
Minish	Rose	Treen
Mink	Rosenthal	Udall
Minshall, Ohio	Rostenkowski	Ullman
Mitchell, N.Y.	Roush	Vander Jagt
Mizell	Rousselot	Vanik
Moakley	Roy	Veysey
Mollohan	Roybal	Waggonner
Montgomery	Runnels	Waldie
Moorhead,	Ruppe	Walsh
Calif.	Ruth	Wampler
Moorhead, Pa.	Ryan	Ware
Morgan	St Germain	Whalen
Mosher	Sandman	White
Murphy, Ill.	Sarasin	Whitehurst
Murphy, N.Y.	Sarbanes	Whitten
Myers	Satterfield	Widnall
Natcher	Saylor	Williams
Nedzi	Scherle	Wilson, Bob
Nelsen	Schneebell	Wilson,
Nichols	Schroeder	Charles H.,
Nix	Sebelius	Calif.
Obey	Seiberling	Wilson,
O'Brien	Shipley	Charles, Tex.
O'Hara	Shoup	Winn
O'Neill	Shriver	Wolff
Owens	Shuster	Wright
Parris	Sikes	Wyatt
Patman	Sisk	Wydler
Patten	Skubitz	Wylie
Pepper	Slack	Wyman
Perkins	Smith, Iowa	Yates
Pettis	Smith, N.Y.	Yatron
Peyser	Snyder	Young, Alaska
Pickle	Spence	Young, Fla.
Pike	Stanton,	Young, Ga.
Podell	J. William	Young, Ill.
Powell, Ohio	Stark	Young, S.C.
Preyer	Steed	Young, Tex.
Price, Ill.	Steele	Zablocki
Price, Tex.	Steelman	Zion
Pritchard	Steiger, Ariz.	
Quie	Steiger, Wis.	
Quillen	Stephens	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—34

Ashbrook	Hanna	Reid
Badillo	Heckler, Mass.	Rooney, N.Y.
Blatnik	Helstoski	Staggers
Burke, Calif.	Landgrebe	Stanton,
Chisholm	Landrum	James V.
Conlan	Leggett	Stokes
Danielson	Mitchell, Md.	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	Moss	Van Deerlin
du Pont	Passman	Vigorito
Fisher	Poage	Wiggins
Goldwater	Railsback	Zwach
Gray	Rarick	

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. du Pont.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Vigorito with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Stokes with Mr. Helstoski.

Mr. Reid with Mr. Goldwater.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Van Deerlin.

Mr. Mitchell of Maryland with Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Passman.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Landgrebe.

Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Danielson.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Badillo with Mr. Zwach.

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Landrum.



The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

#### PETIREMENT OF FRANK E. BATTAGLIA, DEAN OF OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is possible that not all of the Members know that Frank E. Battaglia, the dean of our Official Reporters of Debates, is retiring after a service that has continued for 30 years in the House, and therefore I think it is proper that we should take note that we are losing the services of not only the dean of our Reporters of Debates, but a man who has spent 30 years of service during the course of the legislative history of the House of Representatives in taking down faithfully the utterances of the Members during our sessions, and this has continued ever since the days of the late great Speaker Sam Rayburn.

Frank Battaglia was born and raised in New York City, and worked his way through the City College of New York and through Fordham Law School, where he received an LL.B. degree.

Frank studied shorthand at the DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City, and utilized this skill in several secretarial jobs while attending night school. Through this practice he attained the skill necessary for verbatim shorthand reporting. Having achieved this skill, he worked as a free lance shorthand reporter in practically every court in New York City. He also took depositions in many States in the Northeast section of our country.

Frank decided to come to Washington after he learned of the need for shorthand reporters here. Prior to coming to the House of Representatives he reported various governmental agencies, subsequently confining his work as a freelance reporter to congressional committee hearings.

Frank was appointed as an Official Reporter of Debates of the House of Representatives in 1943 by the late Hon. Sam Rayburn.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I speak for every single Member of the House when I say that we wish Frank well in his retirement. We are sorry to lose his services, and we only hope that in his retirement he will find happiness and contentment after having served us so faithfully for 30 years, and that the knowledge that we all will miss him and

miss his happy personality and his extreme capability as an Official Reporter of Debates will bring him many, many happy memories.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join the gentleman from Texas in his remarks about Frank Battaglia.

Frank has been a very conscientious and dedicated member of our staff of Official Reporters of Debates in the House of Representatives. He has served, I think, every Member of the House faithfully, and has done an outstanding job. We certainly shall miss his services and fine personality. And while Frank is leaving the House of Representatives I might add that he is coming down to our great State of Florida. I wish him all the best in the years of his retirement.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join the gentleman from Texas in his remarks this morning on the retirement of Frank Battaglia. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Texas has taken this time to inform us of the fact that Frank Battaglia will be retiring shortly. Frank has done an excellent job. He will be missed.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join with the gentleman from Texas in paying my respects to Frank Battaglia, a man who has served us well in the House for 30 years. He has earned a well-deserved retirement.

Frank and I have known each other for 14 years. He is an alumnus of the same school, Fordham, that I went to. I have had a very fine relationship with him. Frank has been an able servant here in the House. We are going to miss his services in the years to come.

We are happy that he is going to enjoy his retirement, which again I say he so well deserves.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the retirement of Frank E. Battaglia.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF SERVICE CONTRACT ACT TO CANTON ISLAND

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5157) to amend the Service Contract Act of 1965 to extend its geographical coverage to contracts performed on Canton Island.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5157

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8(d) of the Service Contract Act of 1965 (41 U.S.C. 357(d)) is amended by inserting "and Canton Island," between "Johnson Island," and "but".

#### EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 2. The amendment made hereby shall be effective with respect to all contracts entered into at any time after the date of enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Canton Island is located in the central Pacific about 1,700 miles southwest of Hawaii. The island is actually an atoll 8 miles long and nearly 4 miles wide. This bill is simply an amendment to add Canton Island to the Service Contract Act.

In 1939 the United States and the United Kingdom agreed jointly to administer Canton Island until 1989. At various times it has served as an observation point for solar eclipses, a stopover for transoceanic commercial flights, and as a satellite tracking station.

In the 80th Congress Public Law 80-505 extended the jurisdiction of the U.S. District Court of Hawaii to American subjects on Canton Island. However, the island is not covered by the Service Contract Act of 1965. Canton Island was selected in 1969 by the U.S. Air Force as an impact-scoring and evaluation area for select missiles launched from the Vandenberg Air Force Base.

Subsequently a contract was procured at the base for operation of maintenance services. That contract will be rebid in the immediate future.

There is concern that without a wage determination as required by the Contract Act, a severe wage cutting and bidders is likely, creating problems for employees in the Government under the incumbent contract. The contract affects approximately 283 personnel, 123 from American Samoa, and 160 from Hawaii and the mainland.

Since the Service Contract Act now includes Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and American Samoa, Guam, Wake Island, and Johnston Island, it seems inequitable that Canton Island employees should be excluded from coverage. I am advised by the Department of Labor's Office of Special Wage Standards, which administers the Service Contract Act, that any cost to the Government will be minimal.

The bill was unanimously reported by both the subcommittee and the full committee of the Committee on Education and Labor.

I urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What is the native population of Canton Island?

Mr. CLAY. There are no natives.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask, then, about the cost estimate which says—  
That result would, we believe, be minimal.

What is meant by "minimal" cost?

Mr. CLAY. I should think that the minimal cost would be the administration involved in making sure that none of the people being employed under an Air Force contract would be paid less than the prevailing wages in the area.

Mr. GROSS. There is no estimate, and the report says, "we believe" it would be minimal.

The gentleman has nothing to offer by way of any dollar figure that would be involved?

Mr. CLAY. No. I do not think the dollar figure is a question here. We are talking about an administrative cost in the event someone makes an objection that he is being paid less than the law provides.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman, do not administrators cost money to administer a law?

Mr. CLAY. Legislators cost money to enact laws, too, sir.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought, so when we speak about cost, it can be cost in a number of different ways.

Mr. CLAY. Certainly, and the cost of the time involved today in discussing this matter can be determined, I would imagine.

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

Mr. CLAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WYLIE. I notice on page 2 of the report it says:

In 1939, the United States and the United Kingdom agreed jointly to administer Canton Island until 1989.

Is the United Kingdom going to participate in the payment of the costs of the administration of the island?

Mr. CLAY. I am not aware of any cost that is involved.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so I may respond to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CLAY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the only persons now occupying Canton Island are those persons who are in the employ of the U.S. Government. As a result of the U.S. Air Force contract on the island there are approximately 250 employees, some from the State of Hawaii and other parts of the mainland United States and some from American Samoa.

The Library of Congress in analyzing the jurisdictional issue sent the committee a report indicating that the United States by virtue of the fact that it passed legislation conveying the court's authority in the State of Hawaii over these individuals on Canton Island has already exercised jurisdiction with respect to the working conditions, the personnel, and internal matters affecting these employees as to justify legislating in this area. So I do not think there is any conflict with the United Kingdom, and certainly the United Kingdom is not present on the island today.

It is a technical matter and was the basis for omitting this island when we considered this legislation previously.

Furthermore, there was no contract on the island at that time. However since that time, subsequently, the Air Force has installed a mission there and we believe in order to at least preserve equity among all U.S. employees the service contract ought to be extended to them.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further observation?

Mr. CLAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, the report says the island will be jointly administered by the United States and the United Kingdom, and I was attempting to determine what role the United Kingdom might play in the administration of the island. That is question No. 1.

Question No. 2 is: Are there any citizens of the United Kingdom on the island or is it contemplated there will be some? And is there an agreement with the United Kingdom that the United States will pay the entire cost of administering the island? Are the costs of administering this island which is jointly administered with the United Kingdom by agreement with the United States to be paid for by the United States?

Mr. CLAY. In answer to the gentleman's first question, to my knowledge there are no people living on the island who are citizens of the United Kingdom.

In answer to the second part of the question, this is a contract which is being let by the U.S. Government, so any costs that would be incurred would be our responsibility. It is not a joint contract between the United Kingdom and the U.S. Government.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Missouri indicated, there was no opposition to this legislation. It was my understanding that when the service contract legislation passed last Congress, to make certain the Department of Labor would set prevailing wages at that time, Canton Island was left out because of the joint control with the United Kingdom, but there are no citizens, I understand, of the United Kingdom there.

As far as the cost of this—and I would ask the gentleman from Missouri if this is not true—the contract providing services will be let whether we pass this legislation or not. Is that correct, I ask the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CLAY. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. QUIE. All this legislation does is to insure that the Department of Labor sets the prevailing wages, just as they do on a service contract in any military base in the United States itself. This being totally a U.S. responsibility there now, it just is a matter of justice that the prevailing wage be set for that contract as well as others.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Is there anything to prevent the United Kingdom, that is, the British Government, from coming in at any time?

Mr. QUIE. I do not know of anything that would prevent it but I do not think that would make any difference to this

legislation because it would only affect the U.S. contract for services performed on the island.

Mr. GROSS. It would make quite a difference if they came in and the United States was paying one wage scale and the British another.

Mr. QUIE. It would. But the British are not going to come in until 1989.

Mr. GROSS. They are not going to come in until 1989?

Mr. QUIE. They have chosen not to and cannot after 1989.

Mr. GROSS. Is this by any chance another of the fall backs as a result of the U.S. abandonment of Okinawa and likely to become a center for military and/or civilian personnel in the Pacific?

Mr. QUIE. I would not expect that because of the size of it. I think that generally the people from Hawaii probably have the best understanding of the use of Canton Island as it affects the Hawaiian Islands, because, if I recall correctly, there are times when aircraft are diverted to Canton Island rather than to Hawaii.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago a member of the committee seemed to belittle my question regarding minimum cost. The gentleman from Minnesota will agree with me, will he not, that on page 2 of the report there is a subhead which says, "Cost Estimate"?

Also, it goes on to say the result would be minimal. That language is to be found in the report, is it not?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct, but I think the report is accurate in what it says. When any employee of the Federal Government has additional duties, there would be some cost, but it is insignificant.

It is as though there were, say, five military bases in a State and we set the prevailing wage on four of them; what is the cost of setting the prevailing wage on the fifth one? It is really hard to tell.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, if there was no cost at all, there would be no reason for reference to "minimal costs"; is that not correct?

Mr. QUIE. There will be cost.

Mr. GROSS. I say, if there was no cost, there would be no reason for stipulating in the report, would there?

Mr. QUIE. I would expect that would be correct.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5157, a bill to extend the Service Contract Act to Canton Island.

The Service Contract Act of 1965 provides labor standards for employees working under U.S. Government service contracts. It provides for the payment of prevailing wages and fringe benefits in the locality and requires safe working conditions.

Under the existing act, coverage is provided to all of our States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Outer Continental Shelf lands, American Samoa, Guam, Wake Island, Eniwetok Atoll, Kwajalein Atoll, and Johnston Island. The latter six islands and atolls are all American possessions in the Pacific.

Geographic coverage under the act has



not been extended to Canton Island in the past because of its unique political status. To settle a dispute over ownership of the island, the United States and Great Britain in 1939 agreed to administer the island jointly until 1989. If no prior agreement to the contrary is reached, the arrangement is to continue after that date until modified or terminated by the United States and Great Britain. In 1938, administrative control of Canton Island was placed under the Interior Department by Executive order.

This agreement has worked out satisfactorily, and we have used the island for such purposes as observing solar eclipses, a stopover point for transoceanic commercial flights, and as a satellite tracking station. The jurisdiction of the U.S. District Court of Hawaii extends to U.S. citizens involved in civil or criminal cases arising on or within the island.

The Air Force is currently considering bids for a contract to provide base support services on Canton Island, and will probably make the award no later than July 1, 1973. Employment under an existing contract now includes some 123 personnel from American Samoa and 160 personnel from Hawaii and the U.S. mainland. Practically all of them would be affected by a wage determination if one were conducted under the act. If coverage of the act is not extended to the island prior to the letting of a new contract, however, it is likely that the act will be excluded from the contract for 5 more years.

It is my understanding that the wages currently paid are at the prevailing rate level, so that no increase in cost would be necessitated by this legislation. The bill would merely provide protection to the individual service contract workers, the Government, and responsible contract bidders from a "buy-in" which might occur should a bidder submit a contract with unrealistically low wages which might have to be increased after the contract was awarded.

I see no reason why American employees on Canton Island should be excluded from coverage of the Service Contract Act which is provided to all other American employees. Therefore, I urge the adoption of H.R. 5157.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5157.

The question was taken; and—two-thirds having voted in favor thereof—the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLAY. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 445) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 445

*Resolved*, That Mrs. CARLIS COLLINS, of Illinois, be, and she is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Government Operations.

The resolution was agreed to.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDING DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8537) to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to make permanent certain provisions of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 8537

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO MAKE PERMANENT CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED**

SEC. 101. Sections 10, 11, and 12 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 (50 App. U.S.C. 2210, 2211, and 2212) are repealed.

SEC. 102. Chapter 59 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 1172 the following new section and inserting a corresponding item in the analysis: "§ 1173. Enlisted members: discharge for hardship

"Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, a regular enlisted member of an armed force who has dependents may be discharged for hardship."

SEC. 103. Section 401(3) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) his parent (including a stepparent or parent by adoption and any person, including a former stepparent, who has stood in loco parentis to the member at any time for a continuous period of at least five years before the member became twenty-one years of age) who is in fact dependent on the member for over one-half of his support; however, the dependency of such a parent is determined on the basis of an affidavit submitted by the parent, and any other evidence required under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, and he is not considered a dependent of the member claiming the dependence unless—

"(A) the member has provided over one-half of his support for the period prescribed by the Secretary concerned; or

"(B) due to changed circumstances arising after the member enters on active duty, he becomes in fact dependent on the member for over one-half of his support."

SEC. 104. Section 403 of title 37 is amended—

(1) by striking out that part of the table in subsection (a) which prescribes monthly basic allowances for quarters for enlisted members in pay grades E-1, E-2, E-3, E-4 (four years' or less service), and E-4 (over four years' service) and inserting in place thereof the following:

E-4	\$81.60	\$121.50
E-3	72.30	105.00

E-2	63.90	105.00
E-1	60.00	105.00

(2) by striking out the last sentence in subsection (a);

(3) by striking out "subsection (g)" in the second sentence of subsection (b), and inserting in place thereof "subsection (j)";

(4) by inserting the following new subsections after subsection (f):

"(g) An aviation cadet of the Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard is entitled to the same basic allowance for quarters as a member of the uniformed services in pay grade E-4.

"(h) The Secretary concerned, or his designee, may make any determination necessary to administer this section with regard to enlisted members, including determinations of dependency and relationship, and may, when warranted by the circumstances, reconsider and change or modify any such determination. This authority may be redelegated by the Secretary concerned or his designee. Any determination made under this section with regard to enlisted members is final and is not subject to review by any accounting officer of the United States or a court, unless there is fraud or gross negligence.

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the basic allowance for quarters to which an enlisted member may be entitled as a member with dependents shall not, for such period as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, be contingent on the right of such member to receive pay;" and

(5) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (j).

#### TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Section 302 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1973" wherever it appears therein and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1975".

SEC. 202. Section 302a of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1973" wherever it appears therein and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1975".

SEC. 203. Section 303 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1973" wherever it appears therein and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1975".

SEC. 204. Section 308a of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in place thereof "June 30, 1975".

SEC. 205. Section 207 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (70 Stat. 338), is repealed.

SEC. 206. This Act shall become effective on July 1, 1973.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?  
Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is threefold:

First, it would enact into permanent law certain provisions of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended, which have been regularly extended in the past with the extension of the draft induction authority. These provisions would continue the housing allowance rates of the Dependents Assistance Act—DAA—for junior enlisted personnel in the grade of E-4—with less than 4 years of service—and below. The Dependents Assistance Act expires at the end of this month.

If this legislation is not passed, over 368,000 junior enlisted personnel will have their income reduced between \$15 and \$76.50 per month.

Second, the bill would continue for an additional 2 years the existing authority to pay special pay to physicians, dentists, optometrists, and veterinarians. These special pays range from \$100 to \$350 a month. The existing authority expires at the end of this month. If it is not extended, there will be no authority to pay the special rates to health professionals entering the service after that date.

Finally, the bill extends for an additional 2 years the authority to provide a bonus of up to \$3,000 a year for a 3-year initial enlistment in the combat elements. That authority was initiated by Congress 2 years ago with passage of the last extension of the draft induction authority. The bonus provision was part of the compensation improvements designed to move us toward an all-volunteer force. Like the induction authority, the bonus expires June 30. The initial enlistment bonus has been helpful in attracting personnel to the combat elements, and the Department of Defense has asked for its continuation.

It should be understood that H.R. 8537 would simply continue the present rates of the pay and allowances concerned. In the case of the housing allowances for junior enlisted personnel, it makes permanent a procedure that has been in effect for 23 years.

In the case of special pay for health professionals and the combat enlistment bonus, it continues for 2 years the authority to pay the rates currently in effect.

The Department of Defense has requested additional legislation which would provide additional special pay for health professionals in some instances and additional pay or bonuses for categories of hard-to-get personnel in critical-skill areas. Such legislation was passed by the House last year but received no action in the Senate. It is hoped that the committee will have an opportunity to consider the legislation again this year. However, because of the expiration date of existing laws, there was not time to consider major substantive revisions to the special-pay and bonus statutes at this time. Therefore, the present bill should be considered an interim extension of present authority pending future consideration by the committee of such additional incentives as may be required in special-skill areas as we move into the all-volunteer force environment. You can be sure that our committee will continue to follow retention results closely as the draft induction authority comes to an end June 30 and will be prepared to recommend to the House changes that may be required to attract needed professional personnel to the Armed Forces.

There is a committee amendment. Briefly, the purpose of the amendment is to continue the present authority of the Armed Forces to continue the payment of basic allowance for quarters to the dependents of a member who may be in a nonpay status as a result of being AWOL, in confinement or such. The bill as introduced contained language proposed by the Department of Defense which would have limited this authority to cases of pretrial confinement by foreign governments. The committee did

not believe this limitation of authority appropriate and, therefore, approved the amendment which deletes the language proposed by the Department of Defense and substitutes in lieu thereof the present language of section 5 of the Dependents Assistance Act. That provision has been in effect 23 years and has worked well in providing Secretarial authority to continue housing allowances for families of junior enlisted personnel in deserving cases.

The bill was approved without opposition by the Committee on Armed Services.

I urge its passage by the House.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How long is this authority to be continued?

Mr. STRATTON. This authority would continue, in the case of the basic housing allowance for enlisted men, as permanent law. It is something we have been carrying out for 23 years, but we have traditionally been renewing the authority every time the draft induction authority was renewed. Since, as the gentleman knows, we are not proposing to renew the draft authority this year, the committee is proposing to make this allowance arrangement permanent legislation.

Mr. GROSS. The housing allowance?

Mr. STRATTON. Just the housing allowance; that is right. In the case of special pay for health professionals, that would continue for 2 years more. The arrangement for paying basic allowances for quarters to those individuals who are confined would be also permanent legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Are cutbacks in troop strengths being made?

Mr. STRATTON. There are cutbacks in troop ranks being made, that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has said it will be necessary to continue giving special pay to doctors and other professionals; is that correct?

Mr. STRATTON. Yes, because what we need, of course, are qualified health professionals in the armed services, and with the expiration of the draft authority the draft for doctors is also expiring; so we are not going to get the medical personnel we will need in the armed services in the days to come unless there is some financial incentive for them. There are still a few doctors who have a continuing obligation to serve their country, because they have been deferred from earlier military service under the Berry plan, but that is a rather limited number, and when these are used up we will have to depend entirely upon volunteers in the health services, and we are just not going to get anybody if we do not raise the pay.

Mr. GROSS. So the answer is that in order to get doctors and certain other professionals, we will have to give them premium pay?

Mr. STRATTON. Exactly. The gentleman is exactly right.

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

The bill has been adequately explained

by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON). It is unfortunate that, although last year the House passed the legislation that would have gone all the way toward taking care of the gap in providing health professionals in military personnel, the other body did not act on that bill, so all we can do is continue the legislation which is now effective, and that is what we are doing.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY) yield?

Mr. BRAY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, on page 4, at line 22, there is language which, as I understand, is different than the present law, and the language I refer to says that "the basic allowance for quarters to which an enlisted member may be entitled as a member with dependents shall not \* \* \* be contingent on the right of such member to receive pay."

Now, what is the explanation for that language? How can an enlisted man receive quarters and not receive pay?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY) yield to me?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, this wording referred to is existing law. As I explained in my statement, the Defense Department had originally proposed the language which is stricken out from line 11 through line 19. Their language would have restricted the arrangement that has been in existence for all these years, and the committee felt that since this was emergency legislation and we were simply extending what had been in effect, we ought to go back to the original language. So the language that appears as a committee amendment is actually the language in the law as it now stands.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman to say that we are changing existing law.

Mr. STRATTON. No. The DOD proposal would have changed it. We are retaining the language as it is.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, under what circumstances would enlisted personnel be entitled to quarters and not be entitled to pay?

Mr. BRAY. That would come about in several instances:

One if a serviceman was being held in confinement in a foreign country, because of alleged violation of that country's laws, there are several conditions whereby quarters allowance should be paid even where pay is withheld.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 8537, 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.

#### TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS AUTHORIZATION

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6129) to amend section 2 of the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6129

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), as amended, is amended by deleting "for each of the fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973, \$60,000,000"; and inserting in lieu thereof: "and for each of the fiscal years 1974, 1975, and 1976, \$60,000,000 plus such sums as are necessary, but not to exceed \$10,000,000, for each of such fiscal years, to offset reductions in, or the termination of, Federal grant-in-aid programs or other funds made available to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by other Federal agencies".*

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY).

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6129 to provide for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is not a territory of the United States. It is administered by the United States pursuant to an agreement with the Security Council of the United Nations. It includes the northern Mariana Islands, the East and West Caroline Islands, and the Marshall Islands. There are over 2,000 islands all together scattered across 3 million square miles of the western Pacific Ocean. The land area is about 700 square miles with an estimated population of 107,000. The Chief Executive is a Commissioner appointed by the President, and the territory has a legislative body composed of a 12-member senate and a 21-member house of representatives.

It is necessary for the Congress to appropriate funds to operate the territorial government. The normal full range of government services must be provided, including education, health service, resources management and development, public works, public affairs, transportation, and communication. H.R. 6129 authorizes the same level of spending which has been provided during the last several years.

The administration recommended legislation which was without a dollar ceiling or a time limitation. However, because of the importance of maintaining congressional control over the budgetary aspects of the administration of the trust territory, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is recommending

both a ceiling on the amount authorized to be appropriated and a time limitation on the authorization. As approved by the committee, H.R. 6129 authorizes the appropriation of \$60 million for each of the fiscal years 1974, 1975, and 1976, plus an additional \$10 million per year to offset any curtailment or termination of Federal grant-in-aid programs by other Federal agencies.

Mr. BURTON, chairman of the subcommittee handling the legislation, will furnish additional information on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of H.R. 6129.

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us was unanimously reported out of the Territories Subcommittee and the full Interior Committee. The bill was introduced pursuant to a request of the administration which was necessary because the current authorization for the funding of the trust territories expires as of June 30 this year. The administration asked for an open-end authorization for an unlimited duration. The subcommittee and full committee unanimously decided that rather than having an open-ended authorization we would extend the current level of authorization of \$60 million, with an allowance of a supplemental \$10 million because of the elimination of certain current ongoing programs that the trust territories participate in.

As I noted earlier, this legislation was approved without dissent. I am not aware of any controversy and I urge my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6129. For years I have watched with concern the plight of the Micronesians as they seek to pull themselves into the 20th century. Vast distances, cultural and ethnic biases and, at times, indifferent caretaker governments have thwarted Micronesia's attempt to achieve social, economic, and political stability. Only within recent years has sufficient U.S. financial assistance been pumped into the trust territory to stimulate modernization. Today, however, the significant progress, which has been made in Micronesia's development, hangs in jeopardy. In the face of across-the-board cuts in Federal spending, the trust territory, too, has been designated to take its share, apparently with little forethought as to the consequences.

The proposed fiscal year 1974 budget for the trust territory is \$56 million. Moreover, it is reasonable to assume that in fiscal year 1974 at least one-half of the \$10 million now furnished through other Federal programs will be slashed. In other words, for fiscal year 1974, the trust territory must recognize the possibility of a 13-percent reduction in available funds from that of preceding years. This means, of course, the brunt of the reduction will be absorbed in reduced capital improvements unless the

government of the territory is willing to undergo a major reduction-in-force of its employees—a step which would only add to the unemployment problems that already plague Micronesia.

Among the developing nations—and Micronesia certainly falls in this category—investment represents the brightest hope for the future. Without sufficient capital improvements, the development of a sound economic base with its follow-on social and political institutions, is not feasible. For example, within the trust territory, we are just beginning to see the establishment of a local tax base. In fiscal year 1973, it is estimated that over \$4 million in local taxes will be collected. With increased capital improvements, it could be anticipated that even more local revenues would be generated.

However, such is not the case reflected in the reduced trust territory budgets for fiscal year 1974 and beyond. It appears to me, therefore, that we must either accept the likelihood of destroying sources of local revenue, which could eventually supplant most of today's required U.S. subsidy, or sustain the present level of financial support for the territory. It is the latter course which H.R. 6129 intends to follow.

The bill authorizes the same level of financial support for fiscal years 1974, 1975, and 1976 that the trust territory has enjoyed since 1971. Further, it provides a \$10 million annual bulwark in the event grants-in-aid and other Federal programs are terminated in Micronesia. Lastly, since the authorization extends over 3 years, the proposed legislation permits the government of the trust territory to engage in long-range planning, an ingredient essential to the process of economic development.

I do not mean to imply, Mr. Speaker, that the trust territory will enjoy prosperity over the next 3 years while Federal support for vital programs here at home wanes. On the contrary, Micronesia is beset with inflation, magnified by the distance goods must travel. A 12-to-1 trade imbalance, rising freight costs, shipping tie-ups, and foreign devaluation of the U.S. dollar—all are major factors diluting the effectiveness of U.S. financial assistance to the territory. Indeed, to maintain the current level of governmental services with no reduction in funding, the trust territory must engage in severe belt-tightening. Therefore, on bipartisan grounds, I petition passage of H.R. 6129—not as a handout to the Micronesians, but in the hope of developing in Micronesia a viable economy which can compete favorably with its Pacific neighbors.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6129. As you know, the United States administers the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to a strategic trusteeship agreement concluded in 1947 with the Security Council of the United Nations. This agreement charges the United States with the promotion of political, social, educational, and economic development of the trust territory. For the first 15 years of American administration, however, little was done to improve

the bare subsistence level of the Micronesians, who had suffered under 30 years of Japanese occupation and from the ravages of World War II. In those days, only \$7 million were annually appropriated to accommodate the needs of roughly 75,000 inhabitants scattered over 3 million square miles of ocean. Obviously, such a pittance could go little further than to pay the salaries of the assigned American administrators.

In 1962, however, a change in U.S. policy toward Micronesia was effected. Annual appropriations for the trust territory were gradually increased, thereby encouraging and stimulating political, social, and economic progress. By fiscal year 1971, the level of annual appropriation reached \$60 million, supplemented by an additional \$10 million from U.S. grants-in-aid and other Federal programs managed outside the Department of the Interior. This level of funding has remained constant throughout fiscal years 1972 and 1973.

As a result, long-range plans became a reality. Today, universal education through the 12th grade appears an imminent possibility; a system of new or renovated hospitals and dispensaries, which will eventually make available to all islanders modern medical treatment and health facilities, is underway; community infra-structures, which will provide an adequate water supply, sewage disposal, electrical power, air terminals, roads and harbors, are under construction; and economic programs, which are designed to develop Micronesia's natural resources, are moving ahead.

In spite of significant progress, however, much remains to be done. H.R. 6129 provides for the continuance of civil government in the trust territory at the same level of funding as authorized for the past 3 years. For fiscal years 1974, 1975, and 1976, \$60 million in Department of the Interior funds are authorized.

Moreover, to offset possible reductions in U.S. grants-in-aid and similar programs, the proposed legislation authorizes for the trust territory such sums as necessary, not to exceed \$10 million, for each fiscal year.

Negotiations have been underway for over 3 years to develop a long-term relationship between Micronesia and the United States.

Progress has been made, but many details await accord. Pending agreement on the future status of the trust territory, what Micronesia needs now is assurance that the level of U.S. financial support will be held at least constant for a reasonable length of time. H.R. 6129 allows for just such assurance. The proposed authorization permits development projects to continue unabated. It allows sufficient flexibility for the Trust Territory High Commissioner and the Congress of Micronesia to engage in long-range planning and to exploit economic breakthroughs as they occur. On the other hand, it is no blank check; H.R. 6129 insures a periodic review by the U.S. Congress of the trust territory's achievements and expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, our obligations toward the people of Micronesia are clear. Under article 6.2 of the trusteeship agreement, the United States will:

Promote the economic advancement and self-sufficiency of the inhabitants, and to this end shall regulate the use of natural resources; encourage fisheries, agriculture, and industries; protect the inhabitants against the loss of their lands and resources; and improve the means of transportation and communication.

Accordingly, the budget of the trust territory offers no field for arbitrary "penny pinching." The reduction of funds, even of the slightest magnitude, may result in the abandonment of vital programs essential to economic or social growth and reflects adversely on the good intent of the U.S. Congress and the citizens of the United States. Consequently, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6129. It is a prudent bill, molded to meet the needs of the Micronesians, but modest enough not to be wasteful.

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask someone knowledgeable about this bill what has been spent in the past for this purpose?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the level of our funding has been at the rate of \$60 million for the last 3 years.

Mr. GROSS. Per year?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Per year.

Mr. GROSS. I would ask the gentleman why are we saddled with all of this expense? I thought the United Nations had some sort of interest in this.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. If the gentleman will yield, we always have assumed a responsibility under the trusteeship agreement, and at this time the committee felt that it was necessary to move toward a specific commitment on our part in order to enhance our negotiating position relating to the political status question of these islands in the Pacific at this time.

Mr. GROSS. And the United Nations has no responsibility whatever?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. If the gentleman will yield, yes, the U.N. does. However, the Micronesians have their own taxing responsibilities. In the islands they raise an amount annually of some \$4 million in taxes to meet the budgetary commitments of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. GROSS. \$4 million to meet what obligations?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. The obligations of the Government, the districts in Micronesia.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean the United Nations has put this amount of money in?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. No. This is raised by the local districts, the local people.

Mr. GROSS. They have raised \$4 million, and do they pay this to the United Nations? Are they members of the United Nations, or do they have money raised to operate the government, is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. No. It is my understanding that they collect these taxes just as any other subdivision in our own country would collect taxes, and

this becomes a part of their overall administrative budget.

Mr. GROSS. Plus the \$60 million we give them?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. That is correct. This is used basically for capital improvements dealing primarily with shipping facilities, roads, and airports.

When we consider the fact that they have some 20 populated centers scattered over some 3 million square miles, and the fact that we do have some security interests, as well as trusteeship interests, certainly the Department of the Interior, as evidenced by the filing of the departmental report by our former colleague, Mr. John Kyl. The Interior Department concentrated on these points, and Mr. Kyl spells out the considerations in detail in his letter to the Speaker which is included in its totality in the committee report.

Mr. GROSS. Is this being designed as a fall-back position from Okinawa? Are we going to have to pay for reestablishing another Okinawa somewhere or other in the Pacific, and is to be in this Trust Territory?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. At this point I think it would be premature and inappropriate for me to respond to that question because we cannot be specific. We, the committee, are in the process of evaluating the negotiating team efforts with the trust territory as it relates to the future political status question. The purpose of the negotiations is to determine what our future relationship with these islands and their people will be with the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman that I am going to look with a jaundiced eye on any expenditure for the creation of another Okinawa. I do not think we should have turned Okinawa back to Japanese for another 25 to 50 years, or as long as this Government maintained a substantial military presence in the Pacific.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOSMER was allowed to speak out of order.)

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SALINE WATER PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, shortly this afternoon there will be before us the authorization for appropriations for the saline water program for the fiscal year 1974. The bill as it came down from the administration is one thing; the bill that is coming before us is another thing.

The authorization is sought to be increased by 140 percent, and there are other increases amounting to 264 percent. The total amount of this authorization is only \$15.8 million, but here we have a program that has been going for about 20 years on which a quarter of a billion dollars has been spent and great progress has been made. It is time to cut it loose instead of continuously subsidizing it, now particularly, in a period when we are short on funds.

I shall strenuously object to this proposal later in the day.

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



suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 6129, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. HOSMER. 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 387, nays 14, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 239]

YEAS—387

Aldnor	Daniel, Robert	Helstoski
Abzug	W., Jr.	Henderson
Adams	Daniels	Hinshaw
Addabbo	Dominick V.	Hogan
Alexander	Davis, Ga.	Holifield
Anderson	Davis, S.C.	Holtzman
Anderson, Ill.	Davis, Wis.	Horton
Andrews, N.C.	de la Garza	Hosmer
Andrews, N. Dak.	Delaney	Howard
Annuzio	Dellenback	Huber
Archer	Dellums	Hudnut
Arends	Denholm	Hungate
Armstrong	Dennis	Hunt
Ashley	Dent	Ichord
Aspin	Derwinski	Jarman
Bafalis	Diggs	Johnson, Calif.
Baker	Dingell	Johnson, Colo.
Barrett	Donohue	Johnson, Pa.
Beard	Dorn	Jones, Ala.
Bell	Downing	Jones, N.C.
Bennett	Drinan	Jones, Okla.
Bergland	Dulski	Jones, Tenn.
Bevill	Duncan	Jordan
Biaggi	du Pont	Karh
Blester	Eckhardt	Kastenmeier
Bingham	Edwards, Ala.	Kazen
Blackburn	Edwards, Calif.	Keating
Boggs	Ellberg	Kemp
Boland	Erlenborn	Ketchum
Bolling	Esch	King
Bowen	Eshleman	Kluczyński
Brademas	Evans, Colo.	Koch
Brasco	Evins, Tenn.	Kuykendall
Bray	Fascell	Kyros
Breckinridge	Findley	Landrum
Brinkley	Fish	Latta
Broomfield	Flood	Lehman
Brotzman	Flowers	Lent
Brown, Calif.	Flynt	Litton
Brown, Mich.	Foley	Long, La.
Brown, Ohio	Ford, Gerald R.	Long, Md.
Broyhill, N.C.	Ford	Lott
Broyhill, Va.	William D.	Lujan
Buchanan	Forsythe	McClary
Burgener	Fountain	McCloskey
Burke, Calif.	Fraser	McCollister
Burke, Fla.	Frenzel	McCormack
Burke, Mass.	Frey	McDade
Burleson, Tex.	Froehlich	McEwen
Burlison, Mo.	Fulton	McFall
Burton	Fuqua	McKay
Butler	Gaydos	McKinney
Byron	Gettys	McSpadden
Camp	Gialmo	Macdonald
Carey, N.Y.	Gibbons	Madden
Carney, Ohio	Gilman	Madigan
Carter	Ginn	Mahon
Casey, Tex.	Gonzalez	Mailliard
Cederberg	Goodling	Mallory
Chamberlain	Grasso	Mann
Chappell	Green, Oreg.	Maraziti
Ciancy	Green, Pa.	Martin, Nebr.
Clark	Griffiths	Martin, N.C.
Clausen	Grover	Mathias, Calif.
Don H.	Gubser	Mathis, Ga.
Clawson, Del	Gude	Matsunaga
Clay	Gunter	Mayne
Cleveland	Guyer	Mazzoli
Cochran	Haley	Meeds
Cohen	Hamilton	Meicher
Collins, Ill.	Hammer-	Metcalfe
Conable	schmidt	Mezvisky
Conlan	Hanley	Michel
Conte	Hanrahan	Milford
Conyers	Hansen, Idaho	Mills, Ark.
Corman	Harrington	Minish
Cotter	Harsha	Mink
Coughlin	Harvey	Minshall, Ohio
Cronin	Hastings	Mitchell, Md.
Culver	Hawkins	Mitchell, N.Y.
Daniel, Dan	Hays	Mizell
	Hébert	Moakley
	Hechler, W. Va.	Mollohan
	Heinz	Montgomery

Moorhead, Calif.	Roncallo, N.Y.	Taylor, N.C.
Moorhead, Pa.	Rooney, Pa.	Teague, Calif.
Mosher	Rose	Teague, Tex.
Murphy, Ill.	Rosenthal	Thomson, Wis.
Murphy, N.Y.	Rostenkowski	Thone
Myers	Roush	Thornton
Natcher	Roy	Tierman
Nedzi	Roybal	Treen
Nelsen	Runnels	Udall
Nichols	Ruppe	Ullman
Nix	Ruth	Vander Jagt
Obey	Ryan	Vanik
O'Brien	St Germain	Veysey
O'Hara	Sarasin	Vigorito
O'Neill	Sarbanes	Waggonner
Owens	Satterfield	Waldie
Parris	Saylor	Walsh
Patman	Scherle	Wampler
Patten	Schneebell	Ware
Pepper	Schroeder	Whalen
Perkins	Sebelius	White
Pettis	Seiberling	Whitehurst
Peyser	Shipley	Whitten
Pickle	Shoup	Widnall
Pike	Shriver	Williams
Podell	Shuster	Wilson, Bob
Powell, Ohio	Sikes	Wilson,
Preyer	Slack	Charles H., Calif.
Price, Ill.	Smith, Iowa	Wilson,
Price, Tex.	Smith, N.Y.	Charles, Tex.
Pritchard	Spence	Winn
Quile	Stanton,	Wolff
Quillen	J. William	Wright
Railsback	Stanton,	Wyatt
Randall	James V.	Wyder
Rangel	Stark	Wyman
Rees	Steed	Yates
Regula	Steele	Yatron
Reuss	Steelman	Young, Alaska
Rhodes	Steiger, Wis.	Young, Fla.
Riegle	Stevens	Young, Ga.
Rinaldo	Stokes	Young, Ill.
Roberts	Stratton	Young, S.C.
Robinson, Va.	Stubblefield	Young, Tex.
Robison, N.Y.	Stuckey	Zablocki
Rodino	Studds	Zion
Roe	Sullivan	Zwack
Rogers	Symington	
Roncallo, Wyo.	Symms	
	Talcott	

NAYS—14

Collins, Tex.	Hicks	Rousselot
Crane	Hillis	Snyder
Devine	Holt	Taylor, Mo.
Dickinson	Hutchinson	Wylie
Gross	Miller	

NOT VOTING—32

Ashbrook	Hanna	Rooney, N.Y.
Badillo	Hansen, Wash.	Sandman
Blatnik	Heckler, Mass.	Sisk
Breaux	Landgrebe	Skubitz
Brooks	Leggett	Staggers
Chisholm	Morgan	Steiger, Ariz.
Danielson	Moss	Thompson, N.J.
Fisher	Passman	Towell, Nev.
Frelinghuysen	Poage	Van Deerlin
Goldwater	Rarick	Wiggins
Gray	Reid	

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Van Deerlin.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Passman.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Badillo.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Skubitz.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Danielson.

Mr. Rarick with Mr. Landgrebe.

Mr. Reid with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Breaux with Mr. Sisk.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1385) to amend section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 1385

An act to amend section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), as amended, is amended by deleting "for each of the fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973, \$60,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "for fiscal year 1974, \$60,000,000".

SEC. 2. The Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 4. (a) The government comptroller for Guam appointed pursuant to the provisions of section 9-A of the Organic Act of Guam shall, in addition to the duties imposed on him by such Act, carry out, on and after the date of the enactment of this section, the duties set forth in this section with respect to the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. In carrying out such duties, the comptroller shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Interior and shall not be a part of any executive department in the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The salary and expenses of the comptroller's office shall, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of section 9-A of the Organic Act of Guam, be apportioned equitably by the Secretary of the Interior between Guam and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands from funds available to Guam and the trust territory.

"(b) The government comptroller shall audit all accounts and review and recommend adjudication of claims pertaining to the revenue and receipts of the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and of funds derived from bond issues; and he shall audit, in accordance with law and administrative regulations, all expenditures of funds and property pertaining to the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands including those pertaining to trust funds held by such government.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the government comptroller to bring to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior and the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands all failures to collect amounts due the government, and the expenditures of funds or uses of property which are irregular or not pursuant to law. The audit activities of the government comptroller shall be directed so as to (1) improve the efficiency and economy of programs of the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and (2) discharge the responsibility incumbent upon the Congress to insure that the

substantial Federal revenues which are covered into the treasury of such government are properly accounted for and audited.

"(d) The decisions of the government comptroller shall be final except that appeal therefrom may, with the concurrence of the High Commissioner, be taken by the party aggrieved or the head of the department concerned, within one year from the date of the decision, to the Secretary of the Interior, which appeal shall be in writing and shall specifically set forth the particular action of the government comptroller to which exception is taken, with the reasons and the authorities relied upon for reversing such decision.

"(e) If the High Commissioner does not concur in the taking of an appeal to the Secretary, the party aggrieved may seek relief by suit in the District Court of Guam, if the claim is otherwise within its jurisdiction. No later than thirty days following the date of the decision of the Secretary of the Interior, the party aggrieved or the High Commissioner, on behalf of the head of the department concerned, may seek relief by suit in the District Court of Guam, if the claim is otherwise within its jurisdiction.

"(f) The government comptroller is authorized to communicate directly with any person or with any department officer or person having official relation with his office. He may summon witnesses and administer oaths.

"(g) As soon after the close of each fiscal year as the accounts of said fiscal year may be examined and adjusted, the government comptroller shall submit to the High Commissioner and the Secretary of the Interior an annual report of the fiscal condition of the government, showing the receipts and disbursements of the various departments and agencies of the government. The Secretary of the Interior shall submit such report along with his comments and recommendations to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(h) The government comptroller shall make such other reports as may be required by the High Commissioner, the Comptroller General of the United States, or the Secretary of the Interior.

"(i) The office and activities of the government comptroller pursuant to this section shall be subject to review by the Comptroller General of the United States, and reports thereon shall be made by him to the High Commissioner, the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(j) All departments, agencies, and establishments shall furnish to the government comptroller such information regarding the powers, duties, activities, organization, financial transactions, and methods of business of their respective offices as he may from time to time require of them; and the government comptroller, or any of his assistants or employees, when duly authorized by him, shall, for the purpose of securing information, have access to and the right to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of any such department, agency, or establishment."

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1385 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 6129, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 6129) was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO APPOINT VICE ADM. HYMAN J. RICKOVER, U.S. NAVY (RETIRED) TO THE GRADE OF ADMIRAL ON THE RETIRED LIST

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 1717) to authorize the President to appoint Vice Adm. Hyman J. Rickover, U.S. Navy, (retired) to the grade of admiral on the retired list.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1717

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the vital contribution of Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover (United States Navy retired) to our national defense and in special recognition of his invaluable guidance, initiative, and perseverance in developing the nuclear submarine, the President is authorized to appoint the said Hyman G. Rickover to the grade of admiral on the retired list with all the rights, privileges, benefits, pay and allowances provided by law for officers appointed to such grade.*

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is an expression by Congress of its desire to honor Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover in the most appropriate fashion: by authorizing the President to promote him to the grade of full admiral in the naval service to which he has given his life. Because he is on the retired list, Admiral Rickover is no longer eligible to be considered for selection to the grade of admiral under normal promotion procedures.

Admiral Rickover is presently in the status of being a retired officer recalled to active duty and is thus carried on the list of retired admirals rather than the list of active-duty admirals.

Admiral Rickover has long had a special relationship with the Congress. If it had not been for the intercession of Congress, he would have been retired years ago as a captain. The Congress, in its judgment of defense programs, has benefited greatly from Admiral Rickover's advice and from his candor. It is, therefore, particularly fitting that this honor came at the initiative of the Congress.

Admiral Rickover's achievements are too well known to require repeating. He is a rare American whose dedication to his country and tenacity in pursuit of excellence have contributed greatly to the strength of our national defense. It is rare, indeed, that one man can be said to make so great an impact on the defense policies of his country. The honor this bill would bestow on Admiral Rickover is richly deserved.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with my colleagues in support of this legislation to permit the President to promote Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy (retired) to the grade of full admiral on the retired list. Admiral Rickover justly deserves the title "Father of America's Nuclear Navy" because I feel if it had not been for his dedication and expertise, the military

strength of our country would not be what it is today.

I had the pleasure of being with Admiral Rickover last year when Congressman STRATTON and I inspected the Knolls Atomic Laboratory at Schenectady, N.Y., and later the site of the Navy's prototype of the Trident submarine to be constructed at West Milton, N.Y., in my own district. I was greatly impressed by Admiral Rickover's keen mind, his ready wit and his thorough knowledge of our Nation's nuclear submarine program.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, Admiral Rickover has contributed immeasurably to building our modern nuclear Navy which is today a major factor in preserving peace throughout the free world. It is my hope that the legislation we are considering today to permit the President to promote this distinguished American to the rank of full admiral will be overwhelmingly approved.

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.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STRATTON. 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 H.R. 1717, just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### WATER RESOURCES PLANNING AUTHORIZATION

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6338) to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to provide for continuing authorization for appropriations, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6338

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 401 of the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89-80; 79 Stat. 244; 42 U.S.C. 1962d) is amended to delete, immediately after the phrase "(c) not to exceed \$3,500,000," the words "in fiscal year 1973 and such annual amounts as may be authorized by subsequent Acts" and to insert "annually for fiscal years 1974 and 1975".*

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY).

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to state my support of H.R. 6338, as amended, a bill to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to provide additional authorization for appropriations.

The legislation, simply stated, provides authorization of an added annual ap-



appropriation of \$3,500,000 for use by the Water Resources Council for the next 2 fiscal years—1974 and 1975. A similar authorization was provided for fiscal year 1973 in Public Law 92-396, enacted during the second session of the 92d Congress.

The purposes of the added authorization are twofold. First, not to exceed \$2,500,000 could be appropriated in each of the 2 fiscal years for the preparation by the council of the second national water assessment. The Water Resources Planning Act provides for such assessments to be made periodically, and the council has decided as a matter of policy to prepare and publish them at 5-year intervals. Two years are required to actually compile the data and publish the report. Accordingly, this authorization will not be needed after fiscal year 1975 until some years hence when it is time to start work on the third national assessment.

The second purpose of the added authorization is to provide funding for the Water Resources Council to coordinate and supervise the preparation of river basin and regional water and related land resource plans—\$1 million is authorized to be appropriated for this purpose in each of the 2 fiscal years. Absent this authorization, it would be necessary for the council to designate one of the water resource action agencies to be the lead agency; thus, in effect, delegating its coordinating function. A number of river basin plans have been prepared in this manner and experience has shown that coordination and standardization suffer—and the responsibility for keeping on schedule become obscured.

While it appears that this bill will increase Federal costs by some \$7 million over the 2-year period, this is actually not the case. There will be savings of an approximate equal amount in the budgets of the cooperating water resource agencies and the net impact on Federal expenditures will be negligible.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. JOHNSON of California, chairman of the subcommittee handling the legislation, will present additional information on this legislation. I know of no opposition to this bill and I urge its approval.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in a year when our calendar is replete with dozens of examples of poorly conceived and ineptly administered programs seeking further congressional authorization, I take particular pleasure in rising to support an ongoing program of unquestioned benefit to our Nation's future.

I refer to the program set out in the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, a program administered by the Water Resources Council:

First. To prepare national inventories of water supply and demand;

Second. To develop principles, standards and procedures for project formulation and evaluation;

Third. To establish continuing liaison with the various river basin commissions;

Fourth. To administer grants-in-aid to the States for water resource planning; and

Fifth. To foster and review river basin plans.

This Council is an interdepartmental, independent agency. Its members are cabinet officers and bureau chiefs with statutory and administrative responsibility for a great variety of Federal programs. The Council's Chairman is the Secretary of the Interior and its Vice Chairman is the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

Under their direction, real progress has been made toward a long overdue ordering of our approach to water resource planning. Seven river basin commissions have been set up: New England, the Great Lakes, the Pacific Northwest, the Souris-Red-Rainy, the Ohio, the Missouri and the Upper Missouri Basins. Additionally, a series of grants have been made to the States to augment their water planning abilities. Via this program, the number of technically qualified people in State water planning has increased, State and regional water planning has greatly improved, and State water programs are farther ahead than they would have been without the grants.

The Water Resources Council has earned the respect and the admiration of many Members of Congress and is certainly deserving of our further support.

I commend Mr. HOSMER, a distinguished member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who has shown fine leadership in the field of water resource planning and development.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to speak on behalf of the bill H.R. 6338, to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to provide additional authorization for appropriations.

The Water Resources Planning Act is administered by the Water Resources Council. Its duties, pursuant to law, are: First, assessing national water supplies and needs; second, coordinating river basin and regional water and related land resources plans; and third, administering a grant program to River Basin Commissions to defray the Federal share of operating such commissions.

As the act now stands on the statute books, appropriations are authorized in the amount of first, \$5,000,000 annually for planning grants to States; second, \$6,000,000 annually for the Federal share of operating river basin commissions; and third, \$1,500,000 annually for administering the Water Resources Council. There are no specific funds authorized to be appropriated for the preparation of national assessments or for coordinating the preparation of basin and regional plans.

Absent specific appropriations for these purposes the Council, in prior years, has relied on contributed data and staff resources from the water resource action program agencies to coordinate plans and to prepare the national assessment. In the case of river basin plans, the practice has been to designate a lead agency which would then, in turn, secure its own appropriations from Congress for this activity. Other contributing agencies

to overall regional plans would likewise request funds to cover their inputs.

This approach to coordination has proven to be awkward and ineffective. H.R. 6338 affords a mechanism for improving coordination and standardization of river basin planning by authorizing an annual appropriation of \$1,000,000 to the Water Resources Council with which to finance centralized management. The President's budget for fiscal year 1974, in anticipation of enactment of this legislation, contains a request for \$775,000 for this activity.

The first national assessment prepared by the Water Resources Council was prepared by personnel detailed to the Council by the other water resource agencies and relied heavily on data inputs from these agencies. Experience demonstrated that attainment of time schedules and standardization of input data, as well as analyses, was virtually impossible in the absence of a centralized control mechanism. H.R. 6338 will provide this mechanism for the second assessment scheduled for preparation during fiscal years 1974 and 1975, by authorizing appropriations in the amount of \$2,500,000 for each year. The President's budget anticipates this authorization by including the sum of \$2,395,000 for this purpose for fiscal year 1974.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that the Federal cost of this legislation is more apparent than real. The administrative structure that will be afforded as a result of this legislation will enhance efficiency in the implementation of programs already authorized to be conducted. The legislation actually authorizes no new work, no new man-days of effort, and no activity not already provided by statute. Accordingly, it is probable that the legislation will actually result in an overall reduction in the Federal cost of the programs carried out by the Water Resources Council. These are the reasons that I urge my colleagues to join with me in suspending the rules and passing this legislation.

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

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

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman from California, of course, as well as serving on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is also a valued member of the Committee on Public Works, where I am also privileged to serve with the gentleman.

I would like to know if this is funding for the same organization that caused us so much concern last year, when it was anticipated that they were going to change certain standards for tests for figures for the benefit-cost ratio on public works projects, and other proposed regulations such as deactivating and defunding of projects that did not have construction starts within 3 to 5 years?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would say to the gentleman from Kentucky that the Water Resources Council did make a study, and they have made preliminary recommendations. The study is still under active consideration by the Water Resources Council. In the absence of a permanent director of that council they are now waiting, I presume, for the

new director to be appointed. It is my information that they will go into a further study of their recommendations, and that the report will be rendered some time in late July and August.

Now, certainly those recommendations are going to be reviewed by the administration, the Office of Management and Budget, and the other agencies that are concerned with them. However, I do not think that out of this particular study will come the actual deauthorization of projects which are already authorized in the backlog. I believe that deauthorization was mentioned by the Water Quality Commission, another commission, and that study and report will be made as of June 30.

This commission will be heard before the Committee on the Interior in the other body I do believe this week, or the next week, just prior to the other body leaving for the 4th of July recess.

Both of these reports have certain recommendations that are somewhat difficult and troublesome from the standpoint of their operations under criteria that was laid down. As far as I know, the criteria that is being used is the old criteria, and the discount rate is still used is the rate of 5.5 percent. They have recommended a much higher rate in their study. But that has not been accepted as yet on the part of the administration.

Mr. SNYDER. If they make such recommendations, and they are accepted on the part of the administration, will the funding of the council at this point allow those recommendations to be implemented, barring any action of the Congress?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That would have nothing to do with it. I think if they do recommend them it is up to the Congress then to enact legislation that would set policy for benefit considerations, and the proper discount rate. That legislation is pending, as the gentleman knows, in our own committee, and it is also being considered in the other body at this particular time.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman will recall that in the Rivers and Harbors Bill last year, which I believe was vetoed, or did not get called up for some reason or other, we wrote some language into that bill that would have prevented these new regulations taking effect—of course, as I say, that did not become law.

Now, my question is, is the funding of this council at this point going to put them in a position to make those regulations effective if the Congress does not act on the legislation now pending in the Committee on Public Works, to deactivate all those projects, so many of which would appear to be favorable?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No, it would not have that affect.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, this council has been in existence since 1965. Could the gentleman from California tell me where the money is being spent?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I believe that the council has been in existence

since 1965. It was authorized in the 89th Congress, I do believe.

Mr. WYLIE. That is the date I used. Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am sorry, I thought the gentleman said 1935.

Mr. WYLIE. I said 1965.

I wonder if the gentleman could tell me where the money is being spent?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The money is being spent on the operation of the council, the river basin commissions program, and grant-in-aid programs to the various States. There are seven river commissions at the present time in operation.

The housekeeping for the water resources council has an amount of \$1,500,000 for that purpose. It authorizes \$5 million for the State grant program, and the Federal share of the river basin commissions program amounted to \$6 million.

Mr. WYLIE. It is my understanding that most of the money is being spent in two States, on the Colorado River in Arizona and California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No, it is not. These commissions are scattered throughout the United States. I do not have the actual area, but it is not being spent on the Colorado River in the States of Arizona and California.

Mr. WYLIE. I have just two more questions. Does the gentleman know how much money has been spent so far, and how much longer it is contemplated that this Council will be needed?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is a permanent council, and it has much work to be done. I think throughout the United States we have a very real problem dealing with our water resources law. They are responsible for working with the States within the various river basins dealing with all of the problems of water resource development throughout the United States. I think there is a need for this Water Resources Council for some time to come, because they are dealing with one of the essentials. Since we have enacted the Environmental Protection Act of 1969 and the Water Pollution Control Act of 1972, it makes it mandatory that we carry on this type of function if we are going to coordinate and solve our water resource problems and have an adequate supply of water and other benefits that come with good basin development.

Mr. WYLIE. I would agree with the gentleman, but would it be appropriate for this Council, for example, to make an estimate of the water supply needs for the city of Columbus, Ohio?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I presume it would be an eligible agency, but there are other agencies that would do a job much faster, I would say.

Mr. WYLIE. I am attempting to find out the thrust of the jurisdiction of the Council. The gentleman has been very helpful. I would like to know how much money has been spent so far.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not have the total figures, but I would say that the administration has recognized this as being a very essential part of our water resources concern. They have supported the amounts that were included in the first three items, and they also have supported and recommended in the 1974 budget amounts that would carry

on the functions of the other two programs that I have related to the Congress here in the amount of \$2,395,000, where the bill calls for \$2,500,000, and for an amount of \$775,000, where the bill calls for an authorization of \$1 million.

So I think the amounts that are asked for in the legislation are fully supported by the administration and the Office of Management and Budget, and also by the Department of the Interior.

The executive communication that came up recommended the enactment of this bill, and they are the ones who drafted the bill itself.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6338, amending the Water Resources Planning Act to provide for continuing authorization for appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a proposal to augment and strengthen the role of the Water Resources Council in coordinating and guiding the future development of regional and national water resources.

Like my colleagues from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) and California (Mr. JOHNSON), I have tremendous admiration for the past work of the Water Resources Council and corresponding confidence that a decision by the House to increase the Council's authorization would be a wise and farsighted move.

As the gentleman from California pointed out the Council's first national assessment of water needs and supplies was completed in 1968. This study was, of necessity, based upon highly limited data and analysis provided by a variety of State and Federal water agencies. The difficulties of assembling a conceptually unified body of knowledge under such circumstances are obvious and it has become increasingly clear that the accuracy and practicality of future assessments demand improved methods of data gathering and analysis.

Passage of H.R. 6338 will aid the council in preparing a second national assessment. This second assessment will place special emphasis on areas not previously studied in order to provide a more consistent national data base. The resulting report should give us a more complete picture of our national and regional water resource problems. This study will also lead to new factors and yardsticks for evaluating alternative courses of action in future water resource planning and management.

As has also been mentioned, this apparent increase in Council funding is actually illusory. The previous study was a hodge-podge of staff input from a number of agencies. This increase will take much of this outside input and turn it into inside output by centralizing many staff functions.

Mr. Speaker, we need this Council for the coordination and order it brings to a vital field of enormous national importance. I urge support for this excellent proposal.

#### SALINE WATER PROGRAM

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, earlier in



the afternoon I mentioned to the membership that the bill coming later in the day to authorize appropriations for the saline water program goes 140 percent over the administration request for total OSW budgetary authorization and 60 percent over the administration's request for new authorizations.

At the time the amendment is offered to make the unwarranted increases, I shall oppose it vigorously, and I trust the membership will understand that here involved is a very clear issue of economy in government and of following through on the budgetary recommendations.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 6338, which would increase appropriation authorizations for the Water Resources Council for fiscal years 1974 and 1975. The increased authorizations amount to \$3.5 million annually for administrative expenses of the Council; not more than \$2.5 million for the preparing of the national water assessment as required by law, the remaining \$1 million for administration and coordination of river basin and regional plans prepared pursuant to the Water Resources Planning Act.

The work of the Water Resources Council is important to my congressional district, which borders on that most important river, the Mississippi. The funds authorized in this legislation will enable centralized management of the activities of the Water Resources Council on a continuing basis.

The President's budget for fiscal 1974 contains \$2,395,000 for work in connection with the national assessment and \$775,000 for administration and coordination of river basin plans. Appropriations for the projects are naturally contingent upon our adoption of this authorizing legislation today.

Our water resources are important not only to my congressional district but also to the well-being of the Nation as a whole. We should adopt this legislation to assure that our water resources will receive the full amount of attention and development they require for the sake of the Nation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 6338, 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.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1501) to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1974, and ask for immediate consideration of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1501

An act to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1974

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 401 of the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89-80; 79 Stat. 244; 42 U.S.C. 1962d) is amended to delete, immediately after the phrase "(c) not to exceed \$3,500,000", the words "in fiscal year 1973" and to insert the words "in fiscal year 1974" in lieu thereof.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1501 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 6338, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "To amend the Water Resources Planning Act to provide for continuing authorization for appropriations."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 6338) was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT; SPACE, SCIENCE, VETERANS, AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the Department of Housing and Urban Development; Space, Science, Veterans, and certain other independent agencies appropriation bill for 1974.

Mr. TALCOTT reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

#### HISTORICAL PROPERTIES PRESERVATION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7127) to amend the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915), as amended, establishing a program for the preservation of additional historical properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7127

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915), as amended (16 U.S.C. 470) is further amended in the following respects:

(a) Section 108 is amended by deleting the

first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "To carry out the provisions of this title, there are authorized to be appropriated not more than \$15,600,000 in fiscal year 1974, \$20,000,000 in fiscal year 1975, and \$24,400,000 in fiscal year 1976."

(b) Section 206 is amended by deleting all of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) For the purposes of this section there are authorized to be appropriated not more than \$100,000 in fiscal year 1974, \$100,000 in fiscal year 1975, and \$125,000 in fiscal year 1976: Provided, That effective January 1, 1974, no appropriation is authorized and no payment shall be made to the Centre in excess of 25 per centum of the total annual assessment of such organization."

(c) Section 201 is amended by inserting the following new subsection:

"(g) The Council shall continue in existence until December 31, 1985."

(d) Section 101(b)(1) is amended by deleting "and American Samoa," and inserting "American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY), a member of the committee, such time as he may consume.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a moment to express my support for H.R. 7127, as recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

This legislation, like a comparable bill introduced by the ranking minority member of the committee (Mr. SAYLOR) is designed to extend the national historic preservation program.

If H.R. 7127 is enacted, it will be the second extension for this program which was created by Congress in 1966. At that time, it was felt that a program of matching grants-in-aid should be offered to encourage the States to develop comprehensive statewide historic preservation plans and to enable them to take steps to preserve and restore places of regional, State, and local historical significance.

In the years since that time, practically every State has developed a program for historic preservation and more than \$14 million of Federal funds have been allocated to the States. The enthusiasm for the program has grown, as experience with it has matured so that the future now is even more promising.

Not only has the National Historic Preservation Act provided needed financial assistance, but it has extended new protection to properties of State and local historical significance. Under it, places nominated by the States may be added to the National Register of Historic Places. The importance of this feature of the overall program is demonstrated by the fact that the National Register now includes more than 4,000 entries.

It is the responsibility of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to review direct and indirect Federal activities which might adversely affect these properties. This procedure affords those interested in preservation an opportunity to comment and suggest alternatives to the contemplated action.

Another major element of the program involves U.S. participation in the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property. This organization concentrates on worldwide historic preservation problems. It is supported by each of the 57 member nations which are assessed 1 percent of their annual contribution to UNESCO as their share of the cost of the centre.

In the past, no nation has been permitted to pay more than 30 percent of the total cost of operating the centre, but in the future, under this legislation and under the revised bylaws governing the centre, this maximum share will be reduced to 25 percent.

In the next 2 years, it is anticipated that the U.S. contribution will decrease as a result of the decrease in the maximum contribution of any one nation. By 1976, however, it is possible that some new nations might begin to participate which might result in some increase in the U.S. share. The members of the committee felt that a modest amount of flexibility in the authorization level could be justified by fiscal year 1976 since the maximum permissible contribution, in any event, would not exceed 25 percent of the total budget of the centre.

#### CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the members of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation who reviewed this legislation and perfected it. Instead of recommending an open-ended authorization, they recommended a program limited both in terms of time and dollars. While it is limited, it allows room for sound programing and for orderly growth. At the same time, it effectively insures continuous congressional review.

I am happy to join my colleagues in the committee in recommending the enactment of H.R. 7127 and I urge the Members of the House to consider it favorably.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my support for H.R. 7127, a bill to amend the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. The principal thrust of this bill is to extend and expand for 3 more years, the funding authorization and level for this program, since it otherwise would expire at the end of fiscal year 1973.

Perhaps the most important aspect of this program is the incentive it provides to the State and local governments and private interests to help perform the large task of assuring that some of the best of our Nation's historic resources are preserved, rather than passed into oblivion by the bulldozer and the wrecking ball.

The program established by the 1966 act encourages the States to develop and

submit plans for the preservation of important historic resources within their States. The Federal Government, through the program authorized by this original act, will pay 50 percent of the cost of both survey and plan preparation, and acquisition and development. Of course, the other 50 percent comes from the States and other local sources. Hence, this is a truly cooperative venture which greatly stimulates interest at the grassroots through the State governments across the Nation.

So popular and successful is this program, that it is important to note that the matching fund capabilities of the States considerably exceed the amount of the Federal share available through this program. The interest in this program across the Nation is strong, and is growing stronger.

The bill before us also provides for continued funding authorization for U.S. participation in the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property. Our continued participation is certainly warranted in this activity as the centre serves as a focal point for the collection, development, and dissemination of greater knowledge in the techniques of preserving historic resources around the globe from ruin, by deterioration and purposeful destruction.

H.R. 7127 also provides for the continuation, through 1985, of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, which was established with the enactment of the original act in 1966. Unless such extension provision is made, the Council would be automatically terminated in 1975 by terms of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Since this Council has continuing responsibilities, it seems only appropriate that its continuity be provided for.

This bill further provides for the inclusion of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands as a governmental entity able to participate in the historic preservation program.

Mr. Speaker, this bill assures a continuing effort in preserving our historic heritage, and by a means of stimulating local interest, involvement, and support. This legislation has significance for every part of our country, and I urge its support by my colleagues.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I note that the gentleman makes reference to the fact that this continues our support for the UNESCO Centre in Rome.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly sure how much we are going to put into this. It does not at the same time authorize travel, junkets to Rome for members of the committee, does it?

Mr. SAYLOR. No, it does not, but I can say to my colleague from Iowa that if he would only talk to his people out in Iowa, I am sure that they would be most happy to have the gentleman from Iowa travel to Rome for the purpose of inspecting this cultural centre. And maybe, bring a little of it back to some of the folks in Iowa, because he has a great capacity for absorbing so many things

here on the floor and all the bills that come up. I am sure that what he learned over there would be of invaluable assistance, not only to the Members of Congress, but to his colleagues and to his constituents in Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to believe, if the gentleman will yield further, I am beginning to believe from the exuberance of the gentleman and the appearance of the gentleman today, that he might well be on his way to Rome.

Mr. SAYLOR. I say to my colleague from Iowa that I have been to the Rome Centre, and I hope I have absorbed something of what they are trying to do.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak in behalf of the enactment of H.R. 7127—a bill providing for the extension and expansion of the national historic preservation program.

#### BACKGROUND

As most Members will recall, this program was originally authorized in 1966. At that time, it was viewed as a continuing program, but the authorization was limited in order to maintain better congressional control and oversight over it. In 1970, even though many of us were disappointed with the lack of progress which had been made, we extended it for 3 additional years in the hope that a more conscientious effort would be made to achieve the objectives which it sought to accomplish.

I am pleased to report that progress under the program has improved significantly during the last 3-year authorization. The States, generally, have assumed a great deal of responsibility for important historic preservation projects. Many of them have developed their own registers of historic places or enacted historic preservation acts after the national model. Practically all of the States have made their share of the required matching funds available and are moving forward with their historic preservation plans and acquisition and development projects.

#### EXISTING PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, the existing national historic preservation program can be best explained by dividing it into four parts:

The key element of the program involves matching assistance. Under the 1966 Act, all of the States, the District of Columbia and the territorial possessions of the United States, as well as the federally-chartered National Trust for Historic Preservation, are eligible to participate in the grants-in-aid program. These grants—which are matched dollar for dollar by the recipient—are used to further approved historic preservation planning, acquisition and development programs.

Another feature of the program involves the National Register of Historic Places. From the beginning, this legislation was aimed at encouraging State and local interest in historic preservation. To help accomplish this, the National Register was expanded to include not only places of national significance, but places of regional, State and local significance as well. To make this expansion meaningful, the act provided that any Federal or federally assisted or li-



censed programs should take into consideration the possible effects of such undertakings on National Register properties.

To help protect these places of historic significance, the act established an Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. While we did not go so far as to say that any Federal project or federally assisted project could be stopped, the act does provide that the Council should have a reasonable opportunity to review projects which might adversely affect a National Register property and which would permit the preservation of the historic values.

Finally, in 1970, the Congress authorized United States participation in the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property. This organization is an independent, international organization which is principally concerned with worldwide historic preservation problems. In addition, it is the principal coordinator of information on preservation technology and training. Just since the United States became a member in 1971, 32 Americans have participated in specialized training programs offered by the Centre and two conferences on technical programs have been held in the United States. It will also interest the Members of the House to know that the Architect of the Capitol requested and received technical advice concerning stone preservation in relation to the West Front of the Capitol. Similar assistance is being extended through the Centre with respect to preservation problems at four historic, adobe, Franciscan Missions in Texas.

#### EXPLANATION OF H.R. 7127, AS AMENDED

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not complicated nor is it controversial. In fact, everyone who appeared before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation recommended that this program be continued, but I should take a moment to briefly explain what it will do if it is enacted as recommended:

First, it extends the matching grants program for 3 additional years and authorizes the appropriation of \$15.6 million in fiscal year 1974, \$20 million in fiscal year 1975, and \$24.4 million in fiscal year 1976. All of this money, if requested by the Office of Management and Budget and appropriated by the Congress, will be used to promote the preservation of places which are most meaningful to the American people at the grass roots level. As amended, the bill extends the program to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

To me, this is the heart of the national historic preservation program. It helps protect and restore those places which make people proud of their communities and their States. It helps save remnants of the past so that our children and future generations can better understand and appreciate the contributions of those who preceded them. More of this needs to be done. People appreciate their heritage more when they can see evidence of the work and accomplishments of their forefathers. These are the tangible things that help us understand what makes America the great Nation that it is.

Second, this legislation authorizes the continued participation of the United States in the International Centre for 3 additional years. While I fully expect that we will want to extend our membership beyond that time, the members of the committee agreed that we should also review this phase of the program periodically. The cost of each nation's membership is determined by a formula based on their respective contributions to UNESCO. Over the last 3 years, the appropriation of \$300,000 was authorized in 3 equal installments, but the actual contribution of the United States for its first 3 years of membership is not expected to exceed \$230,000.

H.R. 7127 authorizes the appropriation of \$100,000 annually in fiscal years 1974 and 1975. While it may not be needed, they agreed that \$125,000 should be authorized for fiscal year 1976 so that the United States can meet its obligation under the formula if the membership of the Centre expands significantly. In the past, no nation has been permitted to contribute more than 30 percent of the total assessment, but the governing body of the Centre recently agreed that this maximum should be reduced to 25 percent beginning in 1974. This will probably result in a reduction of the U.S. contribution next year; however, in future years, as new nations participate in the Centre, the U.S. contribution could increase—but never more than 25 percent of the total budget.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7127 provides for the continuation of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. At the time that this advisory body was created, it was to continue indefinitely. During the 92d Congress, general legislation was approved, however, which provided for the termination of all Federal Advisory Committees which did not have a fixed term. Under this Act, the Advisory Council would be discontinued in 1975 unless otherwise provided by law. It was felt that the Council's existence should be assured, so the committee amended the bill to extend it until December 31, 1985.

#### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I want to say that this bill is one which I think everyone can support. Every part of the country has a stake in its approval. It has been thoroughly reviewed and carefully considered by the National Parks Subcommittee and by the Members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. While there may be some who would say that more funds should be authorized, I believe the amounts included in the bill—if appropriated—will result in a very healthy and vibrant program. Based on past experience, I think that the Members of the House can be assured that the committee will watch this program carefully and be guided in the future by the experience of the next 3 years.

I am pleased that Representative JOHNSON of California joined me in cosponsoring the bill now before the House and I want to add my appreciation for the support of our colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) and our colleague from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) who also cosponsored a similar measure. H.R. 7127, as recommended, is the product

of the efforts of all of these gentlemen and of the other members of the committee. It is a constructive proposal and I urge its approval by the Members of the House.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Just to confirm my worst fears, this bill calls for an expenditure of \$15.6 million in fiscal year 1974, \$20 million in fiscal year 1975, and \$24.4 million in fiscal year 1976; is that correct?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. That is correct. The committee thought that these figures were reasonable.

I might point out to the gentleman that more emphasis is being placed on historic preservation and on history now, as we face the bicentennial, than at any other time in our history.

The administration recommended appropriating \$15.6 million for fiscal year 1974. We put in a figure just large enough to cover the administration recommendation for appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I hesitate to ask the question about where it is proposed to get the money. Are we going to borrow it?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Of course, this money, like other money we appropriate, will have to come from the General Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. Like the arts and the humanities and all the rest of it, we are confronted with a \$27 billion interest payment in fiscal year 1974. I am sure the gentleman is aware that \$27 billion will be required to meet the interest on the Federal debt in 1974.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7127 which is an amendment to the act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915).

Prior to the enactment of the act of October 15, 1966, the major burden of preservation of historical treasures had been borne by private agencies and individuals.

Because of the ever increasing extensions of urban centers—building of highways—industrial development, the Congress, in 1966, in its wisdom determined to take appropriate steps to preserve the historical and cultural foundations of this Nation.

Under this act the Secretary of Interior was authorized—

To maintain and expand a national register of our State and national objects of significant historical—architectural—and archeological values.

To establish a system of matching grants-in-aid to the States to preserve—protect—rehabilitate—and restore these State and National treasures.

We created an advisory board—made up of the Secretaries of Interior—Housing and Urban Development—Commerce—Treasury—the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution—the Chairman of the National Trust for Historical Preservation—to give guidance.

And we authorized that not more than \$2 million be spent in fiscal 1967—and not more than \$10 million each year for fiscal 1968, 1969, 1970.

In 1970—we again appeared before this body and submitted an amendment to the act of 1966—recommending cer-

tain amendments to the act relating to the size and membership of the advisory board (17 to 20 members).

We recommended that there be appropriated not more than \$7 million in fiscal 1971—\$10 million in 1972 and \$10 million in fiscal 1973.

And then we added a new section to the act which provided for our membership in the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Historical and Cultural Properties—and for the purpose of this section we authorized that not more than \$100,000 annually be appropriated for fiscal year 1971—and for each of the 2 successive years.

Now—what was the reason for establishing the Centre—what was its purpose—why did we become members?

Every nation of the world possesses priceless treasures—treasures that money cannot buy—and yet—because of the lack of qualified conservators and the art preservation—these treasures are deteriorating and one day will cease to exist—unless we find the answers to preserve them.

The west wall of the Capitol is a good example of what I mean.

Those who saw the ravages of water and mud on the paintings and sculptures of Michaelangelo during the Florence flood—will also understand what I mean.

Those who were in Florence—who saw young boys and girls take priceless books covered with mud, saturated with water and page by page clean them—dry them—press them out—and treat them—to preserve them for humankind—will understand what I mean.

The reason for the Centre was the recognition that we lacked qualified and people skilled in the art of preserving our national treasures.

The original concept was for an organization to serve as a research and training center and as a clearinghouse for the exchange of scientific knowledge and to provide specialists to those who could not afford—to examine works of art and restore them for the benefit of all mankind.

Anyone who visits Rome—Athens—cannot help but realize that there are the treasures—not of Italy and Greece alone—but of all humankind.

Again this body in its wisdom—in May of 1970—approved our membership in the Rome Centre and authorized that we appropriate not more than \$100,000 in 1971, \$100,000 in 1972—and \$100,000 in fiscal 1973.

We are here today recommending to this body that funds be authorized so that the important work now being performed under the National Historical Preservation Act can go forward.

We are here today recommending that funds be authorized so that we may continue participation in the Rome Centre.

My colleague from North Carolina has already said what should be said to justify the passage of this bill—anything I say would be in a sense repetitious. However I would like to say a few words about the Rome Centre.

I do not believe that anyone questions the fact that we lack people with the skills and the knowledge to conserve and preserve our national treasures.

I do not believe anyone will quarrel with the objectives of the centre—

To create a clearing house of knowledge;

To exchange scientific skills;

To provide specialists when needed to preserve works of art—historical or archeological treasures.

One might ask the question—and rightly so—are we getting our money's worth? Should we contribute more or less? Should changes be made?

I asked myself these questions—\$100,000 is not considered much money by Congress as a whole—it is more money than many of us will accumulate in a life time.

Our committee deemed it advisable to send two members to the International Conference at the Rome Centre to find out what was being done and whether we should continue our participation to the tune of \$100,000 a year.

Legislative matters made it impossible for any member of the committee to go. I regret that the only justification that I can present comes from the statement of those connected with the program.

The committee has been advised that the Centre—

Collects — studies — and circulates documentation concerned with scientific and technical problems;

Gives advice and recommendations on general and specific problems connected with preservation and;

The committee was advised that in 1972 the Centre did a study of the masonry of the west wall of our Capitol and recommended methods for its preservation.

The committee was advised that the Centre's experts are to be sent to San Antonio, Tex., to develop methods for treating the deteriorating fabric of four missions all on the national register of historic places.

It has assisted in training researchers—32 from the United States received such instruction this year.

The Centre offers a variety of training courses in preservation and restoration—the principal one being a course in preservation and conservation of monuments and sites.

Is it worth \$100,000 a year? Only you can answer the question.

I do know that if we had the knowledge to preserve masonry of the kind in the west wall of the Capitol—perhaps we would not have had to authorize the \$60 million for a new west front.

If the scientists sent to San Antonio are successful in preserving the priceless fabrics which are found at the four missions—we will have preserved something that money cannot buy.

To continue our membership we are proposing \$100,000 be authorized for 1974 and 1975.

List of members—56 nations—and budget for 1973–1974—

Austria \$26,868, Belgium \$5,166, France \$29,500, Germany \$33,000, United Kingdom \$28,996, United States \$91,000, Japan \$26,570, Ceylon \$210, Korea \$478.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee which reported H.R. 7127, I am pleased to rise in strong support of it.

A great deal of information about our past, which is essential to obtain a clearer and more meaningful picture of the lives of those who lived before us, remains buried in the ground awaiting our discovery. The study of this information can bring the past alive for us all and for our children. Before us today is a bill which provides the means for preventing the needless and irreparable destruction of these records and also will protect valuable legacies of our past.

This legislation will greatly increase the ability of the individual States to continue their efforts in the preservation of historical structures and places of State and local significance. Our participation in the international effort for preservation will also be continued by this bill.

In my opinion, this legislation is necessary to assure fulfillment of national aspirations in the preservation of our heritage.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of H.R. 7127, I am pleased to rise in support of the enactment of the legislation now before the House.

As everyone knows, the basic thrust of this legislation is to encourage the States and their political subdivisions to expand their efforts to preserve places of historical significance. While past programs have concentrated on preserving those places considered to be of "national significance," the national historic preservation program created by Congress in 1966 emphasized the importance of protecting, preserving and restoring those areas and places which are significant in terms of regional, State, and local history.

This program has just begun to show tangible results. During the first authorization period, the States had not yet developed a historic preservation program, but by fiscal year 1973 nearly all of the States had programs underway and those that did not are expected to participate during fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7127 authorizes the appropriation of \$15.6 million in fiscal year 1974, \$20 million in fiscal year 1975, and \$24.4 million in fiscal year 1976. This sounds like a large sum—and it is—but the Members of the House should remember that every dollar is matched by their State and local units of government in an effort to preserve those places which are most meaningful to the people in communities all across the Nation.

The money is distributed to the States on the basis of a formula which assures each a fair share. Thirty percent is divided equally among the participating States, 45 percent is divided on the basis of need, 17.5 percent—but not more than \$1,750,000—is allocated to the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the remainder is held for contingency needs and administrative costs.

Since the program began, about \$21 million has been appropriated. Of this amount, about \$10 million has already



been distributed to the States and another \$5¼ million is available but not yet assigned to them. Slightly over \$4 million has been granted to the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is a very worthwhile program. Every dollar used is spent to help present and future generations of Americans appreciate their heritage. It is a pleasure for me to associate myself with the gentleman from North Carolina in urging the approval of H.R. 7127 by the Members of the House.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 7127, National Historic Preservation Act amendments, which would provide matching grants-in-aid to the States for programs to preserve their historic places and would provide for U.S. participation in the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property. The present provisions in the Historic Preservation Act relating to these matters will expire on June 30, 1973, unless the Congress approves this extension.

Specifically, H.R. 7127 authorizes \$15.6 million in fiscal 1974, \$20 million in fiscal 1975, and \$24.4 million in fiscal 1976 for the grants-in-aid to the States; \$100,000 in fiscal 1974, \$100,000 in fiscal 1975, and \$125,000 in fiscal 1976 to cover U.S. membership in the International Centre; the continued operation of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation through December 31, 1985; and the participation of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in the program.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the need for replacing the old with the new, tearing down the obsolete and erecting the modern in its place. But it makes my heart sad to witness the unnecessary demolition of a place with true historical significance. This legislation has broad support and will be instrumental in helping us preserve the physical aspects of our proud heritage. I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on H.R. 7127.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we fully support this legislation to extend the provisions of the Historic Preservation Act. This bill authorizes matching grants in aid to the States for historic preservation programs that will be an important part of our national Bicentennial celebration. Additional funding authorizations will be necessary, Mr. Speaker, to assure a birthday observance worthy of a great nation, but this bill is a splendid step in the right direction. In South Carolina we are extremely proud of a historic preservation program unsurpassed in the Nation. Through the dedicated and devoted efforts of Dr. Charles E. Lee, director of the State department of archives and history, and many other citizens, our program of historic preservation has become a model for the Nation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 7127, as amended.

The question was taken.

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 Sergeants at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 16, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 240]

YEAS—385

Abdnor	de la Garza	Hudnut
Abzug	Delaney	Hungate
Adams	Dellenback	Hunt
Addabbo	Dellums	Ichord
Alexander	Denholm	Jarman
Anderson, Calif.	Dennis	Johnson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.	Dent	Johnson, Colo.
Andrews, N.C.	Derwinski	Johnson, Pa.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Diggs	Jones, Ala.
Annunzio	Dingell	Jones, N.C.
Arends	Donohue	Jones, Okla.
Armstrong	Dorn	Jordan
Ashley	Downing	Karth
Aspin	Drinan	Kastenmeier
Bafalis	Dulski	Kazen
Baker	Duncan	Keating
Barrett	du Pont	Kemp
Beard	Eckhardt	Ketchum
Bell	Edwards, Ala.	King
Bennett	Edwards, Calif.	Kluczynski
Bergland	Ellberg	Koch
Bevill	Erlenborn	Kuykendall
Blaggi	Esch	Kyros
Blester	Eshleman	Landrum
Bingham	Evans, Colo.	Latta
Blatnik	Evins, Tenn.	Lehman
Boggs	Fascell	Lent
Boland	Findley	Long, La.
Bowen	Fish	Long, Md.
Brademas	Flood	Lott
Brasco	Flowers	Lujan
Bray	Flynt	McClary
Breckinridge	Foley	McCloskey
Brooks	Ford, Gerald R.	McCollister
Brinkley	Ford,	McCormack
Broomfield	William D.	McDade
Brotzman	Forsythe	McEwen
Brown, Calif.	Fraser	McFall
Brown, Mich.	Frenzel	McKay
Brown, Ohio	Frey	McKinney
Broyhill, N.C.	Froehlich	McSpadden
Broyhill, Va.	Fulton	Macdonald
Buchanan	Gaydos	Madden
Burgener	Gettys	Madigan
Burke, Calif.	Gialmo	Mahon
Burke, Fla.	Gibbons	Mailliard
Burke, Mass.	Gilman	Mallory
Burlison, Tex.	Ginn	Mann
Burlison, Mo.	Gonzalez	Maraziti
Burton	Grasso	Martin, Nebr.
Butler	Gray	Martin, N.C.
Byron	Green, Oreg.	Mathias, Calif.
Camp	Green, Pa.	Matsunaga
Carey, N.Y.	Griffiths	Mayne
Carney, Ohio	Grover	Mazzoli
Carter	Gubser	Meeds
Casey, Tex.	Gude	Melcher
Cederberg	Gunter	Metcalfe
Chamberlain	Guyer	Mezvinisky
Chappell	Haley	Michel
Clancy	Hamilton	Millford
Clark	Hammer	Mills, Ark.
Clausen,	schmidt	Minish
Don H.	Hanley	Mink
Clawson, Del	Hanrahan	Minshall, Ohio
Clay	Hansen, Idaho	Mitchell, Md.
Cleveland	Hansen, Wash.	Mitchell, N.Y.
Cochran	Harrington	Mizell
Cohen	Harsha	Moakley
Collier	Harvey	Mollohan
Collins, Ill.	Hastings	Montgomery
Conable	Hawkins	Moorhead,
Corman	Hays	Calif.
Cotter	Hechler, W. Va.	Moorhead, Pa.
Coughlin	Heckler, Mass.	Mosher
Cronin	Heinz	Murphy, Ill.
Culver	Helstoski	Murphy, N.Y.
Daniel, Dan	Henderson	Myers
Daniel, Robert	Hicks	Natcher
W., Jr.	Hillis	Nedzi
Daniels,	Hinshaw	Nelsen
Dominick V.	Hogan	Nichols
Davis, Ga.	Holt	Nix
Davis, S.C.	Holtzman	Obey
Davis, Wis.	Horton	O'Brien
	Hosmer	O'Hara
	Howard	O'Neill
	Huber	Owens

Parris	Ruth	Thomson, Wis.
Patman	Ryan	Thone
Patten	St Germain	Thornton
Pepper	Sandman	Tierman
Perkins	Sarasin	Towell, Nev.
Pettis	Sarbanes	Udall
Peyser	Saylor	Ullman
Pickle	Schneebeli	Vander Jagt
Pike	Schroeder	Vanik
Poage	Sebellius	Veysey
Podell	Selberling	Vigorito
Powell, Ohio	Shipley	Waggonner
Preyer	Shoup	Waldie
Price, Ill.	Shriver	Walsh
Price, Tex.	Shuster	Wampler
Pritchard	Sisk	Ware
Quile	Skubitz	Whalen
Quillen	Slack	White
Rallsback	Smith, Iowa	Whitehurst
Randall	Smith, N.Y.	Whitten
Rangel	Snyder	Widnall
Rees	Spence	Williams
Regula	Stanton,	Wilson, Bob
Reuss	J. William	Wilson,
Rhodes	Stanton,	Charles H.,
Riegle	James V.	Calif.
Rinaldo	Stark	Wilson,
Roberts	Steed	Charles, Tex.
Robinson, Va.	Steele	Winn
Robison, N.Y.	Steelman	Wolf
Rodino	Steiger, Wis.	Wright
Roe	Stephens	Wyatt
Rogers	Stokes	Wyman
Roncallo, Wyo.	Stratton	Yates
Roncallo, N.Y.	Stubblefield	Yatron
Rooney, Pa.	Stuckey	Young, Alaska
Rose	Studds	Young, Fla.
Rosenthal	Sullivan	Young, Ga.
Rostenkowski	Symington	Young, Ill.
Roush	Symms	Young, S.C.
Rousselot	Talcott	Young, Tex.
Roy	Taylor, Mo.	Zablocki
Roybal	Taylor, N.C.	Zion
Runnels	Teague, Calif.	Zwach
Ruppe	Teague, Tex.	

NAYS—16

Archer	Dickinson	Satterfield
Blackburn	Goodling	Scherle
Collins, Tex.	Gross	Treen
Conlan	Hutchinson	Wyllie
Crane	Mathis, Ga.	
Devine	Miller	

NOT VOTING—32

Ashbrook	Goldwater	Rarick
Badillo	Hanna	Reid
Bolling	Hébert	Rooney, N.Y.
Breaux	Holifield	Sikes
Chisholm	Jones, Tenn.	Staggers
Conyers	Landgrebe	Steiger, Ariz.
Danielson	Leggett	Thompson, N.J.
Fisher	Litton	Van Deerlin
Fountain	Morgan	Wiggins
Frelinghuysen	Moss	Wyder
Fuqua	Passman	

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Danielson.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Jones of Tennessee.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Wiggins.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Breaux with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Wyder.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Landgrebe.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Badillo.

Mr. Reid with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Litton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1201) to amend the act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915), as amended, establishing a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1201

An act to amend the act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915), as amended, establishing a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915; 16 U.S.C. 470), as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) Section 108 is amended by deleting the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "There is authorized to be appropriated not more than \$15,000,000 annually for fiscal year 1974 and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years to carry out the provisions of this title."

(b) Subsection (c) of section 206 is amended to read: "There is authorized to be appropriated not more than \$100,000 annually for fiscal year 1974 and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years for the purposes of this section."

(c) Section 201 is amended by inserting the following new subsection:

"(g) The Council shall continue in existence until December 31, 1975".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina: Strike out all after the enacting clause in S. 1201 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 7127, as passed.

The amendment 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. 7127) was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5464, SALINE WATER PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 434 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 434

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5464) to authorize appropriations for the saline water program for fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes, and all points of order against section 1 of said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI, are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now printed on page 2, line 13 through page 3, line 22 of the bill notwithstanding the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 434 provides for an open rule 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 5464, a bill to authorize appropriations for the saline water program for fiscal year 1974.

It shall be in order to consider the committee amendment printed on page 2, line 13 through page 3, line 22 of the bill notwithstanding the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives—prohibiting appropriations in a legislative bill. All points of order against section 1 of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI are also waived.

H.R. 5464 authorizes \$9,127,000 to be appropriated for the program. In addition, \$6,675,094 is authorized to be distributed from funds carried forward from fiscal year 1973 and other past years. This provides for a total authorization of \$15,802,094. This money will be spent for research and development, and for design, construction, acquisition, modification, and maintenance of saline water test beds and test facilities and conversion modules.

Mr. Speaker, the programs of the Office of Saline Water have been instrumental in advancing the technology of

saline water over the last 20 years. I urge adoption of House Resolution 434 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 5464.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Did the committee request a waiver on the points of order on this bill?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. According to the provisions as outlined in the rule, yes.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 434 provides for the consideration of H.R. 5464, to authorize appropriations for fiscal 1974 for the saline water conversion program conducted by the Office of Saline Water, an agency of the Department of Interior. This rule provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. In addition, it waives all points of order against section 1 of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI, which deals with transfer of funds. Also, it makes in order an amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs printed on page 2, line 13 through page 3, line 22 of the bill, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI.

The primary purpose of H.R. 5464 is to authorize appropriations for fiscal 1974 for the saline water conversion program conducted by the Office of Saline Water.

The bill authorizes \$9,127,000 to be distributed among five categories of program activity—research expense; development expense; design, construction, acquisition, and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds and test facilities; design, construction, acquisition, modification, and maintenance of saline water conversion modules; and administration and coordination. Additionally, \$6,675,094 is authorized to be distributed to these categories for obligation and expenditure of funds carried forward from fiscal 1973 and prior years.

H.R. 5464 also provides authority and limited authority to transfer funds among the several categories. These transfers may not be more than 10 percent except in the administration and coordination categories which are limited to 2 percent.

The bill also authorizes any additional appropriations that may be necessary to cover future statutory increases in employee salary schedules and fringe benefits.

There is a reduction in this authorization because of redirection of the program from previous emphasis on sea water distillation, and also a reduction in staff.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule so that the House may begin debate on H.R. 5464.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.



The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The vote 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 4, not voting 40, as follows:

## [Roll No. 241]

## YEAS—389

Abdnor	Culver	Hastings
Abzug	Daniel, Dan	Hawkins
Adams	Daniel, Robert	Hays
Addabbo	W., Jr.	Heckler, W. Va.
Anderson,	Daniels	Heckler, Mass.
Calif.	Dominick V.	Heinz
Anderson, Ill.	Davis, S.C.	Helstoski
Andrews, N.C.	Davis, Wis.	Henderson
Andrews,	de la Garza	Hicks
N. Dak.	Delaney	Hillis
Annunzio	Dellenback	Hinshaw
Archer	Dellums	Hogan
Arends	Denholm	Hollifield
Armstrong	Dennis	Holt
Ashley	Dent	Holtzman
Bafalis	Derwinski	Hosmer
Baker	Devine	Howard
Barrett	Dickinson	Huber
Beard	Dingell	Hudnut
Bell	Donohue	Hungate
Bennett	Dorn	Hunt
Bergland	Downing	Hutchinson
Bevill	Drinan	Ichord
Blaggi	Dulski	Jarman
Blester	Duncan	Johnson, Calif.
Bingham	du Pont	Johnson, Colo.
Blackburn	Eckhardt	Johnson, Pa.
Blatnik	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, Ala.
Boggs	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, N.C.
Boland	Ellberg	Jones, Okla.
Bolling	Erlenborn	Jones, Tenn.
Bowen	Esch	Jordan
Brademas	Eshleman	Kartr
Brasco	Evans, Colo.	Kastenmeier
Bray	Fascell	Kazen
Breckinridge	Findley	Keating
Brinkley	Fish	Kemp
Brooks	Flood	Ketchum
Broomfield	Flowers	King
Brotzman	Flynt	Kluczyński
Brown, Calif.	Foley	Koch
Brown, Mich.	Ford, Gerald R.	Kuykendall
Brown, Ohio	Ford,	Kyros
Broyhill, N.C.	William D.	Landrum
Broyhill, Va.	Forsythe	Latta
Buchanan	Fountain	Leggett
Burgener	Fraser	Lehman
Burke, Calif.	Frenzel	Lent
Burke, Fla.	Frey	Long, La.
Burke, Mass.	Freohlich	Long, Md.
Burleson, Tex.	Fulton	Lujan
Burlison, Mo.	Fuqua	McClory
Burton	Gaydos	McCloskey
Butler	Gialmo	McCollister
Byron	Gibbons	McCormack
Camp	Gilman	McDade
Carney, Ohio	Ginn	McEwen
Carter	Gonzalez	McFall
Casey, Tex.	Goodling	McKay
Cederberg	Grasso	McKinney
Chamberlain	Gray	McSpadden
Chappell	Green, Oreg.	Macdonald
Clancy	Green, Pa.	Madden
Clark	Griffiths	Madigan
Clausen,	Grover	Mahon
Don H.	Gubser	Mailliard
Clawson, Del	Gude	Mallory
Cleveland	Gunter	Mann
Cochran	Guyer	Maraziti
Cohen	Haley	Martin, Nebr.
Collier	Hamilton	Martin, N.C.
Collins, Ill.	Hammer-	Mathias, Calif.
Collins, Tex.	schmidt	Mathis, Ga.
Conable	Hanley	Matsunaga
Conlan	Hanna	Mayne
Conte	Hanrahan	Mazzoli
Conyers	Hansen, Idaho	Meeds
Corman	Hansen, Wash.	Melcher
Cotter	Harrington	Metcalfe
Coughlin	Harsha	Mezvisky
Cronin	Harvey	Michel

Milford	Rinaldo	Studds
Miller	Roberts	Sullivan
Mills, Ark.	Robinson, Va.	Symington
Minish	Robison, N.Y.	Taylor, Mo.
Mink	Rodino	Taylor, N.C.
Minshall, Ohio	Roe	Teague, Calif.
Mitchell, Md.	Rogers	Teague, Tex.
Mitchell, N.Y.	Roncallo, Wyo.	Thomson, Wis.
Mizell	Roncallo, N.Y.	Thone
Moakley	Rooney, Pa.	Thornton
Mollohan	Rose	Tiernan
Montgomery	Rosenthal	Towell, Nev.
Moorhead,	Rostenkowski	Treen
Calif.	Roush	Udall
Moorhead, Pa.	Roy	Ullman
Mosher	Roybal	Vander Jagt
Murphy, Ill.	Runnels	Vanik
Murphy, N.Y.	Ruth	Veysey
Myers	Ryan	Vigorito
Natcher	St Germain	Waggonner
Nedzi	Sarasin	Waldie
Neisen	Sarbanes	Walsh
Nichols	Satterfield	Wampler
Nix	Saylor	Ware
Obeys	Scherle	Whalen
O'Brien	Schneebeli	White
O'Neill	Schroeder	Whitehurst
Owens	Sebellus	Whitten
Parris	Seiberling	Wildnall
Patman	Shipley	Williams
Patten	Shoup	Wilson, Bob
Pepper	Shriver	Wilson,
Perkins	Shuster	Charles H.,
Pettis	Sikes	Calif.
Peyser	Skubitz	Wilson,
Pickle	Slack	Charles, Tex.
Pike	Smith, Iowa	Winn
Poage	Smith, N.Y.	Wright
Podell	Snyder	Wyatt
Powell, Ohio	Spence	Wyder
Preyer	Staggers	Wyllie
Price, Ill.	Stanton,	Wyman
Price, Tex.	J. William	Yates
Fritchard	Stanton,	Yatron
Quile	James V.	Young, Alaska
Quillen	Stark	Young, Fla.
Rallsback	Steed	Young, Ga.
Randall	Steele	Young, Ill.
Rangel	Steelman	Young, S.C.
Rees	Stephens	Young, Tex.
Reuss	Stokes	Zablocki
Rhodes	Stubblefield	Zion
Riegle	Stuckey	Zwack

## NAYS—4

Crane	Rousselot	Symms
Gross		

## NOT VOTING—40

Alexander	Gettys	Rooney, N.Y.
Ashbrook	Goldwater	Ruppe
Aspin	Hébert	Sandman
Badillo	Horton	Sisk
Breaux	Landgrebe	Steiger, Ariz.
Carey, N.Y.	Litton	Steiger, Wis.
Chisholm	Lott	Stratton
Clay	Morgan	Talcott
Danielson	Moss	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Ga.	O'Hara	Van Deerlin
Diggs	Passman	Wiggins
Evins, Tenn.	Rarick	Wolf
Fisher	Regula	
Frelinghuysen	Reid	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Reid.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Horton.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Sisk.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Davis of Georgia.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Clay.

Mr. Breaux with Mr. Lott.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Wolf with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

Mr. Badillo with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. Danielson with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Landgrebe.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call 240, dealing with historical preservation authorization (H.R. 7127), I did not hear the bells. I was engaged in a telephone conversation. Had I been on the floor, I would have voted for the bill in question.

## SALINE WATER PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION, 1974

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5464) to authorize appropriations for the saline water program for fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5464, with Mr. TIERNAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY).

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time in support of H.R. 5464, to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1974.

For years, it has been the policy of the Congress that appropriations for this research and development program be authorized annually. This policy has enabled the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to maintain a high degree of oversight and control over expenditure levels and program emphasis.

Authorizations and appropriations for this program have been running in the \$25 to \$30 million range for the last several years, and the major items of expenditure have been on the seawater distillation process. For fiscal year 1974, the administration has proposed a drastic reduction in the program and has already initiated this reduction by impounding present fiscal year funds. The budget request for fiscal year 1974 calls for only \$2,527,000 in new money. This amount, added to about \$6,675,000 of impounded carryover funds which would be released, would provide a total program level of only about \$9.2 million.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs believes that some reduction in this program is in order, but that the administration's proposed reduction is too severe. The committee agrees that the phasing out of seawater distillation research is a supportable action but termination of brackish water research, as proposed by the President's program, is neither realistic nor supportable.

The committee amendment to H.R. 5464 provides authority to appropriate funds to continue needed research and development on a number of processes for conversion of brackish water, while continuing to give emphasis to seawater conversion by the members process known as reverse osmosis.

The committee amendment increases the amount authorized to be appropriated by \$6.6 million—to a total of \$9,127,000. This sum, plus the carryover, would provide a total program of \$15.8 million. By comparison with the program authorized in the last session of Congress for fiscal year 1973, this is a reduction of about 40 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is responsible legislation. It would keep a worthwhile public program going at a reasonable level during the next fiscal year. Next year, we can look at the program again and determine whether further reduction can be justified.

The enactment of H.R. 5464, as reported, would make it possible to maintain the skeleton staff of experts that has been assembled and trained at public expense—although the staff has been reduced by one-half from the level of last year. I think it is important that we preserve this technical capability until we get a few more years of research information on the processes which show promise such as those that we are emphasizing in the fiscal year 1974 program.

Mr. JOHNSON of California, chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill, will provide more detailed information on the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the enactment of this bill.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, in rising to support the future of the Office of Saline Water, I am mindful of Coleridge's lines from the rhyme of "The Ancient Mariner":

Water, water everywhere nor any drop to drink.

This was written to describe the situation of a ship's crew becalmed in the horse latitudes, but it could well describe mankind's predicament as we approach the final quarter of the 20th century. Three-fifths of the earth's surface is covered with water and millions of acres of the land surface have water under them, but most of this water cannot be used for drinking or irrigation purposes because of its salinity.

The idea of making sea water or brackish surface water potable has long fired the imagination of farsighted men.

In 1791, Secretary of State Thomas

Jefferson sent a message to the Congress urging greater effort to develop desalting techniques. In those days, our Nation was but a strip of development between the Appalachians and the Atlantic Ocean. Interest in desalting was limited to those with a responsibility for ships and their crews—the eastern seaboard had plenty of water and it was not until the Western and Gulf States were settled that voices were raised in favor of methods to purify seawater and the billions of gallons of brackish groundwater underlying much of America's arid lands.

Like many other areas of technology, desalting was given a shot in the arm during World War II. Those of my colleagues who served in the Navy during the war may recall being issued a small, plastic vaporizer that would desalt small amounts of seawater if one were unfortunate enough to be stranded in a life-raft. Even with hours to daydream on a raft, however, I doubt if many of us could have foreseen today's vast desalting plants that produce fresh water by the millions of gallons.

These awesome facilities are an outgrowth of the direct Federal investment in desalting research that commenced shortly after the end of World War II when President Truman told Congress—

Experience in recent years has been that it may not be possible to meet the shortages of water, which are a threat in some areas, through our extensive water-resource programs. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress enact legislation authorizing the initiation of research to find the means for transferring salt water into fresh water in large volume at economical costs.

From this beginning, the Office of Saline Water developed into one of the world's leading agencies in the field of desalting research. As a Member of Congress and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House, I take special pride in OSW's record of the past two decades and in my own solid support for these programs over the years.

Mr. Chairman, there are compelling reasons for continued Federal interest and participation in desalting research. On the domestic front, continued improvement and refinement of the various techniques developed under OSW's leadership promise us an era of cheap and abundant water for drinking, irrigation, cooling, industry, and so forth. With the environmental considerations that now affect public policy, the water purification methods of recent development will be instrumental in meeting the "zero discharge" requirement of Federal law. I am especially happy to point out that OSW's new emphasis on purifying brackish ground and surface waters promises advances of immeasurable importance to my colleagues from inland arid and semi-arid regions.

Desalting research can also contribute to our position in the international community. Technological triumph is nothing new to this country. Our citizens have walked on the bottom of the sea and on the surface of the Moon. Our men of science have achieved miracles in medicine, aeronautics, physics, agriculture, and engineering; in desalinization, we

are on the threshold of equally important technological achievements. Think of it: American technology bringing fresh water to the arid lands of this Earth. This is a field in which we must have a position of international prominence.

With all of these considerations in mind, I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to support the continuation of this program. I particularly urge their support of this bill in light of the committee amendments to it, which authorize an overall program of increased research in the purification of brackish water. There are some in Congress and in the administration who favor limiting OSW's future activity to seawater membranes, freezing and other new processes, but the overwhelming majority of my colleagues on the full Interior Committee and on the Water and Power Resources Subcommittee voted to continue OSW's other areas of research after hearing from governmental, industrial, and scientific witnesses.

Few areas of public investment offer the returns that the purification of previously unusable waters offer us in a period of increasing water famine. It would be extremely shortsighted to weaken our sponsorship for this program just when it is needed most.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself this time to speak in behalf of H.R. 5464, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Saline Water Conversion program for fiscal year 1974.

This measure, as reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, authorizes appropriations of \$9,127,000, an amount approximately 65 percent less than the average amount authorized for this program over the last 5 years. The measure also establishes the manner in which funds carried forward from previous years is to be obligated and expended. The amount so carried forward is \$6,675,000. Thus the bill actually provides direction for an aggregate program of \$15,802,000.

In keeping with the procedures followed by the Congress in recent years, the authorization is in five categories. Such a breakdown assures that the moneys provided for the program will be spent more nearly in keeping with the intent of the Congress. The bill provides, however, some flexibility for administrative latitude by permitting transfers among categories of expense not to exceed 10 percent. The single exception to this rule applies to the administration category where the latitude is limited to 2 percent.

Contrasted to the bills which we have brought out in recent years, where the major items of expense were related to the construction or purchase of fairly large modules, test beds and pilot plants, this bill contains very little money for major procurement. The bill is also characterized by a shift in emphasis away from research and development on seawater distillation technology. Operation and maintenance of the VTE/



MSF plant in Orange County, Calif., is the only distillation-related activity in this program.

Seawater conversion is not being slighted, however, inasmuch as substantial amounts are provided for reverse osmosis, electrodialysis and freezing processes for converting seawater.

The principle issue which we have faced in the committee in bringing out this legislation is the role of Federal support for brackish water research. The draft legislation submitted by the administration did not provide for any continuing support in the brackish water area. The information available to the committee, based on extensive hearings from representatives of the desalting industry and water managers at all levels of government, conclusively indicates that there is still justification for work to be done by the Office of Saline Water in the brackish water field. Indeed, the interest and concern being shown for the saline content of our western rivers—and the recently adopted national goal of zero discharge of waste water—make it crucially important that we continue to refine demineralization technology.

These are the factors which support the committee amendment adding \$6.6 million to the amount requested by the administration. The point will doubtless be made that this represents an inflationary increase of more than 200 percent—or stated otherwise, this bill will be castigated as a “budget buster.”

I have already pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that our bill as amended, is only about one-third of the amount we have freely authorized in recent years. Very few Federal programs can match our action from this standpoint.

Also, I would like to assure the Members that this subject has not been superficially considered in our committee. My Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources has visited all of the Department's research stations—some of them more than once. We have visited many industrial contractors to look at the work firsthand. We took testimony from upwards of 30 research and management practitioners and we received spontaneous statements of support from about 40 others.

The committee agreed that there is little justification for further large-scale support of the distillation process which has been the beneficiary of most of our funds over the last 20 years. There have been improvements in this technology but we have reached a plateau from which there seems little chance of going further. The distillation technology is on the shelf and available for private or public water managers to employ.

Specifically, the impact of H.R. 5464, as amended by the Committee on Office of Saline Water Installations is as follows:

CHULA VISTA TEST STATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

This station will be completely dismantled and salvaged. It has been the site of large-scale seawater distillation modules and test beds. This station occupied lands leased from San Diego Gas

and Electric Co. The lease is being canceled.

ORANGE COUNTY, CALIF.

This station is funded for operation for the fiscal year. The activity carried out at this site consists of the VTE/MSF module authorized and funded for construction in prior years.

ROSWELL, N. MEX.

The vapor compression test bed will be dismantled and salvaged; thus closing out distillation work at the Roswell site. The Brackish Water Membrane Test Center will continue in operation as a site for testing pilot plants utilizing advanced membrane technology suitable for salinity control of natural water supplies and waste water treatment.

FREEPORT, TEX.

The VTE test bed will be dismantled and salvaged; thus closing out distillation research and development at this site. The Materials Test Center will continue to operate a contract operation for the fiscal year 1974.

WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, N.C.

This facility will continue to function as the site for testing of all desalting pilot plants except brackish water membrane systems which will be tested at Roswell, N. Mex.

The fact that we have not “made the deserts bloom,” through seawater distillation, does not mean that we should abandon other concepts of desalting. The committee bill recognizes this principle and very properly shifts the emphasis to other areas of inquiry.

I believe all of this supports my view that this bill warrants the support of the Members of the House and I urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. HALEY. As chairman of the full committee, I commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Over the last 5 years this project has carried appropriations of approximately \$26 million. Over a period of 10 years or more it has averaged out a little better than \$22 million. So this is a substantial reduction from what the program has been. As the gentleman stated it is a very fine program and a necessary program. I hope the House will support the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The chairman of our full committee is absolutely correct. It has carried in the last 5 years somewhere in the neighborhood of \$27 million. We are asking for a very meager amount to carry the research which should be done.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT).

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleagues that we are all now very much aware of the energy crisis. I think this is something that is paramount in the minds of most of us

at this time. We are now headed pell-mell toward what we should call a water crisis, and I think we have been heading in this direction for some time. Unless we use the foresight that should have been used several years ago in connection with energy problems, we are going to be faced with a crisis in the supply of water, not only in this country, but in the world.

The fact is, we do face a worldwide fresh, potable water shortage. The theory under which the OSW was originally conceived was that it would do the basic, heavy research which private industry could not, and could not reasonably be expected to undertake, to the point that it could be taken over by private industry.

Now, in the flash distillation process we have achieved that point. The OSW no longer will be proceeding with any heavy expenditures there.

But there are a number of other processes which need to be further explored and in considerable detail.

The budget request before the Congress in January of this year would really dismantle the Office of Saline Water. Much of the work that has been done would be lost down the drain. I believe it is extremely important that we give this modest increase to the OSW so that they can pursue and finalize the very important work they have done, to put us in a better position to solve the Nation's and the world's water shortage.

I should like to say one final word. Under the leadership of the Director of the Office of Saline Water, Pat O'Meara, the taxpayers of this country are getting some of the most effective and efficient work done by any agency I am familiar with in the Federal Government.

I believe we should vote confidence to this excellent agency and permit it to continue the work it has been doing so well in the past few years, and prepare to forestall a more serious crisis.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. CAMP).

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear to the Members of the Congress that our committee's action to add \$6.6 million to the administration's bill for the Office of Saline Water was taken after extensive hearings, after questioning many, many witnesses who wanted to be heard on the matter. These witnesses emphasized the need for continued research into desalting techniques.

H.R. 5464, as amended by our committee, reflects more accurately the needs of that tremendous part of the United States which does not have an ocean shore from which to draw water by distillation desalting.

In the great State of Oklahoma, we have two great resources—land and water. Our land base is finite; we cannot increase the number of acres given to us. But we can increase the amount of potable life-giving water available to us. The average Oklahoman is a salty character; he has built a prosperous State by the sweat of his brow. His salty char-

acter may reflect, in part, the saline character of much of the underground water supplies of western Oklahoma. Out in Oklahoma we built the Foss Dam and Reservoir, which formed a huge pool of water—but that water turned out to be too salty to drink. Using the technologies developed by the Office of Saline Water, we designed the membrane desalting plant which is currently under construction at Clinton, Okla. This plant will desalt the municipal water supply for four Oklahoma cities—Clinton, Bessie, Hobart and Cordell.

Because of the funding and the direction which the U.S. Congress provided for the Office of Saline Water, this technology was ready to render drinkable the salty water of Foss Reservoir when a growing Oklahoma needed it.

But Oklahoma is not alone, at least half of these United States have tremendous underground reserves of water which must be desalted to make them available for human needs. Some of this water is simply brackish, containing a light load of dissolved salts, but others have a terrific loading of salt—as in the brine coming out of the geothermal wells.

We have heard much about the energy crisis, but we must not lose sight of the much more real and much more frightening specter of a water crisis—a growing shortage of this absolutely vital necessity. As our population continues to grow, our water requirements will grow also. We must find the technologies—before the emergency is upon us—to render salt brines drinkable, to purify the brackish waters that underline the Great Plains.

Recognizing these future needs and being acutely aware of our present imperative needs for more and better water supplies, our committee has restored the reverse osmosis high recovery test bed at Roswell, N. Mex., which was eliminated in the administration's budget request. We want it to continue the valuable work which led directly to the Foss Reservoir plant; we want it to continue learning how to get all the salt out of a water supply, with a minimum expenditure of energy and dollars. We have increased the research and development budget to provide for essential research into the field of geothermal desalting, which will provide both water supplies and energy. Any source of desalted water which will produce energy, instead of spending energy, ought to have our full cooperation.

We have restored a total of \$6.6 million to the spartan budget authorization proposed by the administration. We restored these funds because they are a wise and prudent investment in the future of America. I am proud to support H.R. 5464, as amended, and I urge its passage.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN).

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5464 a bill to authorize funds for continuing the work of the Office of Saline Water.

Mr. Chairman, when this program started the cost to desalt 1,000 gallons of sea water was about \$7—today the cost for desalting 1,000 gallons of sea water is around \$1 and for brackish water about 35 cents.

Our work has been productive in this area. We are at a point where the end of this program is in sight as a successful program.

We do need to fund it at the \$9 million level.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, one of the great needs of this Nation is increased supplies of potable water. The Office of Saline Water has done an outstanding job of dealing with this need and in preparing for the future in this particular field. Particularly is it true in the area of research and development, where great work has been done in significantly advancing the technology of saline and brackish water conversion.

Our subcommittee heard absolutely no testimony against continuing authorizations in this field. The only question is one of the amount of such authorizations.

Now, far too often every one of us who sits on an authorizing committee comes to the conclusion that the amounts which come forward in authorization bills are speculative amounts, amounts that we think would be nice if we could have them, but they are not backed up by hard data.

That is not the case in this particular instance. Every dollar that is called for in the committee's version of this bill is backed up by specific proposals and is backed up by a clear understanding that there are projects calling for those particular dollars.

Mr. Chairman, let there be no misunderstanding about this. We are not dealing with a speculative thing; we are not dealing with speculation. We are not dealing here with the question of whether or not these dollars can be solidly, affirmatively and valuably used for the type of research and development which badly needs to be done. It is clear that those dollars can be so used. It is a question of whether or not we should go forward with these particular projects.

Mr. Chairman, the hearing record is available as to the needs that are demonstrated. The report deals with specifics in this particular regard.

Essentially, I say this: The problem is great. The need in this area, as my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) said earlier, is growing. We have a "sleeping" here in the way of serious trouble down the road if today, while we still have time, we do not go forward with research and development in this field.

Now, if we talk in terms of percentage increase, the percentages sound as if we

have substantially increased what was called for in the basic bill. And in terms of percentages that is absolutely correct. If we deal in terms of dollars, however, we are not here dealing with a massive deficit; we are dealing here with the expenditure or the proposed expenditure of reasonable amounts, particularly when measured against the needs in this particular area.

Mr. Chairman, we are not talking just about the needs of the Northwest or of the West; we are talking about needs for our country nationwide. We should here today authorize every dollar called for in the committee's version of this bill.

The subcommittee which listened to the testimony brought before it, when it finally came to mark up, voted 17 to 1 in favor of this full amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlemen has expired.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, in the full committee when we went into a discussion of the specifics of this, there was again only one negative vote. So it was an almost unanimous action of the subcommittee and it was an almost unanimous action of the full committee. And that negative vote was from a supporter of the Office of Saline Water, our respected colleague from California (Mr. HOSMER) whose judgment is normally very sound, but in this particular instance I suggest his judgment is wrong. This is borne out by the bipartisan action of the subcommittee and the bipartisan action of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the strongest possible support today of no reductions being made in the amount called for by the subcommittee and the full committee, and call for support of the committee's amendment as it is before us.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. TOWELL).

Mr. TOWELL of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, since I took office on January 3, the subcommittees and full committees I have served on and by the votes we have taken on the floor of the House of Representatives, it seems in each instance we are merely voting through the committee system to deal with a crisis, to put out a fire that is burning today, with very little thought being given to what is happening 5 years, 10 years, 15, and 20 years from now.

I say to you—and this has been mentioned by some of my colleagues on the matter of the energy crisis—that if this House 15 or 20 years ago had been paying attention to the energy crisis and the fuel and power shortages, we would not be in the situation we are in today.

Therefore, I strongly urge you to vote in favor of the committee bill and in favor of full funding for the Office of Saline Water so that we do not find ourselves with a critical water shortage in the years ahead.



In many of the areas of the West you will find we are already moving into that stage of shortage. Yet we have water which with research can be developed and can be used economically for crops, for populations, for industry and used wisely on all of those fronts.

So I hope you will all sincerely consider this bill and realize that we have a chance to think to the future and not merely put a fire out today. We have a chance to think ahead and do something to avoid a crisis in 1983 and in 1993 by voting in favor of this bill today.

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

Mr. TOWELL of Nevada. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. I want to commend the gentleman for his timely presentation here today and join with him.

I would like to advise him that if he would like to look at the Record of 15 years ago, I was on this floor speaking of the energy crisis and speaking about our doing away with the oil quota system, but it fell on deaf ears at that time. Therefore I shall listen to the gentleman today and vote with him.

Mr. TOWELL of Nevada. Thank you. I am glad to hear there was somebody doing that here at that time.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HINSHAW).

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5464. Shakespeare once said "What is past is prologue." This thought is worth keeping in mind whenever we are called upon to consider the future of any Federal program.

The Office of Saline Water was established 20 years ago to foster the development of desalting technology to meet the water needs of a rapidly growing nation. During these two decades, the Office of Saline Water has spent nearly \$270 million. As a result, the technology for large-scale desalting is at hand, although in many areas of possible development the costs of desalted water are not yet competitive.

Today, the worldwide use of desalting in relatively small plants is impressive. As of January 1971, there were 688 distillation plants with a capacity of more than 290 million gallons per day, 54 membrane process plants with a daily capacity of nearly 14 million gallons, and crystallization process plants with total capacity of 300,000 gallons per day. This amounts to more than 300 million gallons per day of useful water that would not have existed were it not for research and development efforts of the Office of Saline Water. Additions to this worldwide system are estimated to have raised today's total capacity to about 440 million gallons per day. In Fountain Valley, Orange County, California, which is near my congressional district in Southern California, a sea water distillation module with a capacity of 3 million gallons per day nears completion.

As I have said, desalted water in many areas may not yet be able to compete

economically with regular water sources, but the OSW's past achievements in this area can give us confidence that future water costs can be sharply reduced. Twenty years ago, the rock-bottom price for desalted water was about \$7 per 1,000 gallons at today's prices. Today, the same thousand gallons can be bought for \$1 if the original water was from the sea, and 50 cents per thousand gallons from brackish water plants. When we look at the prices of other vital products, such as beef, gasoline, lettuce, electricity and clothing, we can't help but marvel that so much has been accomplished in only two decades.

There are those in Congress and in the executive branch who see these accomplishments as good reason to phase out the Office of Saline Water, but I suggest that their well-intentioned budget-cutting is misdirected. The time is certainly ripe to put a number of poorly conceived, unproductive Federal programs to death, but the Office of Saline Water is a productive program. There are still more mountains to climb in the desalting field and OSW's past is an admirable prologue to a brilliant future in which desalting technology can serve more than a water supply function.

These new functions include desalting contaminated ground or surface waters as well as certain municipal and industrial waste waters. This would be particularly attractive in areas where wastewater reuse is practicable and in situations where it is absolutely necessary to remove all pollutants from waste water before returning the water to the natural environment.

In summation, Mr. Chairman, I would restate Shakespeare's admonition that past is prologue. The Office of Saline Water has an admirable record and an equally admirable future if we act wisely today in opposing efforts to phase out this program.

I urge a yes vote on H.R. 5464.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CRONIN).

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. Avco Corp., which is located in my district, has been a leader in developing a new freezing process through technology developed by the aerospace industry. Our committee had a chance to visit Avco and see first hand what they are doing. They are perfecting a system for desalting water that reduces by one-half the water treatment cost while using one-third the energy, includes a resource recovery system, and yet is compact enough to fit in a trailer-truck. This system can—and, with funding, will—be applied to industrial waste treatment and water pollution as well as desalinization.

Avco is only \$500,000 away from providing the technology required to solve our Nation's water purification problems. The Federal Government has invested millions of dollars in the desalinization program, and yet we are now curtailing our efforts at the very moment when we need Federal assistance most to retain our

technological leadership in this field and when water pollution and waste treatment are national objectives.

Avco—and others in the field—have made significant contributions, not only to the United States, but to the international problem of water purification.

Desalinization is a world market. However, Japan is presently accelerating its desalinization program, and the Arabs have budgeted and are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars annually for plants which will be completed by 1980. This one project—for a relatively small amount of money—could help capture this large market and return to the Government of the United States a positive balance of payments in our international trade.

The Office of Saline Water is the only agency currently funding the development of such technology. The Office of Saline Water can economically solve the problems of drinking water and industrial waste treatment. This effort deserves our continued support, and I urge the support of my colleagues in passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us was introduced as a result of an executive communication requesting that \$2.52 million in new moneys be added to about \$6.75 million in carryover funds to give OSW a total fiscal year 1974 budget of \$9.2 million. In committee, amendments were added for another \$6.6 million, for a total budgetary authority of \$15.8 million. That was added by way of a committee amendment, which we will have before us shortly to vote up or to vote down.

The committee amendment represents 140 percent of the administration's request for the total OSW budgetary authority, and 264 percent of the administration's request for new money authorization. Those are pretty healthy figures.

What we are seeing before us today is bureaucracy in the throes of survival, because it is planned to cut out this program that has been going on for 21 years now, and which has served its purpose well, but it has completed that purpose, so let us give the taxpayers a break. Get the bureaucrats and the contractors who are living off of this program out of their pockets.

So what has happened? As has been indicated, 40 of these people who are contractors and suppliers for the Office of Saline Water, or for the bureaucrats of the Office of Saline Water, whose position at the Federal trough is being endangered, were corralled and brought down here to try to convince the Members that the fate of the Nation depends upon this \$6.6 million.

I was referred to as being "mistaken" several minutes ago. Let me tell the Members I have been in this technical area for a long, long time, and I can spot anybody who is coming around to try to get another handout. Believe me, one can spot those, all over the Office of Saline Water, if one has got the eyes to do so.

It is time to cut off this program. There always comes a time to cut off any program, and that is the time when its original function has been accomplished.

Today we can desalt water in this country and all over around the world on an economic basis where the price of water is high enough to justify it. There are not any technological break-throughs that have to be made. There are not any millions or any billions of dollars that have to be poured into this program. We have done that. We have put a quarter of a billion dollars in this, and we have gotten our return.

If the Members want to suck along with these bureaucrats, just go ahead and vote for this committee amendment. It is time to set them up on their feet and let this industry do the job that we have subsidized thus far.

Vote against the amendment, but do it with one's eyes wide open. Realize that if the Members vote to put this \$6.6 million in, the primary purpose in doing so is to keep that OSW bureaucracy alive. That is why they have been down here for this money. Unless we vote against the amendment, they will get it.

I urge the Members to vote "no" on this amendment when it comes up.

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Chairman, from the earliest times, when our residents conducted rain dances, to the present day when professional rainmakers seek moisture from the clouds, an adequate water supply has been one of the basic problems of the Southwest.

In my home State of New Mexico ground waters are our principal source of supply and with each passing year we are faced with the reality that someday we will not have sufficient water to meet our needs unless other sources are found.

It is ironic that under our land is a quantity of water of such vast proportions that if we ever can find an economical means to convert it to fresh water, we will have more water than we ever dreamed.

It is with this background that I want to express my support for passage of H.R. 5464 which authorizes fiscal year 1974 appropriations for the saline water program of the Department of Interior.

Nearly 75 percent of the earth's surface is covered with water of which 97 percent is ocean salt water. Two and one-half percent of the water supply is composed of the less salty brackish water and the frozen waters of the polar regions. This leaves one-half percent of the available water for the fresh water needs of the world.

Continued Federal research on economical conversion of brackish water is not only important to the people of the southwest, but could provide the answer for the future freshwater needs of the entire Nation. It is no secret that the water needs of the United States has grown rapidly. Where we now use 400 billion gallons per day, it is estimated this need will double by 1980.

Since 1952, the Federal Government has been the prime stimulus in developing the necessary technology to produce freshwater at a reasonable cost. In the last 10 years progress in desalination research has reached the point that we are said to be on the verge of a breakthrough

which would allow large-scale production of freshwater from previously unusable sources.

The Saline Water Test Facility at Roswell, N. Mex., has provided a central location for the test and evaluation of brackish water desalting and contains blending facilities to simulate the various ground waters found through the United States. The center, completed in 1970, is the largest of its kind in this Nation and has recently undergone extensive improvements in preparation for testing of a high-recovery reverse osmosis test bed plant.

One important advantage of the reverse osmosis process over other methods is the smaller amount of energy required. In view of the energy shortage this should be a prime consideration in assigning priorities for Federal expenditures for water research.

Significant advances have been made in the area of converting brackish water and, in my opinion, the investment could be a bargain for the taxpayer. The return, however, will not be realized if the Federal Government abandons the project at this critical juncture in development.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the growth, development, and improvement of the national well-being depends upon the availability of essential resources. Water, the most common and most abundant of all raw materials, is one of these essential resources. Abundant as it is, however, water must be processed and cleaned in order to be made available for consumption. Although the demand for clean drinking water is currently being met in most residential, industrial, and the agricultural regions of the Nation, future growth and development of the United States calls for the availability of water in areas where it is a scarce resource. Development of arid regions for agricultural purposes, development of sea coasts for massive habitation and the satisfaction of fresh water demands for crowded urban areas all depend upon the development of technology which can economically provide water in increasing amounts to all sectors of the Nation, regardless of climate, geography, or terrain.

The saline water program offers the Congress an opportunity to further the development of alternative and additional sources of consumable water. Since it was first funded in 1952, the Office of Saline Water has done much to advance the technological know-how concerning salt water conversion. In the past two decades, the OSW has placed an emphasis on distillation for the conversion of sea water. The efforts of this research will be climaxed later this year when the Orange County, Calif., distillation plant will begin production of water to the potential capacity of 15 million gallons a day. Furthermore, the sea water conversion technology now provides water for areas where there is no alternative. The process of sea water conversion is now commercially feasible and water can now be produced through plants which can provide essential and cheap water for needy areas.

The authorization for the Office of Saline Water will provide for continued investigation into possible methods of

sea water and brackish water conversion. This program has been weighed heavily toward the distillation of sea water but, with the application of this process toward cheap water production, has shifted toward sea water reverse osmosis technology which, according to preliminary investigations, is shown to have a promising future for commercial application. H.R. 5464 will allow for development in this area and will also allow for continued research into brackish water reverse osmosis, electrodialysis, freezing, ion exchange and piezodialysis, all of which will enhance the water conversion technology and will expand the Nation's ability to utilize its water resources.

I would like to point out that, as the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have long been interested in the development of the Nation's capacity to produce adequate supplies of essential resources. I have long been concerned with the growing resource scarcity and have often encouraged the development of an increased ability to produce enough water to meet the Nation's demand. H.R. 5464 provides the authority for the OSW to further expand the national water technology, takes into consideration the protection of the overall environment, searches for inexpensive techniques and will help to insure the continuation of the national well-being. H.R. 5464, the authorization for the saline water program, deserves to be approved by Congress.

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

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

H.R. 5464

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Saline Water Conservation Act of 1971 (85 Stat. 159), during fiscal year 1974, the sum of \$2,527,000 to remain available until expended as follows:

(1) Research and development expense, including design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds, test facilities, and modules, not more than \$927,000; and

(2) Administration and coordination, not more than \$1,600,000.

Expenditures and obligations under paragraph (1) may be increased by not more than 10 per centum and expenditures and obligations under paragraph (2) may be increased by not more than 2 per centum, if any such increase under either paragraph is accompanied by a corresponding decrease under the other paragraph. Funds authorized and appropriated prior to fiscal year 1974 for any purpose under the Saline Water Conservation Act of 1971 may be obligated and expended for any purpose specified in paragraph (1) and shall remain available until expended.

Sec. 2. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated by section 1 of this Act there are authorized to be appropriated such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law, or other nondiscretionary costs.

Sec. 3. For fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1974, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the



Saline Water Conversion Act of 1971. Funds so appropriated may remain available until expended.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 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 California?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

Page 1, beginning on line 3, strike out all of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Saline Water Conversion Act of 1971 (85 Stat. 159), during fiscal year 1974, the sum of \$9,127,000 to remain available until expended as follows:

(1) Research expense, not more than \$2,000,000;

(2) Development expense, not more than \$3,200,000;

(3) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds and test facilities, not more than \$1,350,000;

(4) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation and maintenance of saline water conversion modules, not more than \$677,000; and

(5) Administration and coordination, not more than \$1,900,000.

(b) Funds authorized and appropriated prior to fiscal year 1974 for any purpose under the Saline Water Conversion Act of 1971 may be obligated and expended as follows, notwithstanding any other provisions of law:

(1) Research expense, \$2,400,000;

(2) Development expense, \$400,000;

(3) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds and facilities, \$2,000,000; and

(4) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation and maintenance of saline water conversion modules, \$1,875,094.

(c) Expenditures and obligations under paragraphs (1), (2), (3) and (4) of subsections (a) and (b) of this section may be increased by not more than 10 per centum and expenditures and obligations under paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of this section may be increased by not more than 2 per centum, if any such increase under any paragraph is accompanied by an equal decrease in expenditures and obligations under one or more of the other paragraphs.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons for the amazing development of American economic and industrial strength has been the genius and enterprise of its citizens combined with their willingness to make public investment in technological research. The fields of agriculture, industrial production, communications, transportation, and power production owe much of their present viability to publicly provided

"seed money" in the early stages of their development. This seed money was vital.

But a second factor has also been vital to American success. That factor has been the prompt withdrawal from these areas of subsidy as soon as possible. It is neither proper nor productive to indefinitely finance and supervise burgeoning private industries.

Once the basic research and development has been taken care of, the industry is expected to sink or swim on its own merits in a free enterprise society. That has been the American success formula and we ought not to abandon it now.

The saline water industry is a salient case in point on this score right here and now as we make this kind of decision concerning it. Since the beginning of direct Federal involvement to promote desalting and saline technology and industrial development, beginning in 1952, approximately \$267 million has been spent by the Office of Saline Water, first primarily by contract research and development, and more lately by more direct operations by the Office itself.

On the whole, this agency has done an outstanding job. I have supported its programs up until today, but today, 20 years later, the desalting industry is definitely here to stay on an economically viable basis. Now the time is ripe for the fledgling to be kicked out of the nest. The demand for potable water and the commercial viability of several desalting processes are enough to attract research and development capital from the private sector in the years ahead. Throwing more Government dollars into the program is totally unwarranted. All it will do is perpetuate an Interior Department bureaucracy at a time when that bureaucracy should be pruned.

The bill we have before us was introduced as a result of an Executive communication requesting that some \$2.52 million in new moneys be added to some \$6.75 million in carry over funds. This would be ballooned by the amendment before us, and I urge defeat of it. I would increase the administration's request by \$6.6 million.

It is unconscionable for this Congress to stoke the fires of inflation by extending new money authorization requests when they are not needed, and when the only purpose is to support the continued easy existence of a large bureaucracy. If other committees treated other programs this way the resulting level of Federal spending would break the economic back of American society. How much in Federal income taxes do the Members' constituents pay? Divide that amount into the \$6.6 million and Members will find out how many American citizens total income payments are going to be wiped out by the committee amendment before us. I think it is unconscionable to do that kind of thing to those people for this illogical purpose.

If, by voting for this massive spending increase Congress abdicates its responsibility to maintain control over Federal spending, we will ultimately surrender our functional power to do so. Each time we set the stage for an Executive veto or impoundment by supporting irresponsible funding levels for pet programs, we risk weakening congressional authority

over the very programs we seek to strengthen. In this particular case we ought not to risk these consequences to subsidize a mature industry that needs no subsidy and to retain on the public payroll those who are no longer required by the Nation's interest.

Those who are competent will be retained to take care of building the Colorado River desalting project.

The fact that the other body today voted for the bloated sized bill here sought to be passed ought to be a warning to every single person in this body to watch out for a Treasury raid.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman feel that the continuation of the work of the Office of Saline Water to the extent of the money on hand and the amount requested in the communication is justified?

Mr. HOSMER. I certainly support the way the bill was recommended by the administration before this amendment was proposed.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

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

(At the request of Mr. GROSS and by unanimous consent Mr. HOSMER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman for the position he has taken today in trying to bring a measure of fiscal sanity to this program.

I want to repeat what I said earlier this afternoon on the House floor, that there is going to be a realization here some one of these days that the dollar is worth 31 cents and becoming more valueless as Congress continues to spend money which we do not have for things with which we can dispense, thus feeding the cancer of inflation.

Mr. Chairman, I also pointed out a little while ago that it is estimated Congress will have to appropriate in fiscal 1974 \$27,500,000,000 to pay the interest on the Federal debt. Ten years ago, in 1964, the interest on the Federal debt was \$10 billion. It is now nearly triple that amount.

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman is right. This is a fiscal sanity vote, and nothing else. I urge that the Members vote no.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to our colleagues from California (Mr. HOSMER), and his plea for voting against this committee amendment.

Is it not strange that he said he supports the administration's measure which has in it his pet project to take care of all of the water that was going to come from the use of geothermal steam? And, the one that has in it California's pet project to improve the Colorado River so that we could take care of our commitment to our neighbors in the Republic of Mexico to the south.

Then, he said we should vote against

the committee amendment to get rid of a bloated bureaucracy.

Members of the House, is there any more bloated bureaucracy than the Atomic Energy Commission? I want to tell the Members that I have heard the gentleman who preceded me in the well, stand here year after year and argue against cutting the AEC budget when some of us tried to make just a little bitty cut in the hundreds of millions of dollars being put into the atomic energy program. And when the Atomic Energy Commission said they had their program ready for production of electricity and all they needed was one experimental station, they came in and got it in last year's budget, they have it in this year's budget and they will have it in next year's budget for a couple hundred million dollars for his pet projects.

Now, if the gentleman's purpose were sincere and he were cutting out money in every program, there might be some credence to it.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of corrections. First, there is nothing in here to take care of the Colorado River water; nor is there anything in here that will take care of geothermal steam, despite what the gentleman says.

As far as the atomic energy authorization is concerned, I am sure the gentleman will be delighted to know that this year it is being cut 2.7 percent over last year.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is 2.7 percent.

Mr. HOSMER. I do not see that any derogation of my motives has a blasted thing to do with the merits of this argument.

Mr. SAYLOR. All I can tell the gentleman is I am willing to have this program cut 2.7 percent below last year, and we would have a lot more in it than the committee allowed this year.

The committee heard from the people in the executive branch downtown, we heard from the people in the industry, and we heard from interested Members of Congress. They were unanimous in telling us that we should increase the amount of money we put in. And we did.

I hope the committee amendment will be sustained.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a very real problem here, a problem of research and development to reclaim and utilize some of the waters that are found in the United States of America. In many areas we are very short.

We started out with a much larger program. We have completed a good deal of this program. We admit that the distillation processes have been completed. The state of the art and technology are on the shelf for industry and public and private water users to use.

In this amendment we have added \$2 million in the field of research, \$2.8 million in the field of development, \$1.1 million for test beds, nothing for modules, and \$300,000 for administration.

I want to say that this gives congressional control over the program that is going to be allowed in this bill in the categories.

We also perfected another amendment, a second amendment, to close the open ended aspects of this bill.

In the overall, the breakdown of the categories as reported—this is all funds-carryovers, new money and what we added—the figures for research is \$2 million, for development \$3.2 million, for test beds \$1,350,000, for modules \$677,000 and for administration \$1.9 million.

I also want to say to the Members of the Committee that the total program amounts to this: Research, \$4.4 million; development, \$3.6 million; test beds, \$3,350,000; modules \$2,552,094—most of that is to dismantle, salvage and clear up the sites and turn them back—and administration, \$1.9 million.

Where is this money going to be spent? It is going to be spent in San Diego, Calif. It is going to be spent in Orange County, Calif. It is going to be spent in Roswell, N. Mex.; in Freeport, Tex.; in Wrightsville Beach, N.C.; at various field stations, contractor facilities, and for headquarters staff.

I want to say that the staff is down to 78 members at the present time, 78 employees. They have sufficient expertise in those 78 people to carry this program forward and to do the job that this bill with its amendment asks for.

I want to say a word about the Office of Saline Water. I have watched all but one of the Directors of the Office of Saline Water, and I believe we have had a very good program.

Mr. Chairman, what we have today is the best performance we have had since the Office was created. This Office was created, or the legislation was offered and perfected by the late Senator Clair Engle when he was chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this about the public agency people who come in to testify, the private sector people who come in to testify, and others who were just interested scientists, physicists, and citizens. They all stated that they were in full support of the proposed legislation, with the amendments, to carry out an active program in further research and development in the three fields, reverse osmosis, electrodialysis, and freezing processes.

Now, this is what the bill restricts it to, and there is a restriction as to the sites where this is going to be carried out. It also adds a second amendment that takes care of the open ended provisions of this bill.

I think we have to give credit to the efforts that have been performed by those who have been in charge of this program and those who have participated in it. The results can speak for themselves. There are plants being built all over the United States and all over the world, but we have a lot further to go in research and development in the three fields I have mentioned, and this calls for an increase of \$6 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the overall moneys that are spent will come within the projected figure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, beginning on line 4, strike out all of Section 3.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TIERNAN, 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. 5464) to authorize appropriations for the saline water program for fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 434, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the first committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on the other committee amendment? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will report the committee amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment:

Page 1, beginning on line 3, strike out all of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Saline Water Conversion Act of 1971 (85 Stat. 159), during fiscal year 1974, the sum of \$9,127,000 to remain available until expended as follows:

(1) Research expense, not more than \$2,000,000;

(2) Development expense, not more than \$3,200,000;

(3) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds and test facilities, not more than \$1,350,000;

(4) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation and maintenance of saline water conversion modules, not more than \$677,000; and

(5) Administration and coordination, not more than \$1,900,000.

(b) Funds authorized and appropriated prior to fiscal year 1974 for any purpose under the Saline Water Conversion Act of 1971 may be obligated and expended as follows, notwithstanding any other provisions of law:

(1) Research expense, \$2,400,000;

(2) Development expense, \$400,000;

(3) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds and facilities, \$2,000,000; and

(4) Design, construction, acquisition, mod-



ification, operation and maintenance of saline water conversion modules, \$1,875,094.

(c) Expenditures and obligations under paragraphs (1), (2), (3) and (4) of subsections (a) and (b) of this section may be increased by not more than 10 per centum and expenditures and obligations under paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of this section may be increased by not more than 2 per centum, if any such increase under any paragraph is accompanied by an equal decrease in expenditures and obligations under one or more of the other paragraphs.

Mr. HOSMER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. HOSMER. 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 281, nays 125, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 242]

YEAS—281

Abzug	Cotter	Hansen, Wash.
Adams	Coughlin	Harrington
Addabbo	Cronin	Harvey
Alexander	Culver	Hawkins
Anderson, Calif.	Daniels	Hays
Anderson, Ill.	Dominick V.	Hechler, W. Va.
Andrews	Davis, Ga.	Heckler, Mass.
N. Dak.	Davis, S.C.	Helstoski
Annunzio	de la Garza	Hinshaw
Armstrong	Delaney	Holifield
Ashley	Dellenback	Holtzman
Barrett	Dellums	Horton
Bell	Denholm	Howard
Bergland	Dent	Hungate
Biaggi	Derwinski	Hunt
Blester	Dingell	Ichord
Bingham	Dorn	Jarman
Blackburn	Drinan	Johnson, Calif.
Blatnik	Dulski	Johnson, Colo.
Boggs	Duncan	Jones, Ala.
Boland	du Pont	Jones, Okla.
Bolling	Eckhardt	Jordan
Brademas	Edwards, Calif.	Karsh
Brasco	Eilberg	Kastenmeier
Breckinridge	Esch	Kazen
Brinkley	Eshleman	Ketchum
Brooks	Evans, Colo.	King
Broomfield	Evins, Tenn.	Kluczynski
Brotzman	Fascell	Koch
Brown, Calif.	Findley	Landrums
Broyhill, Va.	Flood	Leggett
Buchanan	Flynt	Lehman
Burgener	Foley	Litton
Burke, Calif.	Ford	Long, La.
Burke, Mass.	William D.	Long, Md.
Burleson, Tex.	Forsythe	Lujan
Burlison, Mo.	Fraser	McCloskey
Burton	Frenzel	McCormack
Byron	Frey	McDade
Camp	Fulton	McFall
Carey, N.Y.	Fuqua	McKay
Carney, Ohio	Gaydos	McKinney
Casey, Tex.	Gettys	McSpadden
Chappell	Gialmo	Madden
Clark	Gibbons	Mahon
Clausen	Ginn	Maillard
Don H.	Gonzalez	Maraziti
Clay	Green, Oreg.	Martin, N.C.
Collier	Green, Pa.	Mathias, Calif.
Collins, Ill.	Griffiths	Mathis, Ga.
Collins, Tex.	Grover	Matsunaga
Conable	Gude	Mazzoli
Conlan	Haley	Meeds
Conter	Hamilton	Melcher
Conyers	Hanley	Metcalfe
Corman	Hanna	Mezvisinsky
	Hansen, Idaho	Milford

Mills, Ark.	Robison, N.Y.	Studds
Minish	Rodino	Sullivan
Mink	Roe	Symington
Mitchell, Md.	Rogers	Symms
Mitchell, N.Y.	Roncallo, Wyo.	Talcott
Moakley	Rooney, Pa.	Taylor, N.C.
Mollohan	Rose	Teague, Tex.
Moorhead	Rosenthal	Thornnton
Calif.	Rostenkowski	Tiernan
Moorhead, Pa.	Roush	Towell, Nev.
Murphy, Ill.	Roy	Udall
Murphy, N.Y.	Roybal	Ullman
Natcher	Runnels	Vander Jagt
Nedzi	Ruppe	Vanik
Nix	Ryan	Veysey
Obeys	St. Germain	Vigorito
O'Hara	Sarasin	Waldie
O'Neill	Sarbanes	Walsh
Owens	Saylor	Ware
Patman	Schroeder	Whalen
Patten	Sebelius	White
Pepper	Seiberling	Widnall
Perkins	Shipley	Williams
Pettis	Shriver	Wilson, Bob
Peyser	Sikes	Wilson,
Pickle	Sisk	Charles H.,
Pike	Sack	Calif.
Poage	Smith, Iowa	Wilson,
Podell	Smith, N.Y.	Charles, Tex.
Preyer	Staggers	Winn
Price, Ill.	Stanton	Woff
Quile	James V.	Wright
Randall	Stark	Wyatt
Rangel	Steed	Wyman
Rees	Steele	Yatron
Regula	Steiger, Wis.	Young, Alaska
Reuss	Stephens	Young, Ga.
Rhodes	Stokes	Young, Ill.
Riegle	Stubblefield	Young, Tex.
Roberts	Stuckey	Zablocki

NAYS—125

Abdnor	Gubser	Myers
Archer	Gunter	Nelsen
Arends	Guy	Nichols
Bafalis	Hammer-	O'Brien
Baker	schmidt	Parris
Beard	Hanrahan	Powell, Ohio
Bennett	Harsha	Price, Tex.
Bevill	Hastings	Pritchard
Bowen	Heinz	Quillen
Bray	Henderson	Rallsback
Brown, Mich.	Hicks	Rinaldo
Brown, Ohio	Hillis	Robinson, Va.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hogan	Roncallo, N.Y.
Burke, Fla.	Holt	Rousselot
Carter	Hosmer	Ruth
Cederberg	Huber	Sandman
Chamberlain	Hudnut	Stafferfield
Clancy	Hutchinson	Scherle
Johnson, Pa.	Schneebeil	Shoup
Jones, N.C.	Shuster	Skubitz
Jones, Tenn.	Snyder	Spence
Keating	Kuykendall	Stanton
Kemp	Kyros	J. William
Daniel, Dan	Latta	Taylor, Mo.
Daniel, Robert	Lent	Teague, Calif.
W., Jr.	Lott	Thomson, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	McClary	Thone
Dennis	McCollister	Treen
Devine	McEwen	Waggonner
Dickinson	Macdonald	Wampler
Downing	Madigan	Whitehurst
Edwards, Ala.	Mallory	Whitten
Erlenborn	Mann	Wyder
Fish	Martin, Nebr.	Wylie
Flowers	Mayne	Yates
Ford, Gerald R.	Michel	Young, Fla.
Fountain	Miller	Young, S.C.
Fruehlich	Minshall, Ohio	Zion
Gilman	Mizell	Zwach
Goodling	Montgomery	
Grasso	Mosher	

NOT VOTING—27

Andrews, N.C.	Fisher	Rarick
Ashbrook	Frelinghuysen	Reld
Aspin	Goldwater	Rooney, N.Y.
Badillo	Gray	Steelman
Breaux	Hébert	Steiger, Ariz.
Chisholm	Landgrebe	Stratton
Danielson	Morgan	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	Moss	Van Deerlin
Donohue	Passman	Wiggins

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Badillo.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Danielson.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Passman.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Rarick.  
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Frelinghuysen.  
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Moss.  
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.  
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Aspin.  
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Landgrebe.  
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Andrews of North Carolina.  
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Ashbrook.  
Mr. Reid with Mr. Wiggins.  
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Goldwater.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays, 4, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

YEAS—400

Abdnor	Cleveland	Gialmo
Abzug	Cochran	Gibbons
Adams	Cohen	Gilman
Addabbo	Collier	Ginn
Alexander	Collins, Ill.	Gonzalez
Anderson, Calif.	Collins, Tex.	Goodling
Anderson, Ill.	Conable	Grasso
Andrews, N.C.	Conlan	Green, Oreg.
N. Dak.	Conte	Green, Pa.
Annunzio	Conyers	Griffiths
Archer	Corman	Grover
Armstrong	Cotter	Gubser
Ashley	Coughlin	Gude
Bafalis	Cronin	Gunter
Baker	Culver	Guy
Barrett	Daniel, Dan	Haley
Beard	Daniel, Robert	Hamilton
Bell	W., Jr.	Hammer-
Bennett	Daniels	schmidt
Bergland	Dominick V.	Hanley
Bevill	Davis, Ga.	Hanna
Biaggi	Davis, S.C.	Hanrahan
Blester	Davis, Wis.	Hansen, Idaho
Bingham	de la Garza	Hansen, Wash.
Blackburn	Delaney	Harrington
Blatnik	Dellenback	Harsha
Boggs	Dellums	Harvey
Boland	Denholm	Hastings
Bolling	Dennis	Hawkins
Brademas	Dent	Hays
Brasco	Derwinski	Hébert
Bray	Devine	Hechler, W. Va.
Breckinridge	Dickinson	Heckler, Mass.
Brinkley	Diggs	Heinz
Brooks	Dorn	Helstoski
Broomfield	Downing	Henderson
Brotzman	Drinan	Hicks
Brown, Calif.	Dulski	Hillis
Brown, Mich.	Duncan	Hinshaw
Brown, Ohio	du Pont	Hogan
Broyhill, N.C.	Eckhardt	Holifield
Broyhill, Va.	Edwards, Ala.	Holt
Buchanan	Edwards, Calif.	Holtzman
Burgener	Eilberg	Horton
Burke, Calif.	Erlenborn	Hosmer
Burke, Mass.	Esch	Howard
Burleson, Tex.	Eshleman	Huber
Burlison, Mo.	Evans, Colo.	Hudnut
Burton	Evins, Tenn.	Hungate
Byron	Fascell	Hunt
Camp	Findley	Ichord
Carey, N.Y.	Flood	Jarman
Carney, Ohio	Flowers	Johnson, Calif.
Casey, Tex.	Flynt	Johnson, Pa.
Chappell	Foley	Jones, Ala.
Clark	Ford, Gerald R.	Jones, N.C.
Clausen	Ford	Jones, Okla.
Don H.	William D.	Jones, Tenn.
Clay	Forsythe	Jordan
Collier	Fountain	Karsh
Collins, Ill.	Fraser	Kastenmeier
Collins, Tex.	Frenzel	Kazen
Conable	Frey	Keating
Conlan	Fruehlich	Kemp
Conter	Fulton	Ketchum
Conyers	Fuqua	King
Corman	Gaydos	Kluczynski
	Gettys	Koch

Kuykendall	Owens	Staggers
Kyros	Parris	Stanton,
Landrum	Patman	J. William
Latta	Patten	Stanton,
Leggett	Pepper	James V.
Lehman	Perkins	Stark
Lent	Pettis	Steed
Litton	Peyser	Steele
Long, La.	Pickie	Steelman
Long, Md.	Pike	Steiger, Wis.
Lott	Poage	Stephens
Lujan	Podell	Stokes
McClary	Powell, Ohio	Stubblefield
McCloskey	Preyer	Stuckey
McCollister	Price, Ill.	Studds
McCormack	Price, Tex.	Sullivan
McDade	Pritchard	Symington
McEwen	Quie	Symms
McFall	Quillen	Taylor, Mo.
McKay	Rallsback	Taylor, N.C.
McKinney	Randall	Teague, Calif.
McSpadden	Rangel	Teague, Tex.
Macdonald	Rees	Thomson, Wis.
Madden	Regula	Thone
Madigan	Reuss	Thornton
Mahon	Rhodes	Tiernan
Mailliard	Riegle	Towell, Nev.
Mallary	Rinaldo	Treen
Mann	Roberts	Udall
Maraziti	Robinson, Va.	Ullman
Martin, Nebr.	Robison, N.Y.	Vander Jagt
Martin, N.C.	Roe	Vanik
Mathias, Calif.	Rogers	Veysey
Mathis, Ga.	Roncallo, Wyo.	Vigorito
Matsunaga	Roncallo, N.Y.	Waggonner
Mayne	Rooney, Pa.	Walsh
Mazzoli	Rose	Wampler
Meeds	Rosenthal	Ware
Melcher	Rostenkowski	Whalen
Metcalfe	Roush	White
Mezvinsky	Rousselot	Whitehurst
Michel	Roy	Whitten
Milford	Roybal	Widnall
Miller	Runnels	Williams
Minish	Ruppe	Wilson, Bob
Mink	Ruth	Wilson,
Minshall, Ohio	Ryan	Charles H.,
Mitchell, Md.	St Germain	Calif.
Mitchell, N.Y.	Sandman	Wilson,
Mizell	Sarasin	Charles, Tex.
Moakley	Sarbanes	Winn
Mollohan	Satterfield	Wolff
Montgomery	Saylor	Wright
Moorhead,	Scherle	Wyatt
Calif.	Schneebeli	Wydler
Moorhead, Pa.	Schroeder	Wyllie
Mosher	Sebelius	Wyman
Murphy, Ill.	Seiberling	Yates
Murphy, N.Y.	Shipley	Yatron
Myers	Shoup	Young, Alaska
Natcher	Shriver	Young, Fla.
Nedzi	Shuster	Young, Ga.
Nelsen	Sikes	Young, Ill.
Nichols	Sisk	Young, S.C.
Nix	Skubitz	Young, Tex.
O'Byrne	Slack	Zablocki
O'Brien	Smith, Iowa	Zion
O'Hara	Smith, N.Y.	Zwach
O'Neill	Spence	

## NAYS—4

Crane	Hutchinson	Snyder
Gross		

## NOT VOTING—29

Arends	Frelinghuysen	Rodino
Ashbrook	Goldwater	Rooney, N.Y.
Aspin	Gray	Steiger, Ariz.
Badillo	Landgrebe	Stratton
Breaux	Mills, Ark.	Talcott
Chisholm	Morgan	Thompson, N.J.
Danielson	Moss	Van Deerlin
Dingell	Passman	Waldie
Donohue	Rarick	Wiggins
Fisher	Reid	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Arends.  
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Aspin.  
 Mr. Breaux with Mr. Landgrebe.  
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Rodino.  
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Fisher.  
 Mr. Morgan with Mr. Frelinghuysen.  
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.  
 Mr. Waldie with Mr. Wiggins.  
 Mr. Badillo with Mr. Passman.  
 Mr. White with Mr. Ashbrook.  
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. Danielson with Mr. Talcott.  
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.  
 Mr. Reid with Mr. Van Deerlin.  
 Mr. Moss with Mr. Goldwater.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of an identical Senate bill (S. 1386) to authorize appropriations for the saline water program for 1974, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

## S. 1386

An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water program for fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Saline Water Conversion Act of 1971 (85 Stat. 159), during fiscal year 1974, the sum of \$9,127,000 to remain available until expended as follows:

(1) Research expense, not more than \$2,000,000;

(2) Development expense, not more than \$3,200,000;

(3) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds and test facilities, not more than \$1,350,000;

(4) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion modules not more than \$677,000; and

(5) Administration and coordination, not more than \$1,900,000.

(b) Funds authorized and appropriated prior to fiscal year 1974 for any purpose under the Saline Water Conversion Act of 1971 may be obligated and expended as follows, notwithstanding any other provisions of law:

(1) Research expense, \$2,400,000;

(2) Development expense, \$400,000;

(3) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds and facilities, \$2,000,000; and

(4) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion modules, \$1,875,094.

(c) Expenditures and obligations under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsections (a) and (b) of this section may be increased by not more than 10 per centum and expenditures and obligations under paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of this section may be increased by not more than 2 per centum, if any such increase under any paragraph is accompanied by an equal decrease in expenditures and obligations under one or more of the other paragraphs.

SEC. 2. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated by section 1 of this Act there are authorized to be appropriated such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law or other nondiscretionary costs.

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. 5464) was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

## RECLASSIFICATION OF DEPUTY U.S. MARSHALS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 433 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

## H. RES. 433

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5094) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the reclassification of positions of deputy United States marshal, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes for the minority to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON) and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 433 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 5094, a bill providing for the reclassification of positions of deputy U.S. marshal.

The rule provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as an original bill.

H.R. 5094 reclassifies the position of deputy U.S. marshals at grades GS-5, GS-7, GS-9, and GS-11 of the general schedule. Grade 5 will be used only for trainees. Under present procedures, these positions are classified at grades GS-4 through GS-9.

The first year cost of implementing the bill is estimated to be approximately \$2,069,818. The estimated 5-year cost—



based on an estimated 5.5 percent annual increase in Federal salaries—is \$11,551,843.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of H.R. 5094 is necessary to make the pay of deputy U.S. marshals commensurate with the difficulty of their duties and responsibilities and the personal risks to which they are exposed. I urge adoption of House Resolution 433 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 5094.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering House Resolution 433, the rule on H.R. 5094, to provide for the reclassification of positions of deputy U.S. marshal. This rule is an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. It also makes the committee amendment in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The purpose of H.R. 5094 is to reclassify the positions of deputy U.S. marshal, other than supervisory or managerial positions, at grades GS-5, GS-7, GS-9, or GS-11 of the general schedule.

During the 92d Congress, an almost identical bill was vetoed by the President. No hearings were held on H.R. 5094, but hearings were held in the last Congress, on the bill that was vetoed.

This bill would raise the grade levels mentioned above. At present, they are classified at grade levels of GS-4, GS-5, GS-6, GS-7, GS-8, and GS-9.

The estimated cost of this bill, based on 1,320 employees, is \$2,069,818. The 5-year cost estimate, based on a 5.5-percent annual increase, would be \$11,551,843.

The committee report contains letters from the Civil Service Commission, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Department of Justice strongly opposing this legislation, because of the cost and the preferential treatment given to marshals.

Minority views were filed by Congressmen GROSS and DERWINSKI in opposition to this bill. They state that enactment of this bill "would legislatively establish grade levels for one particular occupation which are known to be incorrect when compared with other similar occupations; would create internal grade inequities among present members of the Marshal Service, which could lead to widespread classification appeals; would create chaotic pay disparities; and would be in direct contravention of the economic guidelines which are supposed to apply indiscriminately to all salaried Americans."

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule in order that the House may work its will on this legislation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5094) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for

the reclassification of positions of deputy U.S. marshal, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON).

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5094, with Mr. MEEDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON).

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI) the chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5094.

This is a very simple but very necessary piece of legislation. The sole purpose of this bill is to raise the salaries of non-supervisory deputy U.S. marshals.

Under existing law, deputy U.S. marshals are compensated in accordance with the General Schedule pay rates, contained in title 5 of the United States Code. Ordinarily, these marshals are hired at grade GS-6, which has a starting salary of \$8,572 per year. Grades GS-7 and GS-8 are considered to be the full working levels for non-supervisory deputy marshals.

Under the provisions of this bill, the positions of non-supervisory deputy U.S. marshal would be classified at grades GS-5, 7, 9, or 11 of the General Schedule but GS-5 would be used only for a trainee.

Thus, the effect of this legislation is to elevate the pay of non-supervisory deputy marshals from the existing range of GS-6 to GS-9, to a range of GS-7 to GS-11.

Deputy U.S. marshals perform a variety of important and often dangerous functions.

They repeatedly are required to perform emergency services because of their demonstrated ability to handle difficult and potentially explosive situations.

Consequently, their hours of duty are irregular, and the demands on their mental and physical health often are severe.

There can be no question that these deputy marshals frequently are exposed to great personal danger while carrying out their assigned duties.

Unfortunately, the pay of these deputy marshals is not commensurate with the difficulty of their duties and responsibilities and the personal risks to which they constantly are exposed.

When compared to the salaries of Washington area police forces, such as the District of Columbia police force, the pay of the deputy U.S. marshals suffers badly.

If the pay of these employees is not

increased, the Government cannot hope to compete with the municipal and county police forces for the competent personnel it needs to fill these vital positions.

Therefore, in the interests of equity, competency, and the safety of the American public, I urge the passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5094, which was ordered reported by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The sole purpose of this legislation is to raise the General Schedule grade levels of all deputy U.S. marshal positions other than supervisory or managerial positions.

Under this legislation, the positions of non-supervisory deputy U.S. marshals would be classified at grades GS-5, GS-7, GS-9, or GS-11 of the General Schedule. Under existing procedures, these positions are classified at grades GS-4 through GS-9.

Since the classification standards for deputy U.S. marshal positions were issued by the Civil Service Commission in 1967, the duties and responsibilities of deputy U.S. marshals have been substantially expanded.

The responsibilities of these deputy marshals now include participation in airline antipiracy programs, protection of witnesses who are required to testify in Federal proceedings, transportation of prisoners, and protection of prosecutors, judges and Deputy Attorneys General.

Despite the significant increase in the scope of responsibilities of deputy marshals, the Civil Service Commission has failed to take the necessary action to improve the pay status of these employees.

During the 92d Congress, a bill similar to H.R. 5094 passed the House under suspension of the rules and subsequently passed the Senate. However, that bill—H.R. 13895—was vetoed by the President.

As a result of congressional action on H.R. 13895, the Civil Service Commission has launched a full-scale study of the deputy U.S. marshal occupation.

However, while the Civil Service Commission's study could result in some improvement in the compensation of deputy marshals, our committee is not convinced that the commission is prepared to elevate these employees to the pay status they fully deserve.

H.R. 5094 will affect approximately 1,300 deputy U.S. marshals and the first-year cost of implementing this bill is estimated to be approximately \$2,070,000.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a small price to pay in order to attract and retain the mature and responsible individuals we need to carry out the duties of this vitally important occupation.

All of us can be proud of the role that deputy U.S. marshals have played in our Nation's efforts to combat crime. For this reason, H.R. 5094 deserves the support of every Member of this body.

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.R. 5094 for the same reason I opposed a similar bill

which was justifiably vetoed by the President in the 92d Congress.

First, it proposes by statute to reclassify the pay grades of U.S. deputy marshals. This authority and responsibility has always rightfully rested with the Federal agencies and the Civil Service Commission. To do otherwise establishes an unwelcome precedent and invites other groups of employees to seek similar treatment from the U.S. Congress.

It should be pointed out that the Civil Service Commission is expected to publish by June 30, 1973, a new standard for marshals which will significantly restructure the profession in the Federal service.

Therefore, in spite of Civil Service Commission's findings on the proper classification for deputy U.S. marshals, we have before us H.R. 5094 which would violate this determination.

Second, it creates internal grade inequities among present members of the marshal service, which could lead to widespread classification appeals.

And, finally, the pay increases contained in this bill average out to over 20 percent. The increases are in addition to the 5.14 percent statutory raise deputy marshals received in January 1973, and the raise they will be eligible for in 1974. Also, deputy marshals will continue to be eligible for within-grade increases and promotional increases as they are advanced to higher grades. This clearly exceeds the economic guidelines imposed by the Government.

Mr. Chairman, it is estimated H.R. 5094 will cost the American taxpayer over \$2 million in the first year, and over \$11.5 million in the next 5 years. It should be clear by now we can hardly afford such ill-conceived, untimely, and expensive legislation.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, last Wednesday evening, on nationwide radio and television, the President discussed the American economy, and the various actions he is taking and proposes to take to hold down inflation.

I would like to quote two paragraphs from the President's address. They are:

The battle against inflation is everybody's business. I have told you what the Administration will do. There is also a vital role for the Congress, as I explained to the Congressional leaders just a few moments ago;

The most important single thing the Congress can do in holding down the cost of living is to hold down the cost of Government. For my part, I shall continue to veto spending bills that we cannot afford, no matter how noblesounding their names may be. If these budget-busters become law, the money would come out of your pocket—in higher prices, higher taxes, or both.

Let us give these statements serious consideration. It was the same philosophy, plus the discriminatory nature of H.R. 13895, a similar bill which was passed in the 92d Congress, which prompted the President to veto that bill. In his statement of disapproval, the President said:

There is no justification for this highly preferential treatment, which discriminates against all other Government employees who perform work of comparable difficulty and re-

sponsibility and whose pay is now the same as that of deputy marshals.

Nothing has occurred since that veto to justify the enactment of H.R. 5094.

Mr. Chairman, the general schedule classification system is based on the principle that all Federal positions should be evaluated by the same methods against the same standards.

H.R. 5094 would legislate position classification of deputy U.S. marshals by statute, and would establish a dangerous precedent in direct conflict with the recognized principles of general schedule classification.

There is no basis for decreeing that the bulk of the 1.3 million general schedule employees must remain subject to the studies, tests and evaluations which now determine their grades, but that 1,300 deputy marshals will henceforth be exempt from the standard procedures. This action is preferential to deputy marshals, and unfair to every other Federal employee.

H.R. 5094 is preferential legislation of the worst sort, beneficial to only a small segment of the Federal work force, and will only open the floodgates for other occupations in the Federal service to demand similar treatment.

The pay increases proposed by H.R. 5094 are excessive and unwarranted and would not be based upon increases in value of services received, as is the case with promotions under the general schedule. Such an action would have a deleterious effect on the morale of other Federal employees.

The statutory principle of "equal pay for substantially equal work" would be subverted by the conversion rules which are provided in H.R. 5094, since this bill would place many employees in different grades on the basis of their current step in grade. For example, those now in step 7 of GS-6 would advance to step 10 in GS-7, but those in step 8 of GS-6 would advance to step 1 in GS-9. Thus, two employees whose work is presently identical could find themselves two full grades apart if one happened to have a few more weeks service than the other. And to show the further inequity of this procedure, the employee in step 7 advanced to GS-7 would receive \$12,373, while the employee in step 8 advanced to GS-9 would receive only \$11,614 or \$1,045 less than the employee with less tenure. This same inequity would prevail among GS-8 employees, who would be advanced to GS-9 and GS-11.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons I urge my colleagues to defeat this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN).

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 5094, which reclassifies the positions of deputy U.S. marshals, is a constructive proposal to bring a measure of justice and equality to present incumbents and future recruits of this critically occupational group.

I believe the legislation is warranted because for too long now the U.S. Civil Service Commission has refused to classify deputy U.S. marshals properly, thereby depriving them of pay rates commensurate with their responsibilities. To demonstrate this view, let us consider

the tentative standards for deputy U.S. marshals which are to be published by the Civil Service Commission by June 30, 1973:

Deputy U.S. marshals perform a wide range of law enforcement duties including serving a variety of civil writs and criminal warrants issued by Federal courts; tracing and arresting persons wanted under court warrants; seizing and disposing of property under court orders; safe-guarding and transporting prisoners; providing for the physical security of court facilities and personnel; providing for the physical security of jurors and key Government witnesses and their families; preventing civil disturbances or restoring order in riot and mob violence situations; and performing other special law enforcement duties as directed by a court order or by the Department of Justice. These positions require ability in locating and identifying wanted persons or property; knowledge of court procedure; basic knowledge of business records and practices, knowledge of Federal and State laws which deputies must enforce, as well as relevant court decisions; and ability to deal with individuals from all levels of society.

Deputy marshals are required to carry firearms and be proficient in their use; to operate motor vehicles; and to work irregular hours as necessary. Performance of these duties may involve personal risk, exposure to severe weather conditions, considerable travel, and arduous physical exertion.

And, in addition to these duties, it should be borne in mind that members of the Marshal Service may also be called upon to perform quasi-investigatory duties at the request of other Federal law enforcement agencies. On some occasions, the Marshal Service performs such police functions as mob and riot control, safeguarding of Federal officials and witnesses, and maintaining public order and safety.

One of the specialized law-enforcement activities carried out by deputy marshals is to plan and make arrests of persons wanted for serious criminal violations, such as forgery, counterfeiting, illegal entry into the United States, smuggling, kidnaping, auto theft, tax evasion, parole or probation violations; or violations of narcotics, alcohol, tobacco, gambling, or firearms laws.

Since March 1972 to the present, there have been 23 nonserious injuries, 30 serious injuries which required hospitalization, 2 cases involving total disability, and 2 fatalities. In the past 5 years, from 1968 to 1972, there have been seven fatalities in the U.S. Marshal Service. These injuries and fatalities have all been service connected. The fact that there are only approximately 1,654 deputy marshals in the service gives these statistics added significance.

As another example of the range of duties of the deputy U.S. marshal and the special assignments he is called on to perform, is the Federal antihijacking program. The deputy U.S. marshals were the first Federal law-enforcement personnel to provide protection for persons and property against hijacking. They have made many arrests in this connection and have executed their duties in this field in a highly creditable and professional manner.

Since the inception of the air piracy effort, the U.S. Marshal Service has:

First, prevented at least 29 hijacking attempts;



Second, made a total of 3,846 arrests;  
Third, made 385 arrests for possession of other concealed weapons;

Fourth, made 1,041 arrests for violation of Federal and State narcotic laws;

Fifth, seized \$18,598,836 worth of narcotics;

Sixth, seized \$1,748,943.10 in U.S. currency and recoveries; and

Seventh, collected \$17,603.28 in fines.

Mr. Chairman, I bring these facts and figures to the attention of this body to dramatize the responsibilities and inherent dangers of the deputy U.S. marshal occupation.

Clearly the pay of deputy U.S. marshals is not commensurate with the responsibilities of this law-enforcement occupation. Under the present classification system, a deputy marshal enters the service at the level of GS-4 pay, which pays \$6,882, and the top grade and step of nonsupervisory personnel is step 10 of GS-9, which pays \$15,097. This is not to imply that all deputy marshals reach the top step in GS-9, because they do not. In fact, the average grade of all supervisory and nonsupervisory officers in the U.S. Marshal Service who retired in fiscal year 1972 was GS-9, step 3, or \$12,388.

According to information received from the International Association of Chiefs of Police on June 7, 1973, a police patrolman's pay in major cities of the United States is as follows:

	Starting salary	Maximum	Number of years to reach the maximum
Chicago.....	\$10,524	\$13,680	3½
Cleveland.....	11,742	12,242	2
Detroit.....	9,000	12,750	4
Los Angeles.....	10,670	13,990	3½
New York.....	11,000	13,950	3
Phoenix.....	8,772	11,124	4½
San Francisco.....	13,440	14,040	3
Washington, D.C.....	10,000	14,400	7

Again, these figures should be compared with the starting salary of a deputy U.S. marshal, \$6,882, and the average grade of all officers in the U.S. Marshal Service who retired in 1972, which was step 3 of GS-9, at a pay rate of \$12,388. A comparison cannot be made. All of them pay their starting patrolmen more than we pay starting deputy U.S. marshals.

Mr. Chairman, the record is quite clear. Deputy U.S. marshals are required to perform duties which involve considerable personal risk, exposure to severe working conditions, physical exertion, irregular and long hours, and extended periods of time away from home. However, at the present time pay is not commensurate with these responsibilities.

It is time for the Congress to remedy this situation in some measure by passing H.R. 5094.

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

Mr. HOGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Maryland for his remarks. I associate myself with those remarks.

Mr. Chairman. I wish to express my full support for H.R. 5094, which raises

the grade levels of all U.S. deputy marshal positions other than those in the categories of supervision and management. Passage of this legislation would result in raises totaling \$2,069,818, which would be applied to the salaries of 1,320 deputy marshals. It is my firm opinion that such a reclassification scheme is deserved and long overdue.

Our Federal deputy marshals are asked to perform difficult, risk-laden duties year in and year out, yet the salaries authorized for these men have not remained competitive. We cannot expect to retain quality officers if we refuse to offer them compensation commensurate with their awesome responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues well know, this is not the first time we have fought this battle. Legislation similar to this bill was passed in the course of the 92d Congress and then vetoed by the President. He claimed at that time that approval of these grade reclassifications would discriminate against other Federal employees.

I can only state that I felt then that the deputy marshal's difficult and dangerous responsibilities entitled him to greater compensation, and that my opinion on this point has not wavered in the least. I would hope, also, that congressional passage of this measure a second time will meet with favorable Presidential action.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend Congressman UDALL and the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for the excellent work they did on this bill. I was gratified to see H.R. 5094 receive not only an 18-to-1 vote for passage in committee, but the endorsement of the American Federation of Government Employees. I sincerely hope this body will grant similar approval today to the timely reclassification of U.S. deputy marshals.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS).

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5094. This bill is similar, but not identical, to H.R. 13895, which was passed by both Houses in the 92d Congress, but was vetoed by the President on October 27, 1972.

H.R. 5094, as amended, was approved by the Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service by a voice vote on May 10, 1973, and approved by the full Post Office and Civil Service Committee by a vote of 18 ayes to 1 nay on May 17, 1973.

This bill would put deputy U.S. marshals on a comparable basis with other Federal law enforcement officers, but yet not quite as high as some municipal officers.

In recent years the deputy marshals have seen not only their workload increased but the level and incidence of danger have also increased. Their hours of duty are irregular, and the demands on their mental and physical health are often severe. They are frequently exposed to great personal danger while carrying out their assigned duties.

They are often called upon to work long hours away from home, and, as crime and violence have increased, their

job has become increasingly more dangerous.

The Civil Service Commission and the Justice Department have the tools to establish the proper classification for deputy U.S. marshals, but they have failed to use them. As a result, the morale of the U.S. deputy marshal service is falling to a new low level.

We should recognize the deputy marshal for what he is: a major factor in our efforts to fight crime; and the least we can do is to provide proper compensation for his activities.

H.R. 5094 will provide for this long-overdue compensation and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5094, a bill to reclassify U.S. deputy marshals at grades GS-5, GS-7, GS-9 and GS-11 of the general schedule.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the legislation is justified and is a proper action for the Congress to take. The reasons for this position are as follows:

During the June 27, 1972, hearing on H.R. 13895, a bill similar to H.R. 5094, a question was asked of Mr. Donald Hill, Associate Director of the U.S. Marshal Service, as to how he would compare the job of a deputy marshal with, say, the Metropolitan Police with respect to the personal danger that is connected with the job. Mr. Hill replied:

I think it would compare equally. The danger to a deputy marshal comes from several of his duties—the witness program, the protective program, the air piracy program, and of course deputy marshals are handling groups of prisoners every day into the courts and normally there is no restraining equipment used in the courts.

There is always the danger of an ambush. I think that everybody is aware of the recent—

Another question was asked if Mr. Hill considered the job of deputy marshal a hazardous occupation. Mr. Hill replied:

I most certainly would. Prisoners are restrained while being transferred, but there is always a potential danger there. There is hardly any aspect of the job that doesn't present danger—even on a routine service of a civil process there have been deputy marshals shot and assaulted.

Mr. Hill testified further that in 1971, approximately five deputies lost their lives in the line of duty.

Bearing this testimony in mind, let us compare the starting salaries of police officers in major jurisdictions of the United States and the starting salary of a U.S. deputy marshal. A U.S. deputy marshal starting pay is pegged at a GS-4 pay rate, with a corresponding salary of \$6,882, while the starting salaries of police officers in major jurisdictions of the United States are as follows:

Boston, Mass.....	\$8,283
Buffalo, N.Y.....	8,510
Chicago, Ill.....	10,524
Cleveland, Ohio.....	11,742
Detroit, Mich.....	9,000
Los Angeles, Calif.....	10,670
New York City.....	11,000
Washington, D.C.....	10,000
San Francisco, Calif.....	13,440
Montgomery, County, Md.....	9,000

Obviously, the starting salaries of police officers in other jurisdictions of the United States are considerably higher than the starting salary of a U.S. deputy marshal. In the city of Washington, D.C., the difference in pay is \$3,118.

The main point I wish to make is that deputy U.S. marshals duties, in the words of Mr. Donald Hill, Associate Director of the U.S. Marshal Service in June of 1972, are comparable with respect to the personal danger that is connected with the job of the Metropolitan Police, but their pay rates are not.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to recognize the degree of hazard and personal danger deputy U.S. marshals face on their jobs with proper pay rates. This is what H.R. 5094 does, and I highly endorse it.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS).

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California, and also with those of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON).

On this bill, I know that it has been revised downward from the bill which was vetoed by the President. I would like to ask the gentleman from California, considering the fact that the former bill was vetoed, what assurance do we have in the redrafting of this bill that it will now be acceptable.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I am really not in charge of details at the White House, so I really cannot answer that.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman had a direct line to the White House.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am afraid not.

I would like to say that I believe this is a reasonable adjustment. My feeling is, and the reason I have supported the bill, is that I feel it is an adequate and positive request for men who have hazardous duty, and we call upon them to perform all kinds of chores in very difficult situations.

I think that we should not always stand and look for which way the wind is going to blow at the White House, but do what we think is correct as it relates to the public servants we are talking about who serve our country, and do a creditable job in carrying out that responsibility.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I agree with the gentleman.

Let me ask the gentleman a further question. Have there not been additional duties required of the marshals and deputy marshals, such as skyjacking surveillance and monitoring duty, which is very hazardous, and by reason of these additional duties the bill should be acceptable in the revised form?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. The gentleman is exactly correct. The testimony both last year and this year proves that these requests, which are relatively minor, are clearly justified. I believe the gentleman makes an excellent point that the duties of U.S. marshals through the years have been increased.

I am sure the gentleman knows I am not known as a big spender in the Congress, and I have certainly tried to use fairness and justice as it relates to employees of the Federal Government. I feel that these personnel have made their case and made it properly to the committee on which I serve, and therefore I do support the bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee (Mr. WHITE).

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) and the committee members in favor of passage of H.R. 5094.

There has been much testimony attesting to the fact that the duties of our deputy U.S. marshals have expanded and become increasingly hazardous. The Civil Service Commission agrees that deputy U.S. marshal classification and pay treatment should be elevated to reflect the range of duties and responsibilities that exist in the marshal service at this time. I would like to stress that these positions have not been adjusted by the Commission in 6 years.

In this bill, we are speaking of promotions from grade 4 to grade 5 and from grade 9 to grade 11. These are not super-grade promotions and they are not inconsistent with the President's actions last night to exempt wages from the freeze.

This bill, which I was pleased to cosponsor, is not an act to subvert the classification principles upon which the Federal merit system is based—rather, it is a measure to insure the equity of our Federal merit system—to adjust the classification of an occupation to be consistent and timely with its undisputed, increased hazardous responsibilities and risks.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5094, a bill to raise the general schedule grade levels of all non-supervisory deputy U.S. marshals.

This bill would bring a measure of justice to approximately 1,300 Federal employees who perform faithful, efficient service to our country under the most trying of circumstances.

The duties required of deputy U.S. marshals include protection of political figures, heads of departments and agencies, witnesses and judges, transportation of prisoners, service of civil and criminal processes, making of arrests, and maintenance of order in Federal courtrooms.

Deputy marshals are repeatedly called upon to perform emergency services, with frequent exposure to physical harm.

As is the case with most of our law enforcement officials, the deputy marshals have seen not only their duties and responsibilities increased in the past few years but also the incidence of danger in carrying out those responsibilities.

Despite this increase in level of responsibility and exposure to danger, the Civil Service Commission has taken no action to raise the pay level of these employees to the status they deserve.

There can be no doubt that we, in the

Congress, are the only hope of these dedicated individuals.

We must take action now. Otherwise we run the risk of causing irreparable damage to the quality and efficiency of this vitally important corps of law enforcement officers.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of H.R. 5094, I rise in support of this bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the reclassification of positions of deputy U.S. marshal. On October 14, 1972, both the House and the Senate passed similar legislation but the bill was subsequently vetoed by President Nixon on the grounds that it discriminated "against all other Government employees who perform work of comparable difficulty and responsibility and whose pay is now the same as that of deputy marshals."

Those of us who are familiar with the work of the U.S. Marshal Service were astounded by the President's veto message. Deputy U.S. marshals perform a wide variety of duties and, in recent years, these duties have become more and more hazardous. Since 1970, for example, the marshals have become involved with airline antipiracy programs and their work has been effective in the prevention of at least 29 hijacking attempts and the seizure of almost \$18 million worth of narcotics. Since 1971, they have also been assigned the duty to guard witnesses required to testify in Federal proceedings in addition to their responsibility in protecting prosecutors, judges, and deputy attorneys general.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee in considering this legislation, determined that the pay of deputy marshals is definitely not commensurate with the difficulty of their duties and responsibilities.

The purpose of this legislation is simple, but it will affect about 1,320 non-supervisory deputy marshals presently classified in grades 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the general schedule. The bill will upgrade them to provide them with salaries equivalent to those now being paid to members of city and county police forces across the country.

This legislation is vital if the U.S. Marshal Service is to continue to recruit and keep top personnel and I urge my colleagues to pass this bill once again.

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, this side has no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it is the policy of the Congress that personnel discharging law enforcement responsibilities be adequately paid, in amounts commensurate with the degree of danger and stress incident to these responsibilities; and that, to this end, deputy United States marshals shall be paid at rates not less than the rates at which other law enforcement personnel are paid.*

*(b) Section 5109 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:*



"(c) Each position of deputy United States marshal (other than a supervisory or managerial position) shall be classified, in accordance with regulations issued by the Civil Service Commission, at GS-5, GS-7, GS-9, or GS-11, except that GS-5 shall be used only for a trainee."

Sec. 2. (a) Effective on the effective date of this section, a deputy United States marshal on the rolls on such date to whom the amendment made by the first section of this Act applies, shall be converted, as follows:

(1) a deputy United States marshal in GS-4 immediately before the effective date of this section shall be advanced to that step of GS-5 which corresponds numerically to that step of GS-4 which he had attained immediately before such effective date;

(2) a deputy United States marshal in GS-5 immediately before the effective date of this section shall be advanced to that step of GS-7 which corresponds numerically to that step of GS-5 which he had attained immediately before such effective date;

(3) a deputy United States marshal in step 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7, respectively, of GS-6 immediately before the effective date of this section shall be advanced to step 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10, respectively, of GS-7;

(4) a deputy United States marshal in step 8, 9, or 10, respectively, of GS-6 immediately before the effective date of this section shall be advanced to step 1, 2, or 3, respectively, of GS-9;

(5) a deputy United States marshal in GS-7 immediately before the effective date of this section shall be advanced to that step of GS-9 which corresponds numerically to that step of GS-7 which he had attained immediately before such effective date;

(6) a deputy United States marshal in step 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7, respectively, of GS-8 immediately before the effective date of this section shall be advanced to step 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10, respectively, of GS-9;

(7) a deputy United States marshal in step 8, 9, or 10, respectively, of GS-8 immediately before the effective date of this section shall be advanced to step 1, 2, or 3, respectively, of GS-11; and

(8) a deputy United States marshal in GS-9 immediately before the effective date of this section shall be advanced to that step of GS-11 which corresponds numerically to that step of GS-9 which he had attained immediately before such effective date.

(b) An increase in pay by reason of an initial adjustment of pay under subsection (a) of this section shall not be deemed an equivalent increase in pay within the meaning of section 5335 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of step-increases. Service by an employee performed immediately before the effective date of the conversion of the employee under subsection (a) of this section shall be counted toward not to exceed one step-increase under the time-in-step provisions of section 5335 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) No rate of basic pay in effect immediately before the effective date of this section shall be reduced by reason of the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 3. The preceding provisions of this Act shall become effective at the beginning of the first applicable pay period which commences on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. HENDERSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute 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 North Carolina.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments to be proposed, the ques-

tion is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MEEDS, 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. 5094) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the reclassification of positions of deputy U.S. marshal, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 433, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. 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 319, nays 84, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

YEAS—319

Abdnor	Burleson, Tex.	Dulski
Abzug	Burton	Duncan
Adams	Butler	Eckhardt
Addabbo	Byron	Edwards, Ala.
Alexander	Carey, N.Y.	Edwards, Calif.
Anderson	Carney, Ohio	Ellberg
Calif.	Carter	Esch
Anderson, Ill.	Casey, Tex.	Eshleman
Andrews, N.C.	Chappell	Evins, Tenn.
Andrews,	Clancy	Fascell
N. Dak.	Clark	Flood
Annunzio	Clausen,	Flowers
Armstrong	Don H.	Flynt
Ashley	Clay	Foley
Bafalis	Cleveland	Ford,
Baker	Cochran	William D.
Barrett	Collins, Ill.	Forsythe
Beard	Collins, Tex.	Fountain
Bell	Conlan	Fraser
Bennett	Conte	Frey
Bergland	Conyers	Fulton
Bevill	Corman	Fuqua
Biaggi	Coughlin	Gaydos
Bingham	Cronin	Gettys
Boggs	Culver	Gialmo
Boland	Daniel, Dan	Gibbons
Bolling	Daniel, Robert	Ginn
Bowen	W., Jr.	Gonzalez
Brademas	Daniels	Grasso
Brasco	Dominick V.	Green, Oreg.
Breckinridge	Davis, Ga.	Green, Pa.
Brinkley	Davis, S.C.	Griffiths
Brooks	de la Garza	Gude
Brotzman	Delaney	Gunter
Brown, Calif.	Dellums	Guyer
Brown, Mich.	Denholm	Haley
Broyhill, N.C.	Dent	Hamilton
Broyhill, Va.	Dickinson	Hanley
Buchanan	Diggs	Hansen, Wash.
Burke, Calif.	Dingell	Harrington
Burke, Fla.	Downing	Harsha
Burke, Mass.	Drinan	Harvey

Hastings	Mills, Ark.	Shriver
Hawkins	Minish	Sikes
Hays	Mink	Sack
Hébert	Minshall, Ohio	Smith, Iowa
Hechler, W. Va.	Mitchell, Md.	Smith, N.Y.
Heckler, Mass.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Spence
Helstoski	Mizell	Staggers
Henderson	Moakley	Stanton,
Hillis	Mollohan	J. William
Hinshaw	Montgomery	Stanton,
Hogan	Moorhead,	James V.
Holifield	Calif.	Stark
Holt	Moorhead, Pa.	Steed
Holtzman	Morgan	Steele
Horton	Murphy, Ill.	Steelman
Howard	Murphy, N.Y.	Stephens
Huber	Natcher	Stokes
Hungate	Nedzi	Stratton
Ichord	Nichols	Stubblefield
Jarman	Nix	Stucky
Johnson, Calif.	Obey	Studds
Johnson, Colo.	O'Hara	Sullivan
Johnson, Pa.	O'Neill	Symington
Jones, Ala.	Owens	Symms
Jones, N.C.	Parris	Talcott
Jones, Okla.	Patman	Taylor, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.	Patten	Teague, Tex.
Jordan	Pepper	Thone
Karth	Perkins	Thornton
Kastenmeier	Pettis	Tiernan
Kazen	Peyser	Towell, Nev.
Ketchum	Pickie	Udall
Kluczynski	Pike	Ullman
Koch	Poage	Vander Jagt
Kuykendall	Podell	Vanik
Kyros	Preyer	Veysey
Landrum	Price, Ill.	Vigorito
Latta	Quile	Waggonner
Leggett	Quillen	Waldie
Lehman	Rallsback	Walsh
Lent	Randall	Wampler
Long, La.	Rangel	Whalen
Long, Md.	Rees	White
Lott	Rhodes	Whitehurst
Lujan	Riegle	Whitten
McClary	Rinaldo	Widnall
McCloskey	Roberts	Williams
McCollister	Rodino	Wilson, Bob
McCormack	Roe	Wilson,
McDade	Rogers	Charles H.,
McEwen	Roncallo, Wyo.	Calif.
McFall	Rooney, Pa.	Wilson,
McKinney	Rosenthal	Charles, Tex.
McSpadden	Rostenkowski	Winn
Macdonald	Roush	Wolf
Madden	Roussetot	Wright
Madigan	Roy	Wyatt
Mahon	Roybal	Wyman
Malliard	Runnels	Yates
Mann	Ruth	Yatron
Maraziti	Ryan	Young, Alaska
Mathias, Calif.	St Germain	Young, Fla.
Mathis, Ga.	Sandman	Young, Ga.
Matsunaga	Sarasin	Young, Ill.
Mazzoli	Sarbanes	Young, S.C.
Meeds	Schroeder	Young, Tex.
Metcalfe	Seiberling	Zablocki
Mezvisinsky	Shipley	
Millford	Shoup	

NAYS—84

Archer	Frenzel	O'Brien
Arends	Froehlich	Powell, Ohio
Blester	Gilman	Price, Tex.
Blackburn	Goodling	Pritchard
Bray	Gross	Regula
Brown, Ohio	Grover	Robinson, Va.
Burgener	Gubser	Robison, N.Y.
Burlison, Mo.	Hammer-	Roncallo, N.Y.
Camp	schmidt	Ruppe
Cederberg	Hanrahan	Satterfield
Chamberlain	Hansen, Idaho	Saylor
Clawson, Del	Heinz	Scherle
Cohen	Hicks	Schneebell
Collier	Hosmer	Sebelius
Conable	Hudnut	Shuster
Cotter	Hunt	Skubitz
Crane	Hutchinson	Snyder
Davis, Wis.	Keating	Steiger, Wis.
Dellenback	Kemp	Taylor, Mo.
Dennis	McKay	Teague, Calif.
Derwinski	Mallory	Thomson, Wis.
Devine	Martin, Nebr.	Treen
du Pont	Martin, N.C.	Ware
Erlenborn	Mayne	Wydler
Evans, Colo.	Michel	Wylie
Findley	Miller	Zion
Fish	Mosher	Zwack
Ford, Gerald R.	Myers	
Frelinghuysen	Nelsen	

NOT VOTING—30

Ashbrook	Breaux	Donohue
Aspin	Broomfield	Dorn
Badillo	Chisholm	Fisher
Blatnik	Danielson	Goldwater

Gray	Moss	Rose
Hanna	Passman	Sisk
King	Rarick	Steiger, Ariz.
Landgrebe	Reid	Thompson, N.J.
Litton	Reuss	Van Deerlin
Melcher	Rooney, N.Y.	Wiggins

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Fisher.  
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Rarick.  
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Passman.  
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Reuss.  
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Hanna.  
Mr. Danielson of California with Mr. Wiggins.  
Mr. Reid with Mr. Badillo.  
Mr. Moss with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.  
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Broomfield.  
Mr. Gray with Mr. Landgrebe.  
Mr. Litton with Mr. King.  
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Ashbrook.  
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Goldwater.  
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Aspin.  
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Rose.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill H.R. 5094, just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcalls 238, 239, and 240 I was absent on official business. If I had been present, I would have voted "aye" on all three rollcalls.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall Nos. 239, 240, 241, 242, and 243, I was detained at a meeting at the Blair House. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye," and ask that the permanent RECORD so indicate.

#### INEQUITY OF PHASE 3½ FREEZE

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a number of constituents have brought to my attention the gross inequity caused by the current freeze as it relates to retailers and wholesalers of agricultural products. Specifically, the problem arises when a wholesaler had purchased a large amount of agricultural products at a price higher than he had been selling such products during the "freeze base period" of June 1-8, 1973.

Such wholesaler has no choice but to sell these products, such as tomatoes, potatoes, and other vegetables, because they will rot; and yet he is forced by the freeze to reduce his price to less than the amount he paid for the produce. The

President announced the price freeze on June 13, 1973, and the "freeze base period" is stipulated by Executive order as the "period June 1-8, 1973." During June 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, many retailers and wholesalers purchased produce at prices higher than they were sold during the freeze base period, and it is these vegetables which, under the freeze regulations, must now be sold at prices lower than they actually cost the seller.

It seems to me that we have come a long way in economic regulation when we tell the private businessmen that they must sell goods for prices less than which they paid for them. In my opinion this amounts to an appropriation of their property, because these businessmen must dispose of their produce during the freeze period because of the nature of the product.

My office has contacted the Cost of Living Council and asked if these businessmen would be allowed to sell this produce at their own cost, not with the intent of making a profit but merely to avoid substantial losses because of the freeze base period. To date, we have been informed that no exceptions to the freeze base period have been granted, and unless a bankruptcy was imminent a hardship exception would be unobtainable. It appears to me that the solution to this particular inequity is not difficult. These sellers should be allowed to sell these perishable goods at the level or prices that existed during the freeze base period or at their cost, whichever is higher.

Subsequent to the President's announcement on June 13, 1973, all produce purchased by the sellers should be restricted by the freeze base period. I have written to the Cost of Living Council to this effect and am advising my colleagues that there may be many wholesalers and retailers in their districts with similar problems. Action by the Cost of Living Council to remedy this situation should be supported throughout the United States to avoid the anomaly of having Uncle Sam force American firms to sell their produce at less than they paid for it. The losses that are estimated by the constituents in my district are significant. For one firm they are estimated at \$25,000 to \$35,000, and for another firm they are estimated at \$40,000.

I do not believe that this is the intended result of the current price freeze, and I urge the Cost of Living Council to adopt reasonable regulations to implement the freeze as equitably as possible.

#### THE NEED FOR A SPENDING CEILING

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

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of all the Members of the House a fine statement by our distinguished majority leader regarding the need for a spending ceiling. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I have spoken out on this issue many times.

I am sorry that action has not been taken before now on this critical subject. This is so important that we should

have already adopted a ceiling. In fact, I think we should not enact another appropriations bill until such a ceiling is adopted. It is today the 19th of June. Almost 6 months of the 93d Congress are gone, and all we have are statements and proposals. What we need, Mr. Speaker, and what the American people want, and deserve, is action. We have dilly-dallied around until the hour is late indeed. This House, like Nero, is fiddling while Rome is burning. It is time for action.

#### O, LIBERTY, WHAT CRIMES ARE COMMITTED IN THY NAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SEIBERLING). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, during the past 4 years, I, as a Member of Congress have become increasingly appalled by the continuing immoral covert and overt invasions of the right of privacy of American citizens. As a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, I have a double duty for vigilance—first to the citizens who elected me to the Congress, and, equally, to my colleagues who elected me to this subcommittee.

My remarks today are a part of my efforts to discharge this responsibility by advising the Members of Congress and the public of the dangers which threaten every American's right of privacy.

There is a battle that has to be fought and we have got to win it. The administration seems to be hell-bent on efforts which could invade the privacy of every American citizen.

The most recent incursion in this direction started off innocently enough. The Department of Agriculture wanted to improve its statistics, so it sought, and was granted, an Executive order from the President to obtain some personal financial information from the income tax returns of 3 million farmers.

President Nixon's Executive Order 11697, authorizing the inspection of income tax returns of farmers by the Department of Agriculture—"as may be needed for statistical purposes only"—and a slightly modified Executive Order 11709 for similar purposes presents the frightening prospect that the administration is attempting to begin the process of making personal income information of whole classes of people available to various departments and agencies without regard to the private nature of the information, or protecting individuals from possible abuses.

These are strange orders. They are so broad that any Agriculture Department employee could be authorized to go down to the Internal Revenue Service and inspect the tax returns of any farmer in the country.

The name, address, social security number, size of farm, gross income, expenses, are in these returns.

They would allow Federal bureaucrats to examine such personal financial in-



formation with no reason other than for statistical purposes.

The opportunity for abuse of this Executive order is obvious. The USDA said this data was vital to its operations. If this is true, then why did the same administration which issued this order totally eliminate funds from its budget for a farm census in 1974?

Such blanket authority to inspect individual tax returns of any group, as these Executive orders provide, clearly constitutes an invasion of the right of privacy of that group.

There is only one reason why a citizen submits a tax return to the Government and that is to compute taxes—it has no other purpose.

For the first time in American history, an entire class of our people could—as a result of these orders—have their privacy invaded.

I am alarmed by the technical capability of, and the increasing tendency of, the Government to engage in invasions of the right of privacy of our people. Aided by computer technology, with its enormous storage and rapid retrieval capabilities, Government has at its fingertips the power to compile a "profile" or dossier on any individual from bits and pieces of data gleaned from many sources.

With only a social security number, the most personal information can be compromised, can be manipulated, and misused for political or other purposes.

The tasks with which we as Members of Congress must deal are legion. But it is incumbent on us to make the continuing oversight of Government activities which may result in an invasion of the right of privacy a top priority.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD).

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the gentleman from Arkansas. There is in this House of Representatives no more zealous fighter for the rights of the people to their privacy than is the case of the gentleman from Arkansas, a member of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Committee.

It is he who brought to the attention of this committee this flagrant violation of the rights of privacy; this violation of the sacred trust the people have and the belief that they are filing their income tax returns only for the purpose of paying their taxes.

If the people believe they are going to be used for other purposes, I think the self-enforcing tax law we have will be jeopardized along with the rights of liberty and privacy of the individual.

I would like to pose a question to the gentleman from Arkansas, who also serves as a member of the Committee on Agriculture. Is it not the case that, under the Executive order, information which would be more information than would be needed for legitimate statistical purposes is being requested of those who report farm income on their tax returns?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, that is true.

I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his observa-

tion of this blatant overextension of authority to a secretary of a department in this Government to constitute wholesale invasion of the right of privacy of a class of people.

The classic atmosphere of personal privacy is a political climate where each person decides for himself what personal information he will share with whom.

In this instance, no one asked a single farmer in the United States whether he was willing to share this personal financial information with the Department of Agriculture.

There was no consultation with any farm organization, nor was there even a public announcement from the White House, or the Agriculture Department when the order was issued. It just popped up like Pandora in the Federal Register one day.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LITTON) brought it to the attention of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture. Meanwhile, I asked the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations to investigate the invasion of privacy implications of the order. Hearings and inquiries were set in motion.

There were a number of questions in our minds. Is the first Executive order a model for the Department of Commerce to inspect tax returns of businessmen? Is it a prototype for HUD to use to examine the tax returns of homeowners receiving insured loans through FHA? Is this a plan for the Department of Labor to pry into the tax returns of wage earners? Does it mean that HEW now inspects tax returns of doctors and teachers?

Is this evidence of a master plan of the Federal Government to oversee the private affairs of every group of citizens?

We were shocked at what we eventually uncovered. A committee hearing confirmed our worst fears.

In a letter from the Department of Justice, responding to an inquiry from the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, Robert Dixon, Jr., assistant attorney general in the Office of Legal Counsel, responded to many of the questions in our minds. The query was made as a part of the effort by the subcommittee to have the implementation of the order suspended. Mr. Dixon wrote:

The original order (Ex. O. 11697) was prepared by the Department of the Treasury in language designed to serve as a prototype for future tax return inspection orders. This Department (of Justice) approved the order as to form and legality. It (the Department of Justice) was not requested to, nor did it, express any policy judgement.

This blatant disregard for the rights of private citizens haunts the spirit of the Constitution, the memory of which is not present in some parts of Washington, D.C.

The American farmer has earned a reputation of being a loyal, honest, hard-working, taxpaying, nonprotesting citizen. What shocks the conscience more than this gross injustice, is the fact that this administration would, without press conference or any announcement, pick on the humble farmer, obviously assuming that because of his

reputation for loyalty to government and obedience to the law he would quietly submit to this injustice.

The Executive orders favoring the USDA were to be the first in a series. They were designed specifically as prototypes, or models for future snooping into tax returns by other Federal agencies. Well, I for one, am not going to stand idly by while the first waves from 1984 wash over me and the fine people of Arkansas whom I represent.

The British statesman, Edmund Burke once made a comment which is appropriate for this discussion:

All that is necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world is for enough good men to do nothing.

Let us not be among the "good men" who do nothing whom Burke warned against.

My colleagues downtown they are chipping away at the rock which we call the Constitution. And, as Justice Brandeis said:

Every unjustifiable intrusion by the government upon the privacy of the individual whatever the means employed, must be deemed a violation of the Fourth Amendment.

It is frightening to think that the administration is trying to chart a sinister course for our Government that is fundamentally different from the free and open society that was envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

I shudder to think of the opportunities for bureaucratic abuse that were created by this wholly irresponsible act. Is this another white-collar criminal conspiracy to spy upon and to abuse the rights of the American taxpayers?

Is our American Government becoming the master and our Nation's citizens the servants?

Is this not a case of unjustifiable intrusion to which Justice Brandeis referred?

You bet it is. All the Agriculture Department needs to do is to advise farmers why it needs the information and then ask them to supply it voluntarily. If the farmers want to do this, they will. If they do not, they will not, and this is their right.

That is something called "informed consent." It is a simple thing, but it is the difference between a democratic form of government and a totalitarian one.

It is the difference between servants and masters. And, this is something they have apparently forgotten downtown. The people are the masters and the Government is their servant—not the other way around.

This incident with the income tax information, and other current events, clearly indicate that the executive branch is more devoted to assuming power, is more dedicated to telling the people what they have to do, like it or not, than it is to serving our citizens as most of us were taught to believe that our Government is supposed to do.

Now, I do not care how well intentioned the need for statistics and other information is. The road to tyranny is too often paved with good intentions. And, I do not think there is a Member of Congress who has not been impressed in recent months with how far allegedly good intentions can go astray.

Even the Justice Department, which gives a lot of lipservice to its devotion to the right of privacy, has lost sight of its responsibility. The Assistant Attorney General looked at this new Executive order when it was a draft and checked it as to "form and legality." The Department informed the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee that it did not—I repeat—did not express any policy judgment. Why did it not? Because it was not asked to do so. Well, no one asked me to make this speech today—call it dissent, if you will—but nevertheless, I am making it. And, the Justice Department should have done so too. I call this to the attention of the Judiciary Committee.

Let us talk a moment about the right of privacy. Or, rather the concept of privacy. Privacy is the ability to be confident of security in our homes, persons, and papers. It is not only the bedrock of freedom. Privacy is the essence of democracy. If we cannot speak to each other without Government eavesdropping, or pay our taxes without being snooped upon by hordes of bureaucrats—we soon will not be able to speak, or transact business without Government permission.

As a result of the failure of many officials to speak up and say, "This order is wrong and potentially dangerous to fundamental rights," where do we stand today?

Well, let me tell you. We have an order by the President designed as a prototype to invade the privacy of every American citizen. What other Federal agency is about to snoop into the personal tax returns of our citizens? Are businessmen next on the list? Union members, homeowners, doctors, lawyers? Who knows?

But, I will wager this: Unless this sort of outrageous activity is stopped now, we will all find out soon. Only, by then it may be too late."

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Arkansas for this very illuminating and very shattering exposé of what is only the most recently discovered in a long series of moves of this sort.

I think that he has also put his finger on the threat to the liberties and the privacy of every single citizen in this country if we do not draw the line and, in fact, roll back the line.

The famous cartoonist, Herblock, of the Washington Post, a couple of weeks ago made a speech on what he calls the "Secret Snooper State." He pointed to the two sides of this picture; he pointed, on the one hand, to officials of the executive branch in this administration and in previous administrations, but much more so recently it is to assert the right to keep from the public everything that they, the Government, want, and that they in particular are trying to do.

On the other hand, they are asserting the right to invade the individual citizen's privacy, so that what we have is a phenomenon where the Government seeks to keep more to itself and seeks to

invade more and more the individual's home and private life.

As Herblock pointed out with respect to the effort by certain officials in the executive branch who keep their own public activities concealed, never in human history did so many public officials need so much privacy, as we are beginning to discover.

This fits into other realms like the invasion of homes. We have the Collinsville incidents in Illinois where Government narcotics agents without warrant in the dead of night broke down the doors of private residences of ordinary citizens and after they had broken in and terrorized them discovered they had the wrong address.

If they had gone through the legal procedures and gone to a court and gotten a search warrant, they would not have had that kind of a dreadful situation occurring.

We are just now beginning to find out that this has been going on all over the country, in my district, and in the districts of other Members.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for taking this time to highlight this very serious threat not to a few people with whom we may disagree but to every single person in this country.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the gentleman.

When individual liberties are encroached upon in the name of allegedly good deeds of government for statistical purposes only, for the general welfare, or for reasons of national security, I am reminded of the story of Madam Roland.

During the 18th century, when the French were struggling to throw off the yoke of monarchs and assume the role of freedom, liberty, and equality, one of its earliest leaders was Madam Jean Manon Philpon Roland. In the course of events, the group of patriots to which she belonged, the Girondists, ran afoul of those of Robespierre. In the end, Madam Roland was sentenced to death in the name of the very cause for which she fought.

Just before she was guillotined, her shaved head locked tightly on the block, she strained to get her last look at the statue of Liberty which had been erected by the scaffold in the Place de la Concorde. Then she raised a profound question for every freedom-loving nation. Her question was a warning. She said:

O, Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the subject I have been discussing here today, I believe that many of our colleagues will be interested in an article titled "A Fight Over Who Can Look at Your Tax Return" which appears in the June 25, 1973, issue of U.S. News & World Report. Therefore, if there is no objection, I would like to include the new article in the RECORD at this time.

#### A FIGHT OVER WHO CAN LOOK AT YOUR TAX RETURN

A presidential order opening the income-tax returns of 3 million farmers to examination by U.S. Department of Agriculture officials has aroused concern in Congress over the privacy of 72 million other people who file returns.

For six decades, secrecy of tax returns has

been held sacrosanct. On the only two occasions on which Congress acted to weaken the wall of privacy, the vote was quickly reversed.

Then, last January 17, President Nixon and Treasury Secretary George F. Shultz issued an order allowing Agriculture Department officials to see all tax returns of farmers. The aim was to help the Department to compile lists of farmers, by type of farm and gross income, for periodic surveys used to project crop production, costs and the like.

The January 17 order, officials later made clear, was intended to be a model for others, in case additional agencies felt the need to get similar information about other groups.

#### "INVASION" OF A RIGHT?

In the ensuing months, with Congress protesting vigorously, the original order affecting farmers has been made less sweeping. But the argument goes on.

"A wholesale invasion of the right to privacy," Representative Bill Alexander (Dem.), of Arkansas, called the President's action.

Congressman Jerry Litton (Dem.), of Missouri, said the executive order "made the tax return of every American farmer literally an open book to the USDA."

L. C. Carpenter, vice president of the Mid-Continent Farmers Association, warned:

"Every American—farmer or nonfarmer—should be concerned about this threat to privacy. If the basic American right to privacy can be taken from the farmers, it can be taken from every taxpayer."

The highly personal information the people are required to enter on their returns, members of Congress explain, is entitled to privacy as a basic right under the Constitution. Beyond that, Congressmen worry about the potential for political misuse of such intimate details.

Since 1926, an executive order has been required for access to tax returns. Never in that time, until now, has the income-tax information of any large group been so exposed.

#### WHEN RETURNS ARE SHOWN

Generally, the chances that anyone except an employee of the Internal Revenue Service will see your federal return are small. There are some circumstances in which this may happen.

The Congressional Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has the power to request and inspect returns. Also, the Federal Government has arranged for an exchange of data with the tax collectors in 48 of the 50 States. And, of course, if the IRS believes there has been outright evasion of taxes, it can send a return to the Justice Department for prosecution.

Any Cabinet officer or agency chief, by formal request, can gain access to the return of an individual involved in a case before the agency, particularly if criminal violations are suspected.

In practice, these rules have meant that in ordinary situations the regulations provide that tax returns are to be used for tax enforcement only.

The possibility of a radical departure from this policy set off an investigation of the Nixon executive order by the House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee. Report and recommendations from that investigation are expected before the usual August recess of Congress.

#### ALL FOR ECONOMICS

What the testimony shows, among other things, is that the Agriculture Department has been seeking farmer tax-return data for years.

An address list of farmers, with figures on gross income or total output for each type of operation, was sought for the construction of samples for surveys.

In 1970, for example, then Secretary Clifford M. Hardin wrote the Internal Revenue Service asking for such data. He assured IRS—and his successor echoed him—that Agriculture officials did not want to—and would not need to inspect any tax



returns. They just wanted the tax-return data they had listed.

On Jan. 17, 1973—when the farm economists had decided their request was dead—President Nixon responded with an executive order, complete with regulations signed by Treasury Secretary George P. Shultz and the President.

Agriculture officials discovered their new authority went far beyond anything they had requested. They were granted access to all of the information on all income-tax returns of all individuals who reported income from farming.

#### EXPLOSION IN CONGRESS

When the action came to the attention of congressional committees concerned with tax-return privacy, the reaction was explosive.

The House Subcommittee—headed by William S. Moorhead (Dem.), of Pennsylvania—announced hearings.

A query to the Justice Department about the origin and purpose of the executive order granting blanket authority for inspection of farmers' returns brought an answer that raised congressional ire still higher.

The order, said officials at the Justice Department, "was prepared by the Department of the Treasury in language designed to serve as a prototype for future tax-return inspection orders."

#### LIMITED ACCESS

On March 27, the Nixon Administration yielded to the violent reactions from Congressmen. Mr. Nixon issued an amendment to his January order—with new regulations—limiting the Department of Agriculture's access to farmer returns.

Under the new order, Agriculture officials can still get from IRS the specific data they have been requesting all along and can inspect lines on a farmer's return giving such data. But unlimited inspection of returns would be barred.

The investigating Congressmen are unmollified by that retreat. They still demand to know what future plans motivated the original "prototype" order for wide-open access to the tax returns of 3 million farmers.

Beyond that, these investigators insist that even the sharply restricted version of the executive order is an intolerable breach of privacy.

On May 15, Representative Moorhead wrote to Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz. Despite the restrictive amendment of the inspection order, he said, it was the unanimous view of his Subcommittee that access to tax returns should remain unused until the investigating committee's recommendations were issued.

Three weeks later, Mr. Moorhead received a reply from Don Paarlberg, Director of Agricultural Economics.

Dr. Paarlberg assured Mr. Moorhead that no Department employee would be examining farmers' tax returns. But he said the Department was going ahead to arrange with Internal Revenue to get the requested data, including names, addresses, and gross farm income, on tapes direct from the Revenue Service's computers at Martinsburg, W. Va.

Mr. Moorhead's firm response dated June 7—just one day after Dr. Paarlberg's—was directed once again to Secretary Butz. Said the Congressman:

"As chairman, I urge you personally to give the Congress a categorical assurance that the Department of Agriculture will cease and desist from all efforts to obtain private financial data from farmers' income-tax returns until you receive our findings and recommendations."

At mid-June, Mr. Moorhead was still waiting for that assurance. His Subcommittee, meanwhile, went ahead with its investigations.

#### "NOT SATISFIED"

On June 13, Representative Alexander—the principal instigator of the probe—told

"U.S. News & World Report" that he is "not at all satisfied" with explanations from Agriculture officials, and he revealed that he is determined to bring about a reopening of hearings on the issues.

Said Mr. Alexander, "The Administration seems to be charting a course that is fundamentally different from a free and open society."

What action is the Subcommittee likely to take in the end?

Comments from members of the panel make it clear they will propose that federal departments and agencies be prohibited from inspecting the tax returns of whole groups of people and from getting from IRS the sort of tax-return data requested by Agriculture.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE'S POSITION

The Department of Agriculture, a committee member contends, should be given the names and addresses of farmers by Internal Revenue, "but not the tax-return data on farmer income or production."

To get that information for statistical surveys, committee members argue, Agriculture officials should write to farmers individually and ask them to supply the information voluntarily.

However, staff members concede that the committee has no powers to prevent Agriculture from using its executive order to get the controversial information directly from tax returns.

#### SECRECY OF TAX RETURNS—THE RECORD OF SIX DECADES

1910: Appropriations Act of 1910 provided that federal tax returns could be inspected only on order of the President.

1910-24: Privacy of returns was a debated issue in every new revenue act, but secrecy was maintained.

1924: Revenue Act of 1924 provided for public listing of taxpayers and their incomes and for inspection of returns by the two revenue committees of Congress and by a special committee of the Senate or House.

1926: Revenue Act of 1926 eliminated public listing of incomes and required a resolution of either house, or a joint resolution, for inspection of returns by any committee other than the two revenue committees.

1931: Income-tax returns were opened by executive order to inspection by State officials.

1934: Congress enacted the "pink slip" provision under which basic income data from individual returns would be made public at tax-collectors' offices.

1936: "Pink slip" provision was repealed before it took effect.

1936-1973: No major changes in law concerning inspection of income-tax returns have been enacted since 1936. Privacy rule may be breached only upon the issuance of a presidential order.

#### YEAR OF DECISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SEIBERLING). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President signed into law the Health Programs Extension Act of 1973.

I would like to express my appreciation to my colleagues in the House that supported its passage by an overwhelming 372 to 1. The legislation had 161 cosponsors, and the Senate accepted the House provision by a vote of 94 to 0.

I am especially grateful to my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment for their unanimous bipartisan support of the measure. The able leadership of Chairman PAUL

ROGERS and ranking minority member ANCHER NELSEN gained rapid consideration of this essential measure by the House leadership.

But we are just beginning our awesome task. We have just one more year before these programs expire once again: health services research and development, health statistics, public health training, migrant health, comprehensive health planning, Hill-Burton programs, allied health training, regional medical programs, population research and family planning development disabilities, medical libraries, and community mental health centers. We face a year of decision. A better system for organization and delivery is essential.

Indeed, we have a rare, if not unique, opportunity to study, overhaul and redirect, as necessary, the entire Federal health structure. The massive infusion of Federal tax dollars has so far failed to produce adequate health care resources, accessible to the Nation's population. More than money is clearly needed.

In full cooperation with the other interested congressional committees, with health professionals of every kind, and with the public, our Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment is seeking a new approach to the welter of Federal health programs. Across the country, we see a hopelessly expensive health care system, growing exponentially, taking a bigger chunk of every citizen's income each year. The cost of health care is growing twice as fast as the rate of inflation—about \$23 million a day. Adding to this problem is the fact that the wrong people in the wrong places are making the wrong decisions about the health care system.

First, it seems incredible that our Nation—a nation deeply rooted in technology and science aimed at human progress—does not have a national health policy. We have no definable, ordered priorities to insure the attainment of equitable health care services for everyone. We have no plan to build upon our strengths to insure the health care that the Congress has referred to as a right. Is the right of health care to be construed only as a false promise?

Clearly, the Federal Government must have the capacity to develop a policy to set national priorities to fulfill the promise of equitable health care services at a reasonable cost. Then it must insure that these priorities are met.

We must integrate and coordinate the decisionmaking process, so that sensible allocation of limited resources can be made among all the conflicting priorities. At the same time, we must decentralize the decisionmaking process, so that people close to the problems, people who know best the needs of their own communities, can make the final decisions.

The future Federal approach to health care should incorporate three fundamental elements: First, a regional approach both to planning and to implementation; second, a plan of special revenue-sharing for health, embodying the best of the President's New Federalism; and third, an equitable system of national health insurance.

National health insurance is coming in

the seventies. We can no longer tolerate a situation where a serious illness can bankrupt a family, despite its possession of a reasonable amount of private insurance. We can no longer tolerate a situation where the elderly, struggling to survive on a limited fixed income, are now paying more in average out-of-pocket costs for health care than before the inception of Medicare. We can no longer tolerate the denial of health care for any citizen, regardless of circumstance.

We must be cautious, however, as we consider the various national health insurance proposals. It will do us little good if our tax increase exceeds our saving in health expenses. This is a real danger. Medicare and Medicaid are perfect examples—hospital charges doubled within 5 years of the passage of that legislation. The administration has promised its new national health insurance plan this year. We in Congress eagerly await the proposal.

In the meantime, we must strengthen and improve the structure of the health care system, in anticipation of the increased demands. We cannot tear the existing health care structure down; we cannot afford the bulldozer approach. If we do, national health insurance will precipitate a jump in health costs like no other seen in this country. In the words of my distinguished colleague from Kansas (Dr. BILL ROY) the effect would be just like "pouring a bucket of gasoline on a fire."

Central to bringing health care costs under control is an improved system of planning and demonstration, and a rational system for implementation. We have proved beyond all doubt that we cannot plan and implement everything from Washington. Regardless of how it is accomplished, we must insure that the final decisionmakers are out where the problems are, that they are citizens of the area for which they are making decisions. Our subcommittee is examining proposals that would regionalize and decentralize health care decisionmaking nationally.

Ideally this plan would complement, rather than disrupt, our present system of health care. The free practice of medicine would continue. The plan would build on our existing successes and offer fresh approaches to our failures.

The precise form of this regional system, and how it might be brought about, are of course open issues. But the regional concept for health has worked well in other Western countries, and it has demonstrated its effectiveness with our own successful health programs. It now deserves closer study for application to our total health picture.

The New Federalism and special revenue-sharing for health would work especially well within a regional context. New Federalism means nothing more than letting communities decide for themselves how best to spend their tax dollars. So far, the administration has proposed four special revenue-sharing programs: in education, in manpower, in law enforcement, and in community development. It should be noted that all four of these programs are particularly well suited to local action. There is no question in my mind that States, regions, and local communities should decide for

themselves how to apportion available public funds in these four areas.

An administration proposal for special revenue-sharing in health is yet to come, but I hope one will come soon.

Such a proposal, either from the Congress or the administration, would show the Health Programs Extension Act in its best light. It is not a blanket blessing on all categorical Federal programs but instead a device for keeping the present funding sources in place until better funding plans or systems can be developed.

An essential feature of any health revenue-sharing legislation will be a provision that no region or State gets less money for health than it did under the categorical programs. On this point, a precedent has already been set by the better communities bill, the proposed revenue-sharing program for community development. That bill includes just such a provision, one that insures that no city suffers a cutback in net community development funds due to the enactment of the bill. Another essential feature of revenue-sharing for health will be built-in public accountability for the use of public funds and for the effectiveness of supported health programs.

At this point in our discussion, we should understand that the new federalism is not some kind of subterfuge for reducing the Federal effort toward human resources. The facts show otherwise, and rather dramatically. In 1968, 45 percent of the Federal budget was spent for defense, and 32 percent for human resources. For fiscal 1974, the President's budget provides 30 percent for defense and 47 percent for human resources, a complete reversal. We must take this reversal and build on it; we must act on the new priorities this reversal indicates.

But we have certainly reached a point where hard choices in social programs are essential. We have discovered that the Federal pot of gold has a bottom after all. If new programs are to begin, old ones must be reexamined. We must cut and paste to produce a better product. Such a task is not easy, and I submit that hard choices are just as difficult for a member of one party as for a member of another.

The action we have taken on the Health Programs Extension Act, and the overwhelming nature of that action, has clearly demonstrated the need for closer, ongoing, mutual efforts in health by the administration and Congress. In this year of decision we cannot afford to work at cross purposes. Both Congress and the administration desire, and the people demand, a restructured Federal effort in health which will give us the best possible return on our health dollar. The people will not be served by needless confusion of authority between the branches of Government.

I hope the administration, at all levels, will continue to work closely with those developing the new approaches to health care delivery. Those who must implement our plans should work side by side with the Congress in developing them.

In conclusion, a year of decision is upon us. It is a critically important year that will directly affect every Member

in this Chamber and the well-being of every one of his constituents. Let us begin now to make the best use of this opportunity.

Thank you.

#### CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO DEPLORES ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL FOR SALE OF PHANTOM JETS TO SAUDI ARABIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the administration recently announced that the United States is ready to sell somewhere between 24 and 30 Phantom F-4 jets to Saudi Arabia. The F-4 Phantom jets are offensive weapons of great destructive potential, and the sale of these jets to Saudi Arabia could easily destroy the balance of power in the Middle East and create a situation in which hostilities could break out any time.

The United States has always been committed to maintaining a balance of power in the Middle East, but the sale of these jets to Saudi Arabia would clearly give the Arab States a military advantage over the tiny State of Israel. For the United States to take steps at the present time that would increase tensions and endanger the precarious stability of the Middle East is appalling.

Saudi Arabia does not seem to be in any serious danger of being attacked by her neighbors. To what possible use, then, could she put the offensive F-4 Phantom jets? We know that Saudi Arabia is no friend of the State of Israel and the probability is that some of these jets would be transferred to Egypt with the objective of intimidating Israel with increased military strength. Even though a no-transfer clause is included in our contract with Saudi Arabia, history has shown that a similar agreement was broken by the Libyan Government in a contract with France. It should be obvious to our State Department, therefore, that the possibility of Saudi Arabia transferring these jets to Egypt is a real one.

Since 1948, when the State of Israel was first established, the United States has been deeply concerned about maintaining the independence of Israel. We have always been willing to give the Israeli Government the means for its own defense and to help maintain the Middle East balance of power. Yet, in the face of increasing sales of military weapons to the Arab states by the French and Soviet Governments, the Nixon administration has not given the Israelis the needed number of jets to maintain the balance of power. The situation could be compounded further by sale of the F-4 Phantom jets to Saudi Arabia. This could lead to a steep escalation of the Mideast arms race, and a full-scale war could easily break out thereafter.

The administration has yet to provide a clear and coherent statement on why it made the major decision to sell Phantoms to the Arab States. Possibly the decision was made in order to get preferential treatment in purchasing oil from Arab nations. There appears to be no other reason for proposing this dangerous



transaction; but, even if our oil crisis is the real reason for the sale of these Phantom jets to Saudi Arabia, is it justification enough for risking another war in the Middle East?

The State Department should halt the sale of these Phantom jets to Saudi Arabia in the interest of preserving world peace. The peace agreement between Israel and her Arab neighbors has always been shaky and the sale of these jets will not make matters any better.

The American people should not be coerced by demands of oil-producing countries for protection of their "national security," when these states actually are not in danger of being attacked.

It is imperative that we insure a continuation of the balance of power in the Middle East. This cannot be done without continuing our time-honored strong commitment toward the State of Israel.

I call on the Nixon administration to help reduce tension and promote reconciliation in the Middle East by abandoning at once the sale of Phantom jets to Saudi Arabia.

#### NATIONAL GRANDPARENTS' DAY

(Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my good friend, Congressman HENRY HELSTOSKI, and one-fourth of the Members of this House, I have introduced a resolution calling for the establishment of National Grandparents' Day on the fourth Sunday of November each year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill calls for the expenditure of no public funds. It simply pays deserved attention to America's grandparents, a group numbering in the millions. It has drawn support from members of both major political parties representing widely divergent ideologies and totally different constituencies.

I might point out that the bill is cosponsored by my good friend and neighbor, Chairman PETER W. RODINO, JR., chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over national holidays and other observances.

Very likely, Mr. Speaker, this is the only measure presently pending before the House which is cosponsored by our friends from New York, Messrs. RANGEL and KOCH, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK). We have support from our friends from Virginia and Maryland (Mr. BROYHILL and Mr. GUDE) whose constituents are a hop, step, and a jump away, and Mr. WON PAT, whose Guam constituents are thousands of miles away in the central Pacific Ocean.

We have support from members of the Women's Caucus, the Black Caucus, the farm bloc, and various caucuses named for days of the week, the Tuesday-Thursday Club and its severest critics, some younger Members of the House like the able gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) and California (Mrs. BURKE), as well as many older Members.

To be sure, this is a significant cross-section of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to get behind this resolution. To be sure it is not one of the cosmic issues of the 93d Congress, but on the other hand it certainly shows good will on our part and as I said a few minutes ago, it costs the hardpressed taxpayers nothing which is an important consideration.

The fact that we do not purport to address an issue of cosmic proportions or that this bill does not seek to resolve a grave national crisis, does not mitigate its importance.

The National Conference on Aging in 1971 gave testimony to the terrible loneliness and feeling of disregard felt by many millions of older persons whose families have left for other parts of the country. America has undergone a transformation in the last 50 years as the barriers to the ability to move about the country to seek better opportunities have broken down. But as Americans move about leaving their family homes they also leave behind parents and grandparents who too often suffer the loneliness that forgetfulness and neglect, however unintentional, bring on. What we seek here is a means of reminding Americans of the debt owed to those who built the foundation of their own successes. We are saying to the millions of older Americans that we care and we hope that all Americans in the proper spirit also care and remember.

#### OHIO AND ERIE CANAL NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK AND RECREATIONAL AREA

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REGULA, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on behalf of Mr. VANIK, Mr. SEIBERLING, and 24 of my colleagues, I introduced legislation that would authorize the establishment of the Ohio and Erie Canal National Historical Park and Recreation Area.

This bill follows the pattern set by legislation establishing the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, part of which runs through our Nation's Capital.

Approximately 36 miles of canal paralleling the Tuscarawas River in the State of Ohio between the towns of Clinton and Zoar would be under consideration for possible inclusion within the national park system by the terms of the bill. This section of the Tuscarawas River lies on the southern edge of heavily populated northeast Ohio and traverses 3 counties, Summit, Stark, and Tuscarawas.

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources has completed an exhaustive study of this area and has stated:

The river valley offers diverse landscapes, historical significance and opportunity to satisfy recreational needs of expanding urban areas.

The old canal towpaths and channels, and adjacent woodlands represent an open corridor offering outstanding opportunities for recreation.

The area is replete with history. The

Delaware Indians claimed and utilized the Tuscarawas River in 1750. At that time, the valley was already recognized as a major transportation route. The Muskingham Trail originating in Lake Erie followed the ridges along the Cuyahoga, Tuscarawas, and Muskingham Rivers to reach the Ohio River. Those same streams were parts of a major canoe route from the Great Lakes to the Mississippi. The Muskingham Trail was so important to the Indian way of life that it was designated as sacred ground and kept open to Indian commerce even in times of war. Artifacts are still found throughout the area.

As early as 1765, George Washington, considered the Tuscarawas River as part of an all water route from the Great Lakes to the Ohio River and beyond. The Ohio and Erie Canal route eventually paralleled the Indian Trail and had a tremendous impact on the development of the Ohio territory.

The canal was begun in 1825 and completed in 1832. It was dug by hand and log plows pulled by mules. Contracts for canal construction were let in short sections of a mile or less to farmers owning adjacent land. Eventually the canal spanned a 309 miles route. The locks and spillways along the canal were made of large hand hewn stones and white oak timbers. The bottoms of the locks were surfaced with white oak timbers to protect against erosion. Gates were built of heavy oak timbers and culverts were constructed to carry lateral drainage under the canal. Several aqueducts carried the canal over major streams. Remains of the aqueducts are still visible.

The communities of Clinton, Canal Fulton, Massillon, Navarre, Bolivar and Dover were cities alive with warehouses and taverns. Those cities literally grew up with the canal. Both freight and passenger "packet" boats made the trip from Cleveland to Portsmouth in 80 hours.

The canal was the main route of transportation and commerce until about the time of the Civil War when railroads began to take over. By 1845, packet boats had almost disappeared although freight boats were still in constant use until the great flood of 1913 ended the useful life of the canal.

Today, several locks, remnants of aqueducts and abandoned channels and long portions of the canal itself are still visible in Stark and Tuscarawas Counties.

This area has excellent restoration potential for hiking, riding and nature study. The Ohio Historical Society has restored portions of the canal and the towpath of the canal has been officially designated as the "Ohio Buckeye Trail". The river and canal corridor have outstanding canoeing possibilities and float trips from 3 to 36 miles could easily be developed. Scenic drives and bridge trails could be incorporated within the park and the rewatered sections of the canal would provide excellent winter sports opportunities.

This bill, while fully justifiable on its own merits, is, in my opinion a perfect companion bill to legislation already introduced this year that would establish the Cuyahoga Valley National Historical Park and Recreation Area.

The text of H.R. 8775 is as follows:

A bill to authorize the establishment of the Ohio and Erie Canal National Historical Park in the State of Ohio, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That in order to preserve and interpret the historic and scenic features of the Ohio and Erie Canal and to develop the Canal for public recreation, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to establish the Ohio and Erie Canal National Historical Park. The park shall comprise an area along the Tuscarawas River between Clinton and Zoar, Ohio, specifically depicted on a map, numbered — and dated —, which is on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. The Secretary may revise the boundaries of the park from time to time by publication in the Federal Register.

SEC. 2. Within the boundaries of the park, the Secretary may acquire lands and interests in lands by donation, purchase, exchange, or transfer. Any lands or interests in lands owned by the State of Ohio or its political subdivisions may be acquired only by donation. When any tract of land is only partly within the boundaries of the park, the Secretary may acquire all or any portion of the land outside of the boundaries in order to minimize the payment of severance costs. Land so acquired outside the boundaries may be exchanged by the Secretary for non-Federal lands within the boundaries. Any portion of land acquired outside the boundaries and not exchanged shall be reported to the General Services Administration for disposal under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended. When the Secretary determines that he has acquired enough lands or interests in lands to constitute an administrable unit, he shall establish the Ohio and Erie Canal National Historical Park by publication of notice in the Federal Register.

SEC. 3(a). The owner of improved property acquired by the Secretary may elect to retain a right of use and occupancy for twenty-five years or for a term ending at the death of the owner or his spouse, whichever is later. This right of use and occupancy may be leased or conveyed. The Secretary shall pay the owner the fair market value of his property on the date of its acquisition, less the fair market value of the right retained.

(b). The Secretary may terminate this right of use and occupancy upon his determination that the property has ceased to be used for noncommercial residential purposes and upon tender to the holder of an amount equal to the fair market value of that portion of the right which remains unexpired.

(c). As used in this section, the term "improved property" means a detached year-round, one-family dwelling whose construction was begun before January 1, 1973, and which serves as the owner's permanent residence, together with so much land on which the dwelling is situated and which is in the same ownership as the dwelling as the Secretary shall designate as necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for noncommercial residential purposes.

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall administer the park in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461-467), as amended.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated sums necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, June 11, 1973, I was present in the Chamber and voting throughout the day. However, my vote was not recorded on roll No. 204 for some reason. I would like the RECORD to show that I did attempt to vote in favor of H.R. 6713, and had it been recorded properly, I would have been listed as voting "yea."

#### THE DIRKSEN CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP RESEARCH CENTER

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, June 15, 1973, President Nixon traveled to Pekin, Ill., to honor the memory of the late Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, by taking part in a cornerstone laying ceremony for the Dirksen Congressional Leadership Research Center. An editorial appearing in the Peoria Journal Star, while the President was in Pekin, reminds us of the contributions from Senator Dirksen during his distinguished career of public service, with emphasis on the special talent he had for promoting cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of Government in the interests of the national welfare.

Senator Everett Dirksen was the key link between the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government in the administration of three Presidents during some of the most crucial years in the modern life of the Republic. He was at the core of the process of compromising and adjusting policies and programs to make them acceptable and produce effective action.

As the editorial points out:

The rupture in that characteristic of our Government came almost simultaneously with his death. A large section of Congress declared its own war on the then President and eventually on the presidency. . . .

There is no Everett Dirksen to effectively temper the guerrilla war now going on in the Nation's Capitol.

Some of my colleagues who have been around here for more than a few years may remember the words of the late President Herbert Hoover when he was asked for a statement upon the occasion of the death of Senator Robert Taft, of Ohio. President Hoover said:

Senator Taft was more nearly the irreplaceable man in American life than we have seen in three generations.

I believe that many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in both the House and the Senate will agree that the same might be said of the late Senator Dirksen. As the editorial points out a man of his ability and understanding is badly needed here in Washington in 1973.

The article follows:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, June 15, 1973]

#### DIRKSEN CARRIED THE FLAG (By C. L. Dancey)

"I carry the flag for the president," said Everett Dirksen once.

What few realized was that when he died an era died with him.

WHERE IS THAT FLAG NOW ON CAPITOL HILL?

When the United States of America emerged from World War II, disbanded the armies, mothballed the fleet, shut down the war plants and sought to return to normalcy, we looked around at a shattered world in which we alone seemed to stand alone as a tower of strength.

To our unwilling attention then came the reality of a rapacious Stalinist Russia eager to increase and exploit the troubles of that war-torn world into world conquest and bring its peoples under an institutionalized totalitarian system that would be "irrevocable."

The terrible tests which faced us then, uninvited and unwanted, were dangerous indeed.

Harry Truman, as president, was a decisive man who stepped up to those challenges boldly—and Congress gave him unprecedented powers. Senators Vandenberg and Taft put country before party when the chips were down—and before presidential ambitions—and aided Truman from the Congress. So did Everett M. Dirksen.

Much of Truman's political philosophy was anathema to Dirksen, but Dirksen was not a "hater" and he was not one to put party strife above national welfare or Christian duty, either one.

He was the Vandenberg and the Taft of the House of Representatives then, and he played a key role in putting together a majority in the House to pass the Marshall Plan. Not to snipe at it—but to pass it. Not for a Democratic president, but for the good of mankind.

A bitter opponent of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower in primary and convention, Sen. Everett M. Dirksen "carried the flag" for President Eisenhower in the U.S. Senate and held a special position and role in relation to the presidency. In that period, Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson and Minority Leader Everett Dirksen "negotiated" to achieve a modus vivendi of parties and of Congress with the President of the United States that permitted this government to be effective in trying times.

With the election of John F. Kennedy, Dirksen again fought the partisan battles—but carried the day FOR the President when it came to matters he felt transcended "politics." He, and he alone, fashioned the success of the break-through civil rights bill JFK had called for.

(Dirksen "carried the flag" but not blindly. He had something to say first about where "the flag" was going.)

Dirksen's special relationship with President Kennedy was attested to publicly by Kennedy at a time when it was not just political rhetoric but when it counted—at election time.

Everett Dirksen and Lyndon Johnson had worked together as friendly foes for almost a generation, and when Johnson became president, they could still negotiate "peace" between Congress and the Presidency on the issues bigger than politics.

The team approach marked the Dirksen years, and with it both the Congress and the President had maximum effectiveness. They influenced each other in arriving at policy, instead of paralyzing each other.

In all those years the size of the federal establishment grew and the powers of the



chief administrator, the president, with them—but always they were tempered by "negotiation" with the Congress. It was a process that worked.

For three presidents, during the most crucial years in the modern life of the Republic, Everett M. Dirksen was the key link between the separate branches, executive and legislative. He was at the core of the process of compromising and adjusting policies and programs to make them acceptable and produce effective action.

The rupture in that characteristic of our government came almost simultaneously with his death. A large section of Congress "declared its own war" on the then president and eventually on the presidency—even as a dozen senators were busy scrambling for the White House themselves.

(That is an ambition that virtually precludes the kind of consideration and cooperation Sen. Dirksen made possible.)

Ironically, today, while we have negotiated peace in the nation-rending struggle in Southeast Asia, those who called for "negotiation" and "peace" so loudly abroad have in many cases been the very ones to "declare war" and to divide the Congress and the Presidency into warring camps.

There is no Everett Dirksen to effectively temper the guerrilla war now going on in the nation's capital. And sometimes it seems as if there is no one there to listen, if one should arise.

It is especially fitting that the President should come to today's memorial occasion in Pekin.

Yet, the best memorial for Everett Dirksen—and this country—would be for some person to arise on the Washington scene with his knowledge, his forbearance, his persuasiveness . . . and above all, his ROLE in providing mutual understanding between legislators and administration.

It is badly needed in 1973. And the history of Everett Dirksen reminds us that bridging this gap is not solely the responsibility of the President.

It lies with equal weight on the Congress. Mr. Dirksen faced that responsibility.

It seems to have died when he died. But here on this day, in Peoria and Pekin and Central Illinois, Mr. President, we greet you in the spirit that once lived in Washington when Everett Dirksen "carried the flag." . . . That is:

In agreement or disagreement, with respect for The Presidency, the feeling that every president is Our President, regardless of party—and that much of the posture and well-being of this land depends on the stability of that office.

#### NIXON IN PEKIN

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday in the town of Pekin, Ill., my congressional district was honored by a visit from President and Mrs. Nixon. The President came to Pekin at the invitation of Mrs. Everett McKinley Dirksen for the purpose of laying the cornerstone for the Dirksen Congressional Leadership Research Center which will occupy one wing of the new Pekin Public Library now being constructed.

To my great sorrow and disappointment I was unable to accompany the President on this historic visit because we were deliberating the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill here on the House floor and as a member of the Subcommittee of the Appropriations

Committee responsible for that bill it was incumbent for me to be here for the debate. However, I did send the following telegram:

Since the Minority has no control over the scheduling of legislation in the House where we are considering one of the Appropriation bills the President is so concerned about, I do regret not being able to be where I'd much prefer to be—with the President, Luella Dirksen and all my friends who will be participating in this most significant cornerstone laying.

From this point on we can make the Dirksen Congressional Leadership Research Center a living monument to the late Senator's revered memory and we thank you, Mr. President for giving it its initial heartbeat.

As you might imagine Mr. Speaker, the excitement was running rather high in Pekin since this is the first time in history that a President has visited that city and I include the story appearing on the front page of the Pekin Daily Times in the RECORD at this point:

SEEN BY CROWD ESTIMATED AT 23,500 PERSONS

(By Dave Watters)

President Richard M. Nixon said in Pekin today that the opening of dialogue with the People's Republic of China and the continuing policy of negotiations with the Soviet Union give this country hope that Sen. Everett M. Dirksen's "hope, his dream, that his grandchildren would grow up in a world of peace will be realized."

Speaking before a cheering crowd estimated at well over 10,000 persons in the immediate vicinity of the new Pekin Public Library and Dirksen Congressional Leadership Research Center, the President said that if those two policies had not been realized in recent years, the world situation could "result in a military confrontation."

Entire crowd there and along motorcade route was estimated at 23,500.

"When I opened the dialogue with the People's Republic of China," Nixon said, "I was thinking not just of this generation, but of the next, because one-fourth of the people on Earth live there—and they are among the ablest in the world."

Departing extensively from his pre-announced speech, the President said that if such dialogue had not been established, it would endanger future generations.

The President, who arrived shortly after the intermittent morning drizzle ended, urged Watergate-numb Americans not to become cynical about politics and politicians.

Without directly mentioning the Watergate scandal, the President stressed the basic soundness of the American political system at ceremonies honoring the late Sen. Dirksen, saying "It would be a tragedy if we allowed the mistakes of a few to obscure the virtues of most" in American politics.

"We live in a time when many people are cynical about politics and politicians," Nixon said.

"In this profession—as in any—there is much that could be improved. But there is also much to admire.

"The system is working. The way to make it work is to bring more good people into it. Everett Dirksen would tell the cynics of the day not to shun the system—but to share in it, to enter the political arena and to fight for their ideals."

He also referred to his upcoming summit meeting with Mr. Brezhnev of the Soviet Union, saying he is making "no easy predictions" and anticipates "some hard bargaining."

"You can have great hope," he said, "that as a result of these talks, 'the two great na-

tions will make progress toward reducing the tensions of the world."

And he added that the progress will be made "not at the expense of other nations."

The President's speech followed an emotional introduction by Mrs. Dirksen, whose efforts resulted in the first official presidential visit to this community in history.

And the President responded with extensive words of praise for the late minority leader, who is buried only about four miles from the site of the observance.

"The study of Everett Dirksen's life can teach us many things," he said.

"In the first place, if Everett Dirksen's career symbolizes anything, it symbolizes the importance of a constructive, cooperative relationship between the Congress and the President, a relationship of mutual respect and mutual accommodation."

He recalled some historical moments in the Congress in which Sen. Dirksen had a part.

"Whether the President's name was Roosevelt or Truman, Eisenhower or Kennedy, Johnson or Nixon was not the important thing."

"Whether the President's label was Republican or Democrat made little difference."

"The important thing, as Dirksen saw it, was that progress was better than deadlock—and that neither the Congress nor the Executive could travel very far without the other."

He called attention to the difficulties the administration is now having with the Congress, saying that "too often, we think that a strong executive must mean a weak legislature—and that a strong legislature must mean a weak executive."

"Everett McKinley Dirksen knew better than that. He believed in both a strong Congress and a strong President."

"He knew the risk if they became rivals, but he also knew the potential if they became partners. Both that risk and that potential still exist today, on one crucial issue after another."

"Responsible partnership," the President said, "means recognizing that neither partner can have his own way all the time. It means developing a spirit of give and take—with both sides doing some giving and both sides doing some taking."

The President dealt, one by one, with many of the nation's problems, including that of inflation, which he admitted is one of the largest ills now facing the nation.

"Inflation, after all, is a byproduct of our prosperity," he said. "Our booming economy has encouraged people to buy more than they have ever bought before. Since supplies have been short, these demands have driven prices up."

"We are putting the brakes on rising prices. But in applying those brakes, we have been careful not to throw our whole economy into a disastrous skid which will drive it off the highway of the nation's prosperity."

Recalling the beginning of Phase IV of his economic plan two days ago, the President emphasized that the program is designed "to get us out of a controlled economy, not pull us further into one."

"We must not destroy the freedom and flexibility that aren't the key to our prosperity," he said. "We must not control the boom in a way that will lead to a bust."

The President said that "over the long run, the answer to rising prices does not lie in rigid controls," and drew prolonged applause with his remark that "the best way of holding down the family budget is by holding down the federal budget and by working to expand the supply of important goods."

President Nixon arrived almost exactly at 11:30 a.m. and was greeted by cheers and waving American flags and banners.

There were no derisive shouts and no negative banners, altho two did appear briefly about an hour and a half prior to the President's arrival.

Both were greeted by hoots and boos and lasted only a period of a minute or two before disappearing in the crowd.

It could not be determined immediately what happened to the signs or their bearers, but there was one report that at least one of the placards, reading "Impeach Nixon," was torn up by the crowd.

During his early remarks, the President said that "for the first time in 12 years, America is at peace in Vietnam and we can be thankful for that."

"For the first time in eight years, all of our prisoners of war are home, here in America."

"For the first time in a generation—and I see many young men in the crowd—no one will be drafted into our Armed Services."

When he greeted the crowd, the President recalled a conversation with Sen. Dirksen some time ago, when he told the late senator he hoped to visit Peking, China, before his term expired.

"And the senator, with that wonderful sense of humor of his, said, 'Well, you know, Dick, I'm sure Peking, China, is a great place. But you've never really seen anything until you've seen Peking, Ill.'"

#### ENTHUSIASTIC CROWD GREETES NIXONS; NOTHING MARS CEREMONY AT LIBRARY (By Ellen Paullin)

President and Mrs. Nixon received a welcome today in the triangle beside Pekin Public Library that should leave a warm glow in their hearts, and certainly that welcome, and the reason for it, will never be forgotten for those lucky enough to crowd in the little area today.

A program which seemed almost informal and casual at times was never interrupted by discord, though often slowed by standing ovations. There seemed not an unplanned sound—unless it was the noon whistle which had an almost cheerful tone near the end of the ceremony.

There was no doubt that the Presidential party had come for one purpose: To honor the memory of Pekin's Senator Everett M. Dirksen. The late Senator's twin brother, Tom, introduced to the crowd, brought observations from strangers that Pekinites have recognized for a lifetime: "Oh, he DOES look like him!"

The group on the platform, shining with faces of some of the top men of the nation, nonetheless had a familiar, homey look. Senator Howard Baker, of Tennessee, son-in-law of the Dirksens, was introduced by Master of Ceremonies Henry Altorfer as "Joy Dirksen's husband" and referred to as "home folks to most of us." Baker, along with his wife and daughter, Cynthia, was honored with a standing ovation. His presence today, after his TV exposure from Washington recently, was a thrill secondary only to the visit of the President and Mrs. Nixon.

Mrs. Louella Dirksen, widow of the senator, was accorded today the respect and honor which have long been familiar to her as she has distinguished herself as an individual, as well as a helpmate that Senator Dirksen credited with many of his political victories.

From various vantage points at the site, spectators were treated to some glimpses which may never again be duplicated—two of the most charming women of the nation, the First Lady and Mrs. Dirksen, smiling into the crowd as the President addressed Pekinites and those who had come from afar to see the First Family; the President with his arms around "the Dirksen women"—Mrs. Dirksen, her daughter and granddaughter; and a line-up of current congressional greats who are well aware of the tremendous greatness of the man whose memory they honored today.

As the crowd assembled, the skies, at times, seemed to threaten the proceedings, but at 10:28 there was the first sign that everything remained on schedule: The plas-

tic sheet which covered the speaker's stand was removed and the microphone testing began. The crowd enjoyed a little by-play with the man at the mike, but the chairs on the platform remained shrouded in plastic. Soon the Pekin High school band struck up a march, and as those in the crowd surveyed the scene, they noted the flags, bunting and patriotic drapings; the welcome signs; the Pekin band sweaters worn by the young people recruited as ushers. A helicopter—army colored—chattered away, periodically, and the sprinkle never quite got to be too much to bear.

First on the platform were Mayor William Waldmeier, Tom Dirksen, Mrs. Louella Dirksen, Henry Altorfer, the Rev. Roy B. Davis and Librarian Richard Peck. It was 10:53 a.m. when Altorfer started the service, and there was a noticeable brightening of the sky as Rev. Davis, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal church and member of the library board, gave the invocation. The President later credited Rev. Davis with helping to keep the skies clear.

S-Sgt. Stanley Newel, Pekin's returned prisoner of war, led the crowd in the pledge of allegiance as Steve Zielinski, Eagle Scout, presented the flag. Zielinski, PCHS student, was recently named the outstanding Scout of the Pekin area. The Star Spangled Banner kept spectators on their feet, and then Peck introduced members of the library board, after thanking Mayor Waldmeier for naming board members who are highly competent as well as interested in the library.

As the members stood to be recognized, the crowd was aware of the massive hulk of the new building rising around the old Carnegie library, with its fancy tiled roof and decaying cupola. John Hackler, the library architect, a Pekinite and long time friend of the Dirksens and Bakers was introduced, followed by the construction company head and another Pekinite, Lou Fischer, job foreman.

Members of the foundation board for the Dirksen Congressional Leadership Research Center was next to stand, and as the introductions continued, it was noted that the Illinois Congressional team had found it necessary to remain in Washington to follow thru with legislation important to the President. Among those caught in the press of Washington affairs was Congressman Robert Michel of this district. His predecessor, however, former Pekinite and former Congressman Harold Velde was in the crowd.

Mayor Waldmeier stood to perform his "first official duty of the day" as he presented marigolds to Mrs. Dirksen, and then, as he spoke of the imminent arrival of the President, he told of an earlier meeting with Mr. Nixon. "I told him, 'You should come to Pekin sometime,' and he replied, 'That's what I'm going to do.'"

That announcement was followed by mounting excitement as the crowd learned that the President and Mrs. Nixon were only seven minutes away. Just as the band prepared to play during the interlude, a parade of dignitaries approached the platform: President Pro Tem of the Senate James O. Eastland, Senate Majority Leader Michael Mansfield, Senate GOP Leader Hugh Scott, Sen. Roman Hruska, Senator Howard Baker and his wife, Joy, and their daughter, Cynthia, Illinois Congressman Leslie C. Arends, and Illinois Senators Charles Percy and Adlai Stevenson. Their cars had preceded the President's.

Pekinites who knew Joy Dirksen in her teens could not help but be struck by the strong resemblance in her daughter, and those who knew of Senator Baker's avid interest in photography noted that Cynthia shares that interest. Both she and her father were snapping pictures from the platform, even as they and those about them were being photographed. The Bakers, having just arrived in town, waved from the podium as they recognized friends in the crowd, and

then there was a short period of amiable milling around as the various dignitaries exchanged pleasantries.

About that time, rain started to spot the scene, and umbrellas blossomed, but as cheers from the motorcade route began to seep into the triangle, the moisture abated, and the crowd rose to the thrilling strains of "Hail to the Chief." The President's approach was a slow, hand-shaking route, with Mrs. Nixon joining in greetings the local citizens who lined the pathway.

Then, on the platform, the tumult reached a crescendo as the Nixons came into full view of the entire crowd, embracing Mrs. Dirksen and accepting the welcome of Pekin.

Possibly the proudest moment of Mrs. Dirksen's life came when she turned to say, "Mr. President, will you join me in unveiling the cornerstone?"

And there, as Pekin watched, the two pulled the cover from the simple granite slab, marked only, "15 June 1973."

#### THE 800TH LIFETIME AND THE ENERGY CRISIS

(Mr. SKUBITZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, we hear and read a great deal today about the energy crisis, environmental integrity, pollution, and man's disregard for the bounties of nature.

Recently I had the pleasure of reading the feature address made to the Kansas Academy of Science on April 27 by William W. Hambleton, the director of the Kansas Geological Survey. I commend it most strongly to my colleagues as presenting a facet of these problems that one does not encounter too often nowadays. Mr. Hambleton is a scientist with no ties to any commercial or industrial activity. His views, therefore, are public interest views.

Mr. Hambleton's talk concludes with some recommendations, among which is the immediate creation of a Department of Natural Resources and Energy. I note that Secretary of Interior Morton only this week made a similar suggestion. If it were to be created, the Nation could go farther and do worse than put Kansas' William Hambleton in charge of it.

#### THE 800TH LIFETIME AND THE ENERGY CRISIS (By William W. Hambleton)

One should approach an address dealing with ecology, the environment, or energy with a certain degree of humility, and a realization that even the experts have much to learn. I reflected upon this condition when I happened to notice again the original of a *Peanuts* cartoon that Schultz had presented to one of my colleagues. Lucy is instructing Linus: "Here's a nice pebble, Linus . . . take it home and observe it. The fascinating thing about pebbles is their growth; for some grow up to be stones while others grow up to be rocks. You shall hope of course, that it grows up to be a rock, for a pebble that grows up to be a stone is like a youth that has gone astray." Linus responds: "Sigh, I have so much to learn."

If 50,000 years represents the history of man and his lifetime is reckoned at 62 years, man has been on earth for 800 lifetimes. He spent 650 of these in caves and drew upon earth resources in order to stay alive. If he did not live in harmony with nature, at least he was not in a position to cause discord. Only during the last 70 lifetimes has it been possible for him to communicate; only during the last 6 lifetimes has the printed word been available to him; only during the last 4 has it been possible for him to measure



time with precision; and only during the last 2 has the electric motor been available. During the last, or 800th lifetime, most of the material goods that we know have been developed, and we have gained most of our understandings of our physical and biological world. The 800th lifetime represents a sharp break with all past human experience. Peter Drucker has described this 800th lifetime as the "Age of Discontinuity," and Alvin Toffler has described it in terms of "Future Shock." Humility is indeed called for, and we do have so much to learn.

Nevertheless, I shall sally forth and attempt to tell you something of my perceptions about the earth as a system, especially with respect to some of the environmental and energy problems which have gained the attention of almost everyone in the past few years. Because I am a geologist, these perceptions may differ greatly from the perceptions of those in other disciplines.

A system can be defined as anything which is not chaos, and the earth by this definition clearly is a system in spite of large random elements. The task of learning is to perceive what is chaos and what is not chaos in the world. It is equally important to perceive order where it exists, and not to perceive it where it does not.

As a system, the earth behaved, although it did not know it, generally in a Newtonian manner and according to the Second Law of Thermodynamics. That is to say, it behaved as an order-disorder system, and has cycled locally throughout its history from high energy to low energy states. From time to time, the earth pushed up mountains, creating high-energy states, then cycled through erosional processes to states of minimum energy and disorder. At times it concentrated within its crust certain resources such as iron, coal, gas, and oil; these concentrations we would now call mineral deposits. However, during its cycling process, the earth dispersed these resources. Thus, throughout its entire history the earth has cycled and recycled resources through processes of concentration and dispersal. These processes continue today. To put it another way, natural earth processes are by far the principal agents in modifying our environment. Resources and environmental modification are inextricably linked, for environmental degradation is a natural process on earth. Perhaps Robert Frost has produced the most poetic explication of the Second Law of Thermodynamics in his poem "Mending Wall," which contains the line "something there is that doesn't love a wall," and goes on to describe how neighbors each spring replace the stones that have fallen from the wall during the winter. Is it because of spirits, hobgoblins, or elves? No, freeze and thaw and gravitational attraction have caused the wall, an ordered condition, to obey the Second Law of Thermodynamics and move toward a condition of disorder and minimum energy.

The wasting of earth resources through natural cycling has continued for nearly 4½ billion years without benefit of man; a notion which today seems to evade some of those who describe themselves as environmentalists. The introduction of man certainly has changed the entire time frame of this process. His numbers and capabilities, especially in this 800th lifetime, have enabled him within a short time actually to accelerate earth capabilities for concentration and dispersal of resources. Another notion which seems to evade the environmentalist is that very little matter has been lost from the earth's envelope throughout its history.

Let us now attempt to document some of these ideas. In 1792, Vancouver, who had been Captain Cook's navigator, passed through Santa Barbara Channel and recorded in his log that the surface of the sea was covered with a slimy substance, and the breeze brought with it the strong smell of tar. The next morning, he observed that the

sea had dissolved tar floating on its surface, which covered the sea in all directions within the limits of his view. The place was so foul that he pulled up anchor and departed, the bottom of his ship being covered with tar. Remember, in 1792 no drilling for oil or gas had taken place anywhere, especially in Santa Barbara Channel. In other words, earth recycling was taking place, and I would hazard a guess that probably more crude oil and gas have been lost by natural processes than man has produced.

William Pecora, late Director of U.S. Geological Survey, has estimated that more than 1 million tons of fixed nitrogen in the form of ammonia and nitrates are deposited annually from the atmosphere to the earth as a part of a natural precipitation process. In the United States alone, more than 4 million tons of sodium chloride, 2½ million tons of sodium sulfate, and 36 million tons of calcium compounds fall upon the land-surface—all in rainwater.

Particulate matter and natural gases dispersed from volcanoes "pollute" the atmosphere as a continuing phenomenon. From three eruptions alone—the Krakatoa eruption in Java (1883), the Mount Katmai eruption in Alaska (1912), and the Hekla eruption in Iceland (1947)—more dust, ash, and combined gases were ejected into the atmosphere than from all of man's activities to date.

Many have long believed that water issuing from natural springs is beneficial to health because of its purity. Springs issuing into the Arkansas and Red Rivers carry 17 tons of salt per minute. Lemonade Spring in New Mexico carries 900 pounds of sulfuric acid per million pounds of water, which is 10 times the acid concentration of most acid mine streams in the nation. The Azure Yampa Spring in Colorado contains 8 times the radium content that the Public Health Service sets as a safe limit. Certain plants on the Colorado Plateau contain selenium, which is toxic to cattle. The smoke of the Great Smoky Mountains is caused by the natural emission of terpenes from the forests. Natural landslides, fault scraps, and the like, scar the face of the earth just as certainly as do disfiguring strip mines.

Last December 2, Hershel Byrd, a resident of rural southern Shelby County, Alabama, was started by a rumble that shook his house, followed by the distinct sound of trees snapping and breaking. Two days later, hunters in a nearby woods found a crater approximately 460 feet long, 380 feet wide, and 165 feet deep. Those events mark the time of formation and discovery of a large sinkhole in Alabama, caused by solution of the underlying limestone. This large, natural-solution feature, is just as ugly as the most badly managed open-pit mine or quarry I have seen.

Many environmentalists are shocked to learn that the geologic record is replete with examples of the complete demise of certain species of animals. Perhaps the dinosaur is the most widely-publicized example of this kind of disappearance, but I assure you that numerous other examples can be cited.

Mother Nature, "who doesn't like to be fooled" according to one of the popular television advertisements, is our greatest polluter in man's terms. In thermodynamic terms, however, we are simply observing earth concentration and dispersal of resources.

Man's introduction into the 4½ billion year time frame of the earth, and especially during his 800th lifetime, presents new problems, but they should be kept in perspective. During his entire history, man has attempted to replicate earth's natural concentration and dispersal processes. At whatever level of sophistication, use results in concentration of substances toxic or useless to man, and he has attempted to disperse them, emulating the earth by distributing them into the air and waterways. Only his numbers have made this scheme unworkable; thus creating some of our present problems.

Historical perspectives should be retained, nevertheless, lest our environmental goals become ridiculous. Even the noble Indian, as reported by iconoclast Nick Fent, our hydrologist friend from Salina, has moved his living site because of nitrate contamination of spring water caused by infiltration from his refuse. Nick further reports that "you always hear about how the Indian lived in such harmony with nature. He polluted just as much as the rest of us, but he wasn't as numerous. When the teepee got so full that he couldn't stand up, he moved somewhere else."

We are shocked by the environmental degradation and ecological displacement caused by strip-mining. Perhaps one should remember that the wheat fields of Kansas represent one of the major ecological displacements of all time. The vast plains of the Mid-Continent supported rich and diverse forms of life, including the buffalo. Plowing and fencing have caused major environmental degradation in modern environmental terms, as can be verified by anyone who has seen the landscape from 30,000 feet in an aircraft.

Max Brewer, Alaskan permafrost expert and Commissioner of Alaskan Department of Environmental Conservation, has noted that "in Alaska we have many lakes and streams totally untouched by man which do not meet federal water quality standards. We worry about siltation during bridge construction at the same time Cook Inlet is silted by glacial flour for which there is only one source—nature's glaciers."

Some of our soil conservationists are embarking upon a program of complete sediment control in our rivers. They seemingly do not realize that sediment is produced as part of the process of natural earth recycling or that sediment deposited in the flood plains of our rivers is the source of natural enrichment that makes our bottomlands so productive. Furthermore, the dynamic behavior of the stream is little understood. If the sediment is removed, the excess energy of the stream causes it to begin downcutting, thus creating new sediment.

Am I suggesting that we should ignore environmental pollution? Not at all! I am suggesting that we should avoid being ridiculous and that we should view our environmental protection efforts in terms of natural earth processes and history. I am suggesting also that man must use earth resources and must modify the environment in order to survive. I am suggesting further, that regardless of man, the earth will continue to disperse and reconcentrate matter and energy, used or unused by man. The carbon compounds from the burning of coal and oil eventually will be reconcentrated, and new coal and oil will be formed by organisms. Our garbage and even our plastic wastes will be degraded in time. But Mother Nature, the greatest polluter of all, is not very sentimental about all of this and leaves man's survival to man. Earth processes are supervised by extremely well-behaved angels, whereas social systems are supervised by people, who are not well behaved, and our predilection for mistaken predictions can lead us badly astray.

Several weeks ago, I was riding in a one-peso cab on the Paseo de la Reforma in Mexico City with a cab driver whom I knew spoke English because I had been speaking with him. During our trip, my cab had several near collisions with another cab; a situation which you can well appreciate if you know something about the temperament of Latin drivers. Upon reaching a stop light, my cab driver lowered his window and discoursed at length in volatile Spanish about the ancestry and driving capabilities of the other cab driver in remarks addressed to that individual. When this discourse ceased, I inquired as to the nature of the conversation. My driver said "I told him, friend, do be careful." With regard to our environmental decisions, in this 800th lifetime, I would say also "Friend, do be careful."

In one area especially, the admonishment "Friend, do be careful," is especially important with respect to decisions which must be made soon. I refer to our energy consumption and requirements, and the environmental-crisis condition which we are rapidly approaching. The production of energy, perhaps more than any other factor, has placed great stresses upon the environment, and has placed us upon a collision course between satisfaction of energy needs and environmental protection. Our position is critical, but not yet disastrous. I am not talking about a physical shortage of fuel in the world before 1980 or 1985, at cost of production comparable with today's costs. I am not talking about a physical shortage of fuel in the U.S. at any price: that is, if the price of gasoline were to go to ten dollars per gallon and the price of gas to five dollars per thousand cubic feet, we quite clearly would have adequate supplies because demand would drop. I am talking about the end of an era of available low-priced energy derived from hydrocarbons that the world has enjoyed for the last 25 years or more of this 800th lifetime.

This low-priced energy will be available neither in the United States nor abroad. I am also talking about the disappearance of low-cost domestic sources of energy in the U.S. and about increased reliance on imports. Why has this situation seemingly come upon us so suddenly and why does the public not yet understand the problem? First of all, the order of magnitude bruited about concerning energy consumption and the dimensional units used, are so confusing that the layman, let alone the professional, scarcely can grasp the implications. We are confused by numbers relating to demand and consumption, availability, and reserves expressed as proven, possible, additional, potential, and the like. Furthermore these numbers are expressed in a variety of units such as barrels, tons, BTU, cubic feet, and even, in a recent paper, equivalent tons of coal. The units are so astronomical in magnitude that the average citizen has as little understanding of their meaning, as he does of the national debt. Who, I ask, can visualize a trillion cubic feet of gas, a billion barrels of oil, or 10<sup>12</sup> BTU?

Secondly, our use of energy has increased at a far greater rate than the most accurate predictions were able to foresee.

Let me give you a few of these numbers as anchors for our discussion. Look at the situation a short twenty years ago. In 1950, the United States oil consumption was 7 million barrels per day; production was 6.7 million barrels per day, and we had a shut-in capacity of more than 2 million barrels per day. We will consume about 17 million barrels per day. We will consume about 17 million barrels per day of crude oil during 1973, of which approximately 6 million barrels per day will be imported. The import part computes out to around 28 percent. Our needs are projected to increase to somewhere around 24 million barrels per day by 1980; but our production is projected to stay about level. Thus, as you can see, unless something changes we will be importing half of our crude oil by 1980. If you want a larger number, our present use is somewhere around 6 billion barrels per year.

As for gas, we are consuming around 24 trillion cubic feet a year, importing better than a trillion cubic feet, mainly from Canada. Our consumption is predicted to increase to somewhere around 35 trillion cubic feet by 1980.

We are consuming approximately 600 million tons of coal a year, and consumption is expected to rise to between 750 and 925 million tons by 1980. We export about 71 million tons.

In the United States, then, we use around 600 million tons of coal per year; around 17 million barrels of oil per day, or better than 6 billion barrels per year; and around 24

trillion cubic feet of gas. Only in coal did we not face a deficit.

A third very important factor in the present energy crisis was a 1954 decision of the Supreme Court in the *Phillips* case that the Federal Power Commission had both the authority and responsibility to set the price of gas at the wellhead. If you had owned a gas well at that time, and were selling gas to a pipeline company at a contract price, your contract would have been abrogated by the decision and the Federal Power Commission would have told you at what price you could sell your gas. Because of the great difficulty involved in setting the price for individual wells, the FPC went to an area pricing schedule.

For most of southwestern Kansas, where most of our gas is produced, this price was set at 16 cents per thousand cubic feet. This price was so low, set in an effort to protect the consumer, that it no longer was profitable to explore for gas. Furthermore, this cheap gas virtually drove coal from the market as an energy resource, and depressed the price of crude oil. As a consequence, we became profligate users of gas, wasting it with abandon, and using it as a fuel for purposes for which coal or crude oil were much better suited. Except for gas, production of crude oil and coal began to decline beginning in 1958, and reserves declined. Kansas is an excellent example. In 1958, Kansas produced more than 120 million barrels of crude oil per year. In 1971, this production had declined to 78.5 million barrels, a decline of 7.4 percent over the previous year, and in 1972 production declined to 73.7 million barrels, an additional 6.1 percent decline in production. Drilling declined, and only 19 of 199 holes more than two miles from production found new production. Kansas refineries processed 132 million barrels of crude oil; but of this amount 64 million barrels were imported, including nearly 10 million barrels from Canada. This oil was produced from 42,000 wells of which 38,000 were stripper wells producing less than 10 barrels per day; 535 more holes were plugged than were reported drilled. During 1971 natural gas production in Kansas was .39 trillion cubic feet, a decline of 1.6 percent over the previous year.

Assuming no increase in demand, the United States now has proven reserves of oil and gas for about 10 years. However, this amount of oil and gas will not be available each year, because the oil and gas cannot be produced at a sufficiently high rate to meet our demand. Our consumption would be of little consequence if our rate of use were not increasing at around 3.5 percent per year, if our resources were distributed at the right places and at the right time, and if we knew that we could draw upon adequate reserves to supply our needs for the foreseeable future. However, even if we experienced increased exploration activity because of the price increases, except for the Alaskan slope and offshore, it is not likely that we will find large new reserves in the United States. The problem is compounded because we really do not know the magnitude of our reserves. Many policy decisions must relate to the difficult question of potential supplies with respect to undiscovered deposits, as well as deposits that cannot be produced profitably now, but may become workable in the future.

Uncertainty is introduced because most mineral deposits lie beneath the earth's surface and are difficult to locate and examine in a way that yields accurate knowledge as to the extent and quality. Another source of uncertainty is that specifications for recoverable materials are constantly changing as the advance of technology permits us to produce minerals that were once too low-grade, too inaccessible, or otherwise impossible to recover profitably. Thus, it is often difficult to estimate, measure, or prove reserves with a high degree of accuracy until they have been largely mined out, let alone estimate the extent of unexplored reserves of an inferred or possible class. Estimates of

proved reserves prepared in advance of appreciable production commonly reveal errors from 25 to 50 percent, usually on the conservative side; the error in estimates in unexplored or incompletely explored deposits is much larger, usually on the high side by an order of magnitude, that is to say by a factor of ten.

A fourth cause of our present energy crisis results from the vigorous efforts of environmental groups and environmental legislation. Sulfur-emission standards have denied use of the coal reserves of the eastern United States, and proposed legislation, if passed, would prevent any strip-mining of our huge low-sulfur coal reserves in the western states. Oil spills in Santa Barbara Channel and elsewhere have effectively blocked off-shore exploration, especially on the Atlantic seaboard. Similar efforts have prevented construction of a pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to coastal ports in Alaska. Other environmental efforts have prevented construction of power plants and transmission lines. On March 7, the Federal Power Commission issued a news release which reports that 35 steam, electric-generating units, totalling more than 30,000 megawatts, originally scheduled for service by the summer of 1973, are not now expected to be ready. The study shows that thirty of these delayed units are nuclear fueled, with capacity totalling nearly 27,400 megawatts. The other five are fossil units. Many units which have received operating licenses are not available for full load operations due to limitations imposed by environmental considerations, technical problems, or license restrictions. In addition, 51 nuclear units totalling nearly 45,000 megawatts, which have been granted construction permits, have not yet received operating licenses. Environmental siting considerations have prevented construction and other matters such as uncertainties concerning secondary core-cooling and collapsed fuel rods are responsible for restricted load operations and delays in construction.

A fifth factor, which contributes to our energy crisis, is our failure to fund research and development in the use of other fuel sources. We are only spending several hundred million dollars a year for such enterprises, but Senator Jackson estimates that we will require \$20 billion for an energy research and development program over the next decade on coal gasification, shale-oil plants, advanced power-cycle plants, coal liquefaction, geothermal and solar power, and the breeder and fusion reactors. Even if this effort is undertaken, commercial, demonstration plants are ten to fifteen years away.

As a sixth factor, the international situation with respect to energy has changed drastically. Until about 1969, a buyer's market existed for crude oil being produced mostly in the Arab states and Venezuela. International petroleum companies were able to set the posted price of crude oil, which in turn determined the royalty payments to the producing countries.

In 1951 when Iran nationalized its oil and was the largest producer in the Middle East, it was producing only 340,000 barrels per day. When production was cut off, it was relatively easy to move across the Persian Gulf to Iraq, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia. Today, Iran is producing more than 5 million barrels per day, Saudi Arabia is producing more than 6 million barrels per day, Kuwait is producing 3 million barrels per day, and by 1980 Saudi Arabia alone may be producing more than 20 million barrels per day. Even as late as 1967 when the Suez Canal was closed, Libyan production could be increased to take up the slack.

However, in 1960, a little-noticed event took place. Iran, Venezuela, and Saudi Arabia banded together to form OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) and subsequently were joined by other Middle East countries to form an eleven-nation cartel. As long as a buyer's market persisted, these countries could be played off one



against the other in terms of price. With the turn toward a seller's market, another significant event took place in 1970 after Colonel Gaddafi of Libya seized power in a military coup, rejected prevailing royalty rates, and launched a bitter ten-month campaign for a better deal. Other Arabian countries developed sophistication in dealing with the international petroleum companies, exemplified by Saudi Arabia's shrewd Minister of Oil and Mineral Wealth, Sheikh Yamani. The Arab states now control 60 percent of the world's proven reserves and are bargaining with increasing skill. Their income, which was \$4.4 billion a year five years ago, has soared to more than \$10 billion and by 1980 easily could reach \$40 billion. Saudi Arabia, which has a population of about 7 million, would have greater monetary resources than the U.S. and Japan combined. Saudi Arabia's income from the sale of crude oil is approximately \$60 million per day. Libya enjoys an income of \$2 billion per year and has a population of only approximately 2 million people. In a seller's market, OPEC has become a controlling crude-oil cartel, composed of producing countries with fantastic incomes, and such small populations that the income can be spent only with difficulty. Led by Sheikh Yamani, the Saudi Arabian government oil agency, Petromin, will acquire a 25 percent share in Aramco, the huge producing company through which Exxon, Texaco, Standard of Cal., and Mobil have been pumping Saudi Arabian oil. By 1983, the Saudi share of Aramco will have increased to 51 percent.

A similar situation prevails in the other OPEC countries, which look to development of distribution, refining, and marketing facilities of their own. The royalty paid producing companies has more than doubled since 1970 and doubtless will increase further. The OPEC countries are now interested in placing constraints on production rates, for oil left in the ground now will appreciate in value. At the present time, about 20 percent of the oil imported into the United States comes from the Arabian countries; the bulk of our imports comes from Venezuela, which produces mainly a high-sulfur crude oil. The Venezuelan productive capacity cannot satisfy the demand of the United States, and inevitably we must turn to Middle Eastern oil and face attendant problems relating to national security and an increasing balance of payments deficit.

Finally, one must examine the shortages of the past winter regarding fuel oil and the anticipated gasoline shortages of the summer. We have built no new refineries in the United States during the past few years, largely because a refinery must be constructed in terms of the crude-oil stocks which are fed to it and a great uncertainty exists in this area. A U.S. catalytic refinery is designed to operate economically with a product output of about 60 percent gasoline and jet fuel in the light fractions, and about 40 percent fuel oil and heavier fractions. Furthermore, the sulfur content of the oil must be anticipated in the design. Uncertainties as to supply sources, opposition to siting new refineries, opposition to new port facilities and the like have contributed to the problem. During the past winter, in order to provide fuel oil for heating purposes during an unusually cold winter, refineries deferred changing product mix that would build up gasoline stocks for summer use.

The prospects for relieving the energy shortage are very bleak. What, then can be done?

1. We must immediately establish a Federal Department of Natural Resources and Energy. The natural resource and energy industries and the public are faced by a weltering confusion of regulations and policies issuing from nearly 65 federal agencies. Not even Congress has an authoritative source of information and advice. The policies developed by such an agency might

be wrong, but at least they would have the merit of consistency.

2. In order to maintain an adequate resource and energy capability, this new federal agency should treat energy supply and demand as part of an integrated energy system. The requirements for energy are shifting constantly in terms of quantity, form and substance. Additional factors include accommodation to end use patterns and the need to resolve resource conflicts within the social requirements that resources must be provided without destroying the quality of the environment. Hopefully, such an integrated policy would serve to avoid the ridiculous spectacle which we have witnessed since 1954 when the Federal Power Commission established area gas pricing at the well head, thereby discouraging exploration and depressing the price of other energy resources.

3. Inasmuch as the reserve calculations for both proved and underdeveloped resources are of doubtful quality, national standards for reserve estimates should be applied consistently throughout the nation.

4. The pricing structure of the entire energy industry should be decontrolled to the point where prices are free to seek the market level, and at both state and federal levels, taxation policies should be developed that actually encourage exploration and resource development in order to assure the capital flow necessary for our energy needs. An estimated \$500 billion will be required by 1985 and these capital requirements will be met only with great difficulty under present policies.

5. Present restrictions on leasing and offshore drilling should be removed immediately, and construction of the Alaskan pipeline should proceed. With the leadtime requirements for development, we can no longer defer this activity. Compromises must be made between energy and environmental-protection needs. I am convinced personally that offshore production can be regulated to minimize oil spills, and that in terms of earth recycling history and the absence of significant damage to the biota in Santa Barbara Channel, that the remaining unavoidable spills will have little effect on the environment.

6. State and federal policies should support and encourage the development of all energy resources, for all will be needed. Research and technological feasibility studies should proceed on every possible source of energy from organic waste such as cow manure, to solar and wind energy, hydrogen transfer systems, the breeder reactor, and geothermal energy.

7. A major policy of energy conservation should be instituted. Its elements include development of more efficient systems, mass transit, and even federal building codes that would require insulation of buildings at acceptable levels. Studies indicate that adequate insulation can conserve as much as 30 percent of the energy used to heat buildings. Great differences exist in the efficiency of air conditioners, for example, and manufacturers should be required to post efficiencies prominently on their equipment. Incidentally, if prices rise to realistic levels, conservation policy is almost unavoidable. The homeowner may conclude from cost analysis that insulation is cheaper than fuel.

8. Nationally, realistic pollution and environmental control programs should be adopted which represent basic compromises. Much pollution control at projected federal standards is energy intensive and counterproductive. The amount of energy required to achieve zero point-source effluent into our waterways will require tremendous amounts of energy, whose production creates further pollution. Such legislation as House Bill 6482 should be avoided. This bill, containing many recommendable requirements, arbitrarily limits strip-mining coal to areas of less than 20 degrees. This bill does not permit

accommodation to local conditions. In some areas, for example, land surface, presently exceeding the slope limitations, would be enhanced by strip-mining and reclamation to slopes less steep than the original land surface.

9. Although commitment to foreign imports may be unwise for security reasons, many opportunities exist for negotiation in an increasingly open-ended economy. With mutual interdependence increasingly evident, the desire for increased trade declared, many opportunities are presented. The recent requirements of the Soviet Union for grain provide for opportunity to negotiate for energy resources. However, these negotiations will require inclusion of natural-resource experts at the highest levels of the State and Commerce Departments, and these experts should be regarded as fundamental to foreign policy development. We cannot negotiate agreements with the kind of naivete that characterized recent grain exports, for the nations with whom we are dealing already are committed to the use of high technical skills in trading negotiations.

Possibly the consuming countries should form their own cartel in order to deal with the producing countries on equal terms. Parenthetically, I would suggest that we might even investigate the potential for stockpiling imported oil and gas—abundant underground storage facilities are available in salt cavities, mines, and even depleted oil and gas reservoirs.

At the state level, it is exceedingly important that we determine distribution and consumption patterns in order that we can deal intelligently with shortages as they occur. We should support research on alternate energy sources, and encourage exploration in every way. We can also take the lead in conservation matters relating to improvement of building codes and consumer protection.

In conclusion with respect to energy and environmental matters, this 800th lifetime will not be easy. Many compromises will be necessary. We can look forward to local shortages of energy over the next four or five years as we struggle to develop stable sources of supply from foreign countries, develop our own resources, build new electric-power capacity, build new refineries, and develop new transportation and port facilities. In another 10 to 15 years, as demand increases in all other countries, our energy situation could become catastrophic unless we proceed vigorously to develop alternative sources of energy, many of which are minimal in their impact on the environment. However, we must begin now to allocate research and development dollars to the production of alternative energy sources; we must undertake stringent conservation programs to reduce our energy consumption; and we must become a much wiser public in understanding our problems.

This 800th lifetime will not be dull or easy, but it should be exciting and productive for those who are willing to make a commitment to something greater than their "convulsive little egos." I invite your commitment to those institutions which are the change-agents of our society. Every person who thinks of himself as responsible must care for every institution he touches, and for those he touches intimately he must care deeply. I invite you to commitment to a lifelong learning process with breadth if you would participate fully in this 800th lifetime. To paraphrase Linus, "We have so much to learn."

**MAJORITY LEADER THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., SAYS THE PEOPLE SUPPORT CONGRESS ON SPENDING CONTROL**

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the people are solidly backing the Congress against the executive branch on this question of spending control.

According to a recent Harris poll, 45 percent of the people—as against 26 percent—feel that Congress should enact its own spending ceiling and prohibit the President from impounding appropriated funds.

That is exactly the approach that the House leadership proposes to take—new anti-impoundment procedures combined with a \$267.1 billion spending ceiling for fiscal 1974.

The Harris poll reflects continuing public support for the great social and humanitarian programs initiated by Democratic Congresses and Democratic Presidents of the years past. Forty-two percent of the people—as against 38 percent—said they do not oppose social programs, provided that Congress does not overspend its budget ceiling.

It is clear that the people want Congress to continue to pass judgment on all spending requests. That is our responsibility under the Constitution. This Nation will not accept spending by unilateral decree; it will not tolerate one-man rule or anything like it.

The House leadership is proposing sound, responsible spending-control legislation. That is what the public wants and expects, and Congress should enact it promptly.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. BREAUX (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), from 3:30 today through June 29, on account of official business of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KETCHUM), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HASTINGS, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEMP, today, for 15 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ICHORD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. SKUBITZ and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD

and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$552.50.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KETCHUM), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZION.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. SHOUP.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in four instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD of California.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. FORSYTHE.

Mr. HUBER.

Mr. QUIE in two instances.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DENT.

Mr. CLARK.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. LEHMAN in 10 instances.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD in three instances.

Mr. PREYER.

Mr. WALDIE.

Mr. UDALL in 10 instances.

Mr. DRINAN.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. BRADEMANS in six instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in three instances.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 470. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to regulate the transactions of members of national securities exchanges, to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to define certain duties of persons subject to such Acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 907. An act to authorize the appropriation of \$150,000 to assist in financing the arctic winter games to be held in the State of Alaska in 1974; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 20, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1052. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, to authorize the President to prohibit or curtail the exportation of articles, commodities or products from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1053. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 2734a(a) and 2734b(a) of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the settlement under international agreements, of certain claims incident to the noncombat activities of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOLAND: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 8825. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, and corporations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes; (Rept. 93-296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. SULLIVAN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5649. A bill to extend until November 1, 1978, the existing exemptions of the steamboat *Delta Queen* from certain vessel laws; (Rept. No. 93-289); referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 8606. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; (Rept. No. 93-290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. SULLIVAN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 6187. A bill to amend section 502(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; (Rept. No. 93-291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 7447; (Rept. No. 93-295). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 446. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 8510. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 93-292). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 447. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 8662. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 93-293). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 448. Resolution waiving certain points of order against H.R. 8760. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 93-294). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and



severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURTON, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. LOTT, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. VEYSEY, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 8799. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the circumstances under which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may pay for care and treatment rendered to veterans by private hospitals in emergencies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BUTLER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. LOTT, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. VEYSEY, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 8800. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to remove the time limitation within which programs of education for veterans must be completed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:  
H.R. 8801. A bill to amend section 105(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the excludability from gross income of disability pension payments to an individual shall be determined without regard to whether or not the individual has reached retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON (for himself, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. MOSS, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. STARK, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. ROYAL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. RYAN, and Mrs. BURKE of California):

H.R. 8802. A bill to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:  
H.R. 8803. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax, in the case of an individual or a married couple, for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:  
H.R. 8804. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of certain public safety officers who die in the performance of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUBER (for himself, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. STUCKEY, and Mr. TRENN):

H.R. 8805. A bill to limit certain legal remedies involving the involuntary busing of schoolchildren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 8806. A bill to establish a Federal Legal Aid Corporation through which the Government of the United States of America may render financial assistance to its respective States for the purpose of encouraging the provision of legal assistance to individual citizens who are in need of professional legal services for prosecutions or defense of certain causes in law and equity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KETCHUM:  
H.R. 8807. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a tax credit or deduction for contributions made for the purpose of influencing the passage of State or local referendums and initiatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKINNEY (for himself and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 8808. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income amounts won in State lotteries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:  
H.R. 8809. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to prohibit the sale for human consumption of meat from horses, mules, and other equines; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HICKS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. SARASIN):  
H.R. 8810. A bill for the relief of certain orphans in Vietnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. HANLEY):

H.R. 8811. A bill to prohibit discrimination against locally recruited personnel in the granting of overseas differentials and allowances, equalize the compensation of overseas teachers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself and Mr. STEELMAN):

H.R. 8812. A bill to provide for the regulation of surface mining operators in the United States, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to States to encourage State regulations of surface mining, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 8813. A bill to amend the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 to extend the authorization for appropriations thereunder for 1 year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 8814. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that any individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze if he has 20 quarters of coverage (and meets the other conditions of eligibility therefor), regardless of when such quarters were earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK:  
H.R. 8815. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the reporting of certain physical abuse of children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THONE:  
H.R. 8816. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying out a program of animal health research; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALDIE:  
H.R. 8817. A bill to reduce the percentage rates of employee deductions, agency contributions, and deposits for civil service retirement purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALSH:  
H.R. 8818. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include security guards at installations of the Federal Government within the provisions of such title relating to civil service retirement of Government employees engaged in certain hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:  
H.R. 8819. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that interest paid on certain special savings deposits of prisoners of war and other missing members

of the armed forces shall be exempt from Federal taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:  
H.R. 8820. A bill to provide for the development and implementation of programs for youth camp safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:  
H.R. 8821. A bill to establish an arbitration board to settle disputes between supervisory organizations and the U.S. Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:  
H.R. 8822. A bill to establish a Federal State Legislative Council; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BOLAND:  
H.R. 8825. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commission, and corporations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS (for himself, Mr. ABRNOR, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BYRON, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, and Mr. COLLINS of Texas):

H.J. Res. 624. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the fourth Sunday of November of each year as "National Grandparents' Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GROVER, Mr. JUDE, and Mr. GUNTER):

H.J. Res. 625. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the fourth Sunday of November of each year as "National Grandparents' Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS (for himself and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H.J. Res. 626. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the fourth Sunday of November of each year as "National Grandparents' Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS (for himself, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. HECHLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HINSHAW, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KING, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. LENT, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MINISH, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. MURPHY of New York):

H.J. Res. 627. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the fourth Sunday of November of each year as "National Grandparents' Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RARICK, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. SLACK, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. JAMES V. STANTON):

H.J. Res. 628. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the fourth Sunday of November of each year as "National Grandparents' Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS (for himself, Mr. STEELE, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. TREEN, Mr. VETSEY, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.J. Res. 629. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the fourth Sunday of November of each year as "National Grandparents' Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLIS:  
H. Res. 449. Resolution for the creation of congressional senior citizen internships; to the Committee on House Administration.

### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

257. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to investigating the prosecution of five residents of New York in Fort Worth, Tex., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private

bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 8823. A bill for the relief of James A. Wentz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8824. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to Mrs. Harriet La Pointe Vanderventer; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H. Res. 450. A resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 8795) for the relief of John J. Egan to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

241. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Dennis M. Ribarich, Co. C, 1/52, APO N.Y. 09139, and others, relative to initiating impeachment proceedings against the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE—Tuesday, June 19, 1973

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. WALTER D. HUDDLESTON, a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose kingdom is above all earthly kingdoms, watch over this Nation, its leaders, and its people in this crucial hour of world history. In our dealings with other nations may we be kind but firm, generous without extravagance, right without compromise. May our strength and wisdom be applied in bringing freedom, justice, and peace to the world.

Guide by Thy higher wisdom the President and all our leaders. In our dealings with each other may we be gentle, understanding, and fair. In dealing with ourselves may we require the best. May our private lives and public actions be in accord with our prayers.

We pray in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., June 19, 1973.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. WALTER D. HUDDLESTON, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. HUDDLESTON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 18, 1973, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER FOR HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 499 TO BE HELD AT THE DESK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 499, to extend a commission study on bankruptcy laws for a period of some 2 months—which I understand the House will pass later today—be held at the desk. I hope that it can be acted on at an appropriate time without being referred to committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 210, 211, and 212.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 7200) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise certain eligibility conditions for annuities; to change the railroad retirement tax rates; and to amend the Interstate Commerce

Act in order to improve the procedures pertaining to certain rate adjustments for carriers subject to part I of the act, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committees on Labor and Public Welfare, Finance, and Commerce, with amendments. The amendment of the Committees on Labor and Public Welfare and Finance is to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

### TITLE I—RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AMENDMENTS

#### PART A—TEMPORARY PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. Section 2(a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended—

(1) by striking out "Women" in paragraph 2 and inserting in lieu thereof "Individuals";

(2) by striking out "Men who will have attained the age of sixty and will have completed thirty years of service, or individuals" in paragraph 3 and inserting in lieu thereof "Individuals"; and

(3) by striking out "such men or" in paragraph 3 thereof.

SEC. 102. (a) Section 3201 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the rate of tax on employees under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act) is amended by striking out all that appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on the income of every employee a tax equal to the rate of the tax imposed with respect to wages by section 3101(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 plus the rate imposed by section 3101(b) of such Code of so much of the compensation paid to such employee for services rendered by him after September 30, 1973, as is not in excess of an amount equal to one-twelfth of the current maximum annual taxable 'wages' as defined in section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any month after September 30, 1973."

(b) Section 3202(a) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking out "1965" wherever it appears in the second sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "1973";

(2) by striking out "(1) \$450, or (11)" wherever it appears in the second sentence thereof; and

(3) by striking out "whichever is greater," wherever it appears in the second sentence thereof.

(c) Section 3211(a) of such Code (relating to the rate of tax on employee repre-