

LOOKS AT EYES

When meeting people, she said, she looked at their eyes.

"I can tell more about a person by looking into his eyes. I can't tell you what color hat you are wearing, but I can remember your eyes. I notice teeth, too. Teeth and eyes."

"Everyone has her own way of managing the White House," Mamie said. "And the First Ladies have different color schemes and want to rearrange the furniture differently, but you can do pretty much as you please."

"I always had one rule, though: I didn't interfere with Uncle Sam," she stated with emphasis.

"I think that President and Mrs. Nixon are bringing dignity back to the White House—which I'm sure was there when Ike and I were there," she said.

Mamie said she has noticed two differences between her way of entertaining and her successors'.

"I liked high floral arrangement, and I see now where they're using smaller ones. I would always use carnations as a base flower," she added, explaining that she did so to avoid guests' possible allergies to other flowers.

Her fondness for carnations was well known. "The Colorado growers used to send me 300 a week for my own use," she said.

Mamie had no measure of any difference between Mr. Nixon as vice-president and now as President.

NO BUSINESS TALK

"I wouldn't know. The minute Ike walked into the mansion, business was dropped. I never knew—we never discussed the presidency," she said.

"It goes back to letting him run his business and me run the house. As you can see, I'm not a woman's libber," she confessed.

Mamie also confessed to not being a cook, but said she did remember a recipe for tomato pudding she submitted to a cookbook once.

"It's good. You ought to try it," she urged. Again, the quick peal of laughter. "It's not a dessert pudding. You serve it with beef or any roast meat. It's made with tomato paste, not whole tomatoes," she explained.

(It's also made with brown sugar, salt, bread cubes and butter, and baked in the oven.)

Mamie's life-style is such that cooking need not concern her.

She travels with 12 Secret Service agents and a secretary, who work to make Mamie's passage as smooth as possible.

When in Boone, the entourage stays at the Imperial Inn, a motel, where they are given a wing to themselves. Her visits are kept so quiet that some of the motel staff never see her during her stay.

"I live pretty much my own life now," Mamie said. "I go hither and yon, work on my projects and keep in touch with my family."

Some of her projects include working on a "People-to-People" program and close contact with Gettysburg (Pa.) College and Eisenhower College in Seneca Falls, N.Y.

A typical day, Mamie said, could have her waking up early.

"I always ring for breakfast at 8:15. My secretary comes at 9, and we go over letters and things until 4. So it's a very long day."

"There's one thing I still have—my checkbook and my signature," she said. "I answer most of the letters I receive, but don't write that down or I'll have everyone writing me," she instructed half-seriously.

Mamie said she "truly enjoys" her yearly visit to her birthplace. "I'm proud I'm from Iowa," she said. "I'll always know where the tall corn grows!"

Her uncle Joel, who celebrated his birth-

day with Mamie on Wednesday, "lives in the very house where he was born," Mamie said. "Can you imagine that?"

She recalled that she and her three sisters used to sleep on a mattress outside her uncle's home when they visited in the summer as small children.

"We thought that was hot stuff. We'd fall asleep at 9 p.m. thinking it was midnight," she said.

Another vivid memory was traveling from the Doud home in Denver to her grandmother's house in Boone.

BEES FOUND HER

"We had plumbing and indoor lights and everything and then we'd come to grandma's in Boone—with an outhouse out back," she said. "There were more bees around that place! And they'd find me," she giggled.

Mamie is "very much a family person," and pointed out that she now has three great-grandchildren.

"I think I'm a strange grandmother," she declared. "I don't baby-sit."

She said that she was "very pleased" about grandson David's decision to leave military service and study law. "David gave his time—three years—to Uncle Sam. He's not militarily-inclined at all."

SECRET SERVICE

She paused, and looked toward the two Secret Service agents in the room. "They're almost family too," she said. "Some of them have been with me for 20 years."

"They all know my shortcomings," Mamie said ruefully. "I have to be helped when I walk, you know."

But when she gave her final comment and issued her last warm smile, Mamie stood erect and walked carefully from the room slowly and proudly, without the aid of waiting hands.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, November 27, 1973

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

Teach me Thy way, O Lord, that I may walk in Thy truth; unite my heart to fear Thy name.—Psalms 86: 11.

O Thou who art good, whose love is everlasting, and whose truth endures through all the ages, open our eyes that we may see the way Thy spirit is beckoning us and open our ears that we hear the voice of Truth as she calls us to be truehearted, wholehearted, faithful, and loyal in this critical hour of our national life. Give to us the dauntless courage to so live our own lives and to so lead our people that we as a nation may be lifted above the bitterness that blights the brightness of brotherhood and be carried beyond the strife which separates the spirits of men.

Make us united in great purposes, elevated to genuine sympathies and eager for all good works. Keep us close to Thee this day that we may walk the way of truth and live the life of love for the sake of our country and the peace of the world: Through Jesus Christ our Lord. 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 a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1106. An act to amend the Federal Reports Act to avoid undue delays in the collection of information by Government agencies.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1443, FURNISHING DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1443) to authorize the furnishing of defense articles and services to foreign countries and international organizations:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 93-664)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1443) to authorize the furnishing of defense articles and services to foreign countries and international organizations, 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 disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Assistance Act of 1973".

POLICY; DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 2. Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) In the chapter heading, immediately after "CHAPTER 1—POLICY", insert "DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATIONS".

(2) In section 102—

(A) insert "(a)" immediately after "STATEMENT OF POLICY.—"; and

(B) add at the end thereof the following:

"(b) The Congress further finds and declares that, with the help of United States economic assistance, progress has been made in creating a base for the economic progress of the less developed countries. At the same time, the conditions which shaped the United States foreign assistance program in the past have changed. While the United States must continue to seek increased cooperation and mutually beneficial relations with other nations, our relations with the less developed countries must be revised to reflect the new realities. In restructuring our relationships with these countries, the President should place appropriate emphasis on the following criteria:

"(1) Bilateral development aid should concentrate increasingly on sharing American technical expertise, farm commodities, and industrial goods to meet critical development problems, and less on large-scale cap-

ital transfers, which when made should be in association with contributions from other industrialized countries working together in a multilateral framework.

"(2) Future United States bilateral support for development should focus on critical problems in those functional sectors which affect the lives of the majority of the people in the developing countries: food production; rural development and nutrition; population planning and health; and education, public administration, and human resource development.

"(3) United States cooperation in development should be carried out to the maximum extent possible through the private sector, including those institutions which already have ties in the developing areas, such as educational institutions, cooperatives, credit unions, and voluntary agencies.

"(4) Development planning must be the responsibility of each sovereign country. United States assistance should be administered in a collaborative style to support the development goals chosen by each country receiving assistance.

"(5) United States bilateral development assistance should give the highest priority to undertakings submitted by host governments which directly improve the lives of the poorest of their people and their capacity to participate in the development of their countries.

"(6) The economic and social development programs to which the United States lends support should reflect, to the maximum extent practicable, the role of United States private investment in such economic and social development programs.

"(7) Under the policy guidance of the Secretary of State, the agency primarily responsible for administering this part should have the responsibility for coordinating all United States development-related activities."

(3) At the end thereof, add the following new sections:

"SEC. 103. FOOD AND NUTRITION.—In order to alleviate starvation, hunger, and malnutrition, and to provide basic services to poor people, enhancing their capacity for self-help, the President is authorized to furnish assistance, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for agriculture, rural development, and nutrition. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$291,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 104. POPULATION PLANNING AND HEALTH.—In order to increase the opportunities and motivation for family planning, to reduce the rate of population growth, to prevent and combat disease, and to help provide health services for the great majority, the President is authorized to furnish assistance on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for population planning and health. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, in addition to the funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$145,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 105. EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT.—In order to reduce illiteracy, to extend basic education and to increase manpower training in skills related to development, the President is authorized to furnish assistance on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for education, public administration, and human resource development. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$90,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975,

which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 106. SELECTED DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS.—The President is authorized to furnish assistance on such terms and conditions as he may determine, to help solve economic and social development problems in fields such as transportation, power, industry, urban development, and export development. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$53,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 107. SELECTED COUNTRIES AND ORGANIZATIONS.—The President is authorized to furnish assistance on such terms and conditions as he may determine, in support of the general economy of recipient countries or for development programs conducted by private or international organizations. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$39,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 108. APPLICATION OF EXISTING PROVISIONS.—Assistance under this chapter shall be furnished in accordance with the provisions of titles I, II, or X of chapter 2 of this part, and nothing in this chapter shall be construed to make inapplicable the restrictions, criteria, authorities, or other provisions of this or any other Act in accordance with which assistance furnished under this chapter would otherwise have been provided.

"SEC. 109. TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding section 108 of this Act, whenever the President determines it to be necessary for the purposes of this chapter, not to exceed 15 per centum of the funds made available for any provision of this chapter may be transferred to, and consolidated with, the funds made available for any other provision of this chapter, and may be used for any of the purposes for which such funds may be used, except that the total in the provision for the benefit of which the transfer is made shall not be increased by more than 25 per centum of the amount of funds made available for such provision. The authority of sections 610(a) and 614(a) of this Act may not be used to transfer funds made available under this chapter for use for purposes of any other provision of this Act.

"SEC. 110. COST-SHARING AND FUNDING LIMITS.—(a) No assistance shall be furnished by the United States Government to a country under sections 103 through 107 of this Act until the country provides assurances to the President, and the President is satisfied, that such country will provide at least 25 per centum of the costs of the entire program, project, or activity with respect to which such assistance is to be furnished, except that such costs borne by such country may be provided on an 'in-kind' basis.

"(b) No grant assistance shall be disbursed by the United States Government under sections 103 through 107 of this Act for a project, for a period exceeding thirty-six consecutive months, without further justification satisfactory to the Congress and efforts being made to obtain sources of financing within that country and from other foreign countries and multilateral organizations.

"SEC. 111. DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF CO-OPERATIVES.—In order to strengthen the participation of the urban and rural poor in their country's development, not less than \$20,000,000 of the funds made available for the purposes of this chapter shall be available during the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 only for assistance in the development of cooperatives in the less developed coun-

tries which will enable and encourage great numbers of the poor to help themselves toward a better life.

"SEC. 112. PROHIBITING POLICE TRAINING.—(a) No part of any appropriation made available to carry out this Act shall be used to conduct any police training or related program in a foreign country.

"(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply—

"(1) with respect to assistance rendered under section 515(c) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, or with respect to any authority of the Drug Enforcement Administration or the Federal Bureau of Investigation which relates to crimes of the nature which are unlawful under the laws of the United States; or

"(2) to any contract entered into prior to the date of enactment of this section with any person, organization, or agency of the United States Government to provide personnel to conduct, or assist in conducting, any such program.

Notwithstanding paragraph (2), subsection (a) shall apply to any renewal or extension of any contract referred to in such paragraph entered into on or after such date of enactment.

"SEC. 113. INTEGRATING WOMEN INTO NATIONAL ECONOMIES.—Sections 103 through 107 of this Act shall be administered so as to give particular attention to those programs, projects, and activities which tend to integrate women into the national economies of foreign countries, thus improving their status and assisting the total development effort.

"SEC. 114. LIMITING USE OF FUNDS FOR ABORTIONS.—None of the funds made available to carry out this part shall be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions."

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

SEC. 3. (a) Section 203 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 203. FISCAL PROVISIONS.—Not more than 50 per centum of dollar receipts scheduled to be paid during each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 from loans made pursuant to this part and from loans made under predecessor foreign assistance legislation are authorized to be made available for each such fiscal year for use for purposes of making loans under chapter 1 of this part. Such receipts shall remain available until expended."

(b) Effective July 1, 1975, such section 203 is repealed.

TECHNICAL COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

SEC. 4. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) In section 211 (a), in the last sentence immediately after the word "assistance", insert the word "directly".

(2) In section 214, strike out subsections (c) and (d) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) To carry out the purposes of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 \$19,000,000, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 \$6,500,000 in foreign currencies which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

"(e) Not later than June 30, 1974, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Congress such recommendations (including recommendations concerning which agency of the United States Government should administer such assistance) as he considers desirable for assistance to schools, libraries, and hospital centers for medical education and research, outside the United States, founded or sponsored by United States citizens and serving as study and demonstration centers for ideas and practices of the United States."

HOUSING GUARANTIES

SEC. 5. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

- (1) In section 221, strike out "\$205,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$305,000,000".
- (2) In section 223(1), strike out "June 30, 1974" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1975".

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

SEC. 6. Title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

- (1) In section 235(a) (4), strike out "June 30, 1974" and insert in lieu thereof "December 31, 1974".
- (2) In section 240(h), strike out "June 30, 1973" and insert in lieu thereof "December 31, 1974".

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

SEC. 7. Section 252(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1974, \$934,000, and for the fiscal year 1975, \$934,000, for grants to the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance, Inc., in accordance with the purposes of this title."

PROGRAMS RELATING TO POPULATION GROWTH

SEC. 8. Section 292 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973, \$125,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the fiscal year 1974, \$125,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1975, \$130,000,000".

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 9. Chapter 3 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

- (1) At the end of section 301 add the following new subsection:

"(e) (1) In the case of the United Nations and its affiliated organizations, including the International Atomic Energy Agency, the President shall, acting through the United States representative to such organizations, propose and actively seek the establishment by the governing authorities of such organizations a single professionally qualified group of appropriate size for the purpose of providing an independent and continuous program of selective examination, review, and evaluation of the programs and activities of such organizations. Such proposal shall provide that such group shall be established in accordance with such terms of reference as such governing authority may prescribe and that the reports of such group on each examination, review, and evaluation shall be submitted directly to such governing authority for transmittal to the representative of each individual member nation. Such proposal shall further include a statement of auditing and reporting standards, as prepared by the Comptroller General of the United States, for the consideration of the governing authority of the international organization concerned to assist in formulating terms of reference for such review and evaluation group.

"(2) In the case of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Asian Development Bank, the President shall, acting through the United States representative to such organizations, propose and actively seek the establishment by the governing authorities of such organizations, pro-

fessionally qualified groups of appropriate size for the purpose of providing an independent and continuous program of selective examination, review, and evaluation of the programs and activities of such organizations. Such proposal shall provide that such groups shall be established in accordance with such terms of reference as such governing authorities may prescribe, and that the reports of such groups on each examination, review, and evaluation shall be submitted directly to such governing authority for transmittal to the representative of each individual member nation. Such proposal shall further include a statement of auditing and reporting standards, as prepared by the Comptroller General of the United States, for the consideration of the governing authority of the international organization concerned to assist in formulating terms of reference for such review and evaluation groups.

"(3) Reports received by the United States representatives to these international organizations under this subsection and related information on actions taken as a result of recommendations made therein shall be submitted promptly to the President for transmittal to the Congress and to the Comptroller General. The Comptroller General shall periodically review such reports and related information and shall report simultaneously to the Congress and to the President any suggestions the Comptroller General may deem appropriate concerning auditing and reporting standards followed by such groups, the recommendations made and actions taken as a result of such recommendations."

(2) In section 302(a), strike out "for the fiscal year 1972, \$138,000,000 and for the fiscal year 1973, \$138,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "for the fiscal year 1974, \$127,822,000 and for the fiscal year 1975, \$150,000,000".

(3) In section 302(b) (2), strike out "for use in the fiscal year 1972, \$15,000,000, and for use in the fiscal year 1973, \$15,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "for use in the fiscal year 1974, \$14,500,000, and for use in the fiscal year 1975, \$14,500,000".

(4) Section 302(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Of the funds made available to carry out this chapter for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, \$18,000,000 shall be available in each such fiscal year only for contributions to the United Nations Children's Fund."

(5) In section 302(e), strike out \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972 and \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year 1973" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974 and \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1975".

CONTINGENCY FUND

SEC. 10. Section 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows: "(a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the President for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 not to exceed \$30,000,000, to provide assistance authorized by this part primarily for disaster relief purposes, in accordance with the provisions applicable to the furnishing of such assistance."

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

SEC. 11. (a) Section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL—" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) (1) Not later than forty-five days after the date on which each calendar quarter of each year ends, the President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, a report on the programing and obligation, on a calendar quarter basis, of funds under this chapter prior to such date.

"(2) Not later than forty-five days after the date on which the second calendar

quarter of each year ends and not later than forty-five days after the date on which the fourth calendar quarter of each year ends, the President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, a complete and detailed semiannual report on the activities and operations carried out under this chapter prior to such date. Such semiannual report shall include, but shall not be limited to—

"(A) the status of each agreement concluded prior to such date with other countries to carry out the purposes of this chapter; and

"(B) the aggregate of obligations and expenditures made, and the types and quantity of equipment provided, on a calendar quarter basis, prior to such date—

"(i) to carry out the purposes of this chapter with respect to each country and each international organization receiving assistance under this chapter, including the cost of United States personnel engaged in carrying out such purposes in each such country and with each such international organization;

"(ii) to carry out each program conducted under this chapter in each country and by each international organization, including the cost of United States personnel engaged in carrying out each such program; and

"(iii) for administrative support services within the United States to carry out the purposes of this chapter, including the cost of United States personnel engaged in carrying out such purposes in the United States."

(b) Section 482 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$42,500,000" and all that follows down through the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "\$42,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975. Amounts appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until expended."

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

SEC. 12. (a) Chapter 1 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 502A. EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.—Excess defense articles shall be provided whenever possible rather than providing such articles by the procurement of new items."

(b) Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 503 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 503. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—(a) The President is authorized to furnish military assistance, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, to any friendly country or international organization, the assisting of which the President finds will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace and which is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance, by—

"(1) acquiring from any source and providing (by loan or grant) any defense article or defense service; or

"(2) assigning or detailing members of the Armed Forces of the United States and other personnel of the Department of Defense to perform duties of a noncombatant nature.

"(b) In addition to such other terms and conditions as the President may determine pursuant to subsection (a), defense articles may be loaned thereunder only if—

"(1) there is a bona fide reason, other than the shortage of funds, for providing such articles on a loan basis rather than on a grant basis;

"(2) there is a reasonable expectation that such articles will be returned to the agency making the loan at the end of the loan period, unless the loan is then renewed;

"(3) the loan period is of fixed duration not exceeding five years, during which such article may be recalled for any reason by the United States;

"(4) the agency making the loan is reim-

bursed for the loan based on the amount charged to the appropriation for military assistance under subsection (c); and

"(5) arrangements are made with the agency making the loan to be reimbursed in the event such article is lost or destroyed while on loan, such reimbursement being made first out of any funds available to carry out this chapter and based on the depreciated value of the article at the time of loss or destruction.

"(c) (1) In the case of any loan of a defense article or defense service made under this section, there shall be a charge to the appropriation for military assistance for any fiscal year while the article or service is on loan in an amount based on—

"(A) the out-of-pocket expenses authorized to be incurred in connection with such loan during such fiscal year; and

"(B) the depreciation which occurs during such year while such article is on loan.

"(2) The provisions of this subsection shall not apply—

"(A) to any particular defense article or defense service which the United States Government agreed, prior to the date of enactment of this subsection, to lend; and

"(B) to any defense article or defense service, or portion thereof, acquired with funds appropriated for military assistance under this Act."

(2) In section 504(a)—

(A) strike out "\$500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972" and insert in lieu thereof "\$512,500,000 for the fiscal year 1974"; and

(B) strike out "forty countries" and insert in lieu thereof "thirty-one countries".

(3) Section 505 is amended by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(e) In considering a request for approval of any transfer of any weapon, weapons system, munitions, aircraft, military boat, military vessel, or other implement of war to another country, the President shall not give his consent under subsection (a) (1) or (a) (4) to the transfer unless the United States itself would transfer the defense article under consideration to that country, and prior to the date he intends to give his consent to the transfer, the President notifies the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate in writing of each such intended consent, the justification for giving such consent, the defense article for which he intends to give his consent to be so transferred, and the foreign country to which that defense article is to be transferred. In addition, the President shall not give his consent under subsection (a) (1) or (a) (4) to the transfer of any significant defense articles on the United States Munitions List unless the foreign country requesting consent to transfer agrees to demilitarize such defense articles prior to transfer, or the proposed recipient foreign country provides a commitment in writing to the United States Government that it will not transfer such defense articles, if not demilitarized, to any other foreign country or person without first obtaining the consent of the President.

"(f) Effective July 1, 1974, no defense article shall be furnished to any country on a grant basis unless such country shall have agreed that the net proceeds of sale received by such country in disposing of any weapon, weapons system, munition, aircraft, military boat, military vessel, or other implement of war received under this chapter will be paid to the United States Government and shall be available to pay all official costs of the United States Government payable in the currency of that country, including all costs relating to the financing of international educational and cultural exchange activities in which that country participates under the programs authorized by the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961."

(4) In section 506(a)—

(A) strike out "the fiscal year 1972" in

each place it appears and insert in lieu thereof "the fiscal year 1974";

(B) strike out "vital to the security" and insert in lieu thereof "in the security interests"; and

(C) strike out "\$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$250,000,000".

(5) Sections 507, 508, 509, 512, and 514 are repealed.

(6) Section 513 is amended—

(A) by striking out "THAILAND.—" in the section heading and inserting in lieu thereof "THAILAND AND LAOS.—(a)"; and

(B) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) After June 30, 1974, no military assistance shall be furnished by the United States to Laos directly or through any other foreign country unless that assistance is authorized under this Act or the Foreign Military Sales Act."

(c) Section 655(c) shall not apply to assistance authorized to be furnished under any provision of law for fiscal year 1974.

SECURITY SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 13. Chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) in section 532 by striking out "for the fiscal year 1972 not to exceed \$618,000,000, of which not less than \$50,000,000 shall be available solely for Israel" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the fiscal year 1974 not to exceed \$125,000,000, of which not less than \$50,000,000 shall be available solely for Israel"; and

(2) by striking out section 533.

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 14. Section 617 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "twelve" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight".

PROHIBITIONS

SEC. 15. The first full paragraph of section 620(e) (1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "no other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection." and inserting in lieu thereof "the provisions of this subsection shall not be waived with respect to any country unless the President determines and certifies that such a waiver is important to the national interests of the United States. Such certification shall be reported immediately to Congress."

EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL

SEC. 16. Section 625 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) (1) In accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe, the following categories of personnel who serve in the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of this Act shall become participants in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System:

"(A) persons serving under unlimited appointments in employment subject to subsection (d) (2) of this section as Foreign Service Reserve officers and as Foreign Service staff officers and employees; and

"(B) a person serving in a position to which he was appointed by the President, whether with or without the advice and consent of the Senate, if (1) such person shall have served previously under an unlimited appointment pursuant to such subsection (d) (2) or a comparable provision of predecessor legislation to this Act, and (2) following service specified in clause (1) of this subparagraph, such person shall have served continuously with such agency or its predecessor agencies only in positions established under the authority of sections 624(a) and 631 (b) or comparable provisions of predecessor legislation to this Act.

"(2) Upon becoming a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System, any such officer or employee shall make a special contribution to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 852

of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. Thereafter, compulsory contributions will be made with respect to each such participating officer or employee in accordance with the provisions of section 811 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

"(3) The provisions of section 636 and title VIII of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, shall apply to participation in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System by any such officer or employee.

"(4) If an officer who becomes a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System under paragraph (1) of this subsection is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone, to a position in any agency of the United States Government, any United States delegation or mission to any international organization, in any international commission, or in any international body, such officer shall not, by virtue of the acceptance of such an appointment, lose his status as a participant in the system.

"(5) Any such officer or employee who becomes a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be mandatorily retired (A) at the end of the month in which he reaches age seventy, or (B) earlier if, during the third year after the effective date of this subsection, he attains age sixty-four or if he is over age sixty-four; during the fourth year at age sixty-three; during the fifth year at age sixty-two; during the sixth year at age sixty-one; and thereafter at the end of the month in which he reaches age sixty. However, no participant shall be mandatorily retired under this paragraph while serving in a position to which appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Any participant who completes a period of authorized service after reaching the mandatory retirement age specified in this paragraph shall be retired at the end of the month in which such service is completed.

"(6) Whenever the President deems it to be in the public interest, he may extend any participant's service for a period not to exceed five years after the mandatory retirement date of such officer or employee.

"(7) This subsection shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins more than one year after the date of its enactment, except that any officer or employee who, before such effective date, meets the requirements for participation in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System under paragraph (1) of this subsection may elect to become a participant before the effective date of this subsection. Such officer or employee shall become a participant on the first day of the second month following the date of his application for earlier participation. Any officer or employee who becomes a participant in the system under the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, who is age fifty-seven or over on the effective date of this subsection, may retire voluntarily at any time before mandatory retirement under paragraph (5) of this subsection and receive retirement benefits under section 821 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

"(8) Any officer or employee who is separated for cause while a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System pursuant to this subsection, shall be entitled to benefits in accordance with section 837 (b) and (d) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. The provisions of subsection (e) of this section shall apply to participants in lieu of the provisions of sections 633 and 634 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended."

REPORTS AND INFORMATION

SEC. 17. Section 634 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsections:

"(f) The President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a comprehensive report showing, as of June 30 and December 31 of each year, the status of each loan and each contract of guarantee or insurance theretofore made under this Act, with respect to which there remains outstanding any unpaid obligation or potential liability; the status of each sale of defense articles or defense services on credit terms, and each contract of guarantee in connection with any such sale, theretofore made under the Foreign Military Sales Act, with respect to which there remains outstanding any unpaid obligation or potential liability; the status of each sale of agriculture commodities on credit terms theretofore made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with respect to which there remains outstanding any unpaid obligation; and the status of each transaction in which a loan, contract of guarantee or insurance, or extension of credit (or participation therein) was theretofore made under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, with respect to which there remains outstanding any unpaid obligation or potential liability. Such report shall include individually only any loan, contract, sale, extension of credit, or other transaction listed in this subsection in excess of \$1,000,000.

"(g) The President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, not later than January 31 of each year, a comprehensive report, based upon the latest data available, showing—

"(1) a summary of the worldwide dimensions of debt-servicing problems among such countries, together with a detailed statement of the debt-servicing problems of each such country;

"(2) a summary of all forms of debt relief granted by the United States with respect to such countries, together with a detailed statement of the specific debt relief granted with respect to each such country and the purpose for which it was granted;

"(3) a summary of the worldwide effect of the debt relief granted by the United States on the availability of funds, authority, or other resources of the United States to make any such loan, sale, contract of guarantee or insurance, or extension of credit, together with a detailed statement of the effect of such debt relief with respect to each such country; and

"(4) a summary of the net aid flow from the United States to such countries, taking into consideration the debt relief granted by the United States, together with a detailed analysis of such net aid flow with respect to each such country."

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Sec. 18. Section 637(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year 1972, \$50,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1973, \$50,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, \$45,000,000".

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

Sec. 19. Section 638 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "PEACE CORPS ASSISTANCE" and inserting in lieu thereof "EXCLUSIONS".

AFRICAN SAHEL Famine and Disaster Relief and Development Program

Sec. 20. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by inserting after section 639 the following new sections:

"SEC. 639A. Famine and Disaster Relief to the African Sahel.—(a) The Congress affirms the response of the United States Government in providing famine and disaster relief and related assistance in connection with the drought in the Sahelian nations of Africa. The President shall report to Congress as soon as possible on solutions to this problem of famine and further pro-

pose how any of these solutions may be carried out by multilateral organizations.

"(b) Notwithstanding any prohibitions or restrictions contained in this or any other Act, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$25,000,000 to remain available until expended, for use by the President, under such terms and conditions as he may determine, for emergency and recovery needs, including drought, famine, and disaster relief, and rehabilitation and related assistance, for the drought-stricken Sahelian nations of Africa.

"SEC. 639B. AFRICAN SAHEL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—The Congress supports the initiative of the United States Government in undertaking consultations and planning with the countries concerned, with other nations providing assistance, with the United Nations, and with other concerned international and regional organizations, toward the development and support of a comprehensive long-term African Sahel development program."

COORDINATION; SHIPPING DIFFERENTIAL

Sec. 21. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 640B. COORDINATION.—(a) The President shall establish a system for coordination of United States policies and programs which affect United States interests in the development of low-income countries. To that end, the President shall establish a Development Coordination Committee which shall advise him with respect to coordination of United States policies and programs affecting the development of the developing countries, including programs of bilateral and multilateral development assistance. The Committee shall include the head of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I, Chairman, and representatives of the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor, the Executive Office of the President, and other executive departments and agencies, as the President shall designate.

"(b) The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination among—

"(1) the various departments and agencies of the United States Government having representatives in diplomatic missions abroad; and

"(2) representatives of the United States Government in each country, under the direction of the Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission.

The President shall keep the Congress advised of his actions under this subsection.

"(c) Programs authorized by this Act shall be undertaken with the foreign policy guidance of the Secretary of State.

"(d) The President shall report to the Congress during the first quarter of each calendar year on United States actions affecting the development of the low-income countries and on the impact of those undertakings upon the national income, employment, wages, and working conditions in the United States.

"SEC. 640C. SHIPPING DIFFERENTIAL.—For the purpose of facilitating implementation of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1241(b)), funds made available for the purposes of chapter 1 of part I or for purposes of part V may be used to make grants to recipients to pay all or any portion of such differential as is determined by the Secretary of Commerce to exist between United States and foreign-flag vessel charter or freight rates. Grants made under this section shall be paid with United States-owned foreign currencies wherever feasible."

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 22. Section 644 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (g) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) 'Excess defense articles' means the quantity of defense articles owned by the United States Government, and not procured in anticipation of military assistance or sales requirements, or pursuant to a military assistance or sales order, which is in excess of the Approved Force Acquisition Objective and Approved Force Retention Stock of all Department of Defense Components at the time such articles are dropped from inventory by the supplying agency for delivery to countries or international organizations under this Act."

(2) Subsection (i) is repealed.

(3) Subsection (m) is amended to read as follows:

"(m) 'Value' means—

"(1) with respect to an excess defense article, the actual value of the article plus the gross cost incurred by the United States Government in repairing, rehabilitating, or modifying the article, except that for purposes of section 632(d) such actual value shall not be taken into account;

"(2) with respect to a nonexcess defense article delivered from inventory to foreign countries or international organizations under this Act, the acquisition cost to the United States Government, adjusted as appropriate for condition and market value;

"(3) with respect to a nonexcess defense article delivered from new procurement to foreign countries or international organizations under this Act, the contract or production costs of such article; and

"(4) with respect to a defense service, the cost to the United States Government of such service."

ANNUAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE REPORT

Sec. 23. Section 657 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 657. ANNUAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE REPORT.—(a) In order that the Congress and the American people may be better and more currently informed regarding the volume and cost of assistance extended by the United States Government to foreign countries and international organizations, and in order that the Congress and the American people may be better informed regarding the sale of arms to foreign countries and international organizations by private industry of the United States, not later than December 31 of each year the President shall transmit to the Congress an annual report, for the fiscal year ending prior to the fiscal year in which the report is transmitted, showing—

"(1) the aggregate dollar value of all foreign assistance provided by the United States Government by any means to all foreign countries and international organizations, and the aggregate dollar value of such assistance by category provided by the United States Government to each such country and organization, during that fiscal year.

"(2) the total amounts of foreign currency paid by each foreign country or international organization to the United States Government in such fiscal year, what each payment was made for, whether any portion of such payment was returned by the United States Government to the country or organization from which the payment was obtained or whether any such portion was transferred by the United States Government to another foreign country or international organization, and, if so returned or transferred, the kind of assistance obtained by that country or organization with those foreign currencies and the dollar value of such kind of assistance;

"(3) the aggregate dollar value of all weapons, weapons systems, munitions, aircraft, military boats, military vessels, and other implements of war, and the aggregate dollar value of each category of such implements of war, exported under any export license, to all foreign countries and interna-

tional organizations, and to each such country and organization, during that fiscal year;

"(4) all exports of significant defense articles on the United States Munitions List to any foreign government, international organization, or other foreign recipient or purchaser, by the United States under this Act or any other authority, or by any individual, corporation, partnership, or other association doing business in the United States, including but not limited to, full information as to the particular defense articles so exported, the particular recipient or purchaser, the terms of the export, including its selling price, if any, and such other information as may be appropriate to enable the Congress to evaluate the distribution of United States defense articles abroad; and

"(5) such other matters relating to foreign assistance provided by the United States Government as the President considers appropriate, including explanation of the information required under clauses (1) through (4) of this subsection.

"(b) All information contained in any report transmitted under this section shall be public information. However, in the case of any item of information to be included in any such report that the President, on an extraordinary basis, determines is clearly detrimental to the security of the United States, he shall explain in a supplemental report why publication of each specific item would be detrimental to the security of the United States. A supplemental report shall be transmitted to the Congress at the same time that the report is transmitted.

"(c) If the Congress is not in session at the time a report or supplemental report is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall accept the report or supplemental report on behalf of their respective Houses of Congress and present the report or supplemental report to the two Houses immediately upon their convening.

"(d) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) 'foreign assistance' means any tangible or intangible item provided by the United States Government under this or any other law to a foreign country or international organization, including, but not limited to, any training, service, or technical advice, any item of real, personal, or mixed property, any agricultural commodity, United States dollars, and any currencies owned by the United States Government of any foreign country; and

"(2) 'provided by the United States Government' includes, but is not limited to, foreign assistance provided by means of gift, loan, sale, credit, or guaranty."

INDOCHINA POSTWAR RECONSTRUCTION

Sec. 24. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART V

"SEC. 801. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The President is authorized to furnish, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, assistance for relief and reconstruction of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, including especially humanitarian assistance to refugees, civilian war casualties, and other persons disadvantaged by hostilities or conditions related to those hostilities in South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. No assistance shall be furnished under this section to South Vietnam unless the President receives assurances satisfactory to him that no assistance furnished under this part, and no local currencies generated as a result of assistance furnished under this part, will be used for support of police, or prison construction and administration, within South Vietnam.

"SEC. 802. AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this chapter, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, for the fiscal year 1974 not

to exceed \$504,000,000, which amount is authorized to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 803. ASSISTANCE TO SOUTH VIETNAMESE CHILDREN.—(a) It is the sense of the Congress that inadequate provision has been made (1) for the establishment, expansion, and improvement of day care centers, orphanages, hostels, school feeding programs, health and welfare programs, and training related to these programs which are designed for the benefit of South Vietnamese children, disadvantaged by hostilities in Vietnam or conditions related to those hostilities, and (2) for the adoption by United States citizens of South Vietnamese children who are orphaned or abandoned, or whose parents or sole surviving parent, as the case may be, has irrevocably relinquished all parental rights, particularly children fathered by United States citizens.

"(b) The President is, therefore, authorized to provide assistance, on terms and conditions he considers appropriate, for the purposes described in clauses (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section. Of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 802 for fiscal year 1974, \$5,000,000, or its equivalent in local currency, shall be available until expended solely to carry out this section. Not more than 10 per centum of the funds made available to carry out this section may be expended for the purposes referred to in clause (2) of subsection (a). Assistance provided under this section shall be furnished, to the maximum extent practicable, under the auspices of and by international agencies or private voluntary agencies.

"SEC. 804. CENTER FOR PLASTIC AND RECONSTRUCTIVE SURGERY IN SAIGON.—Of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 802 for the fiscal year 1974, not less than \$712,000 shall be available solely for furnishing assistance to the Center for Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery in Saigon.

"SEC. 805. AUTHORITY.—All references to part I, whether heretofore or hereafter enacted, shall be deemed to be references also to this part unless otherwise specifically provided. The authorities available to administer part I of this Act shall be available to administer programs authorized in this part."

FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT AMENDMENTS

Sec. 25. The Foreign Military Sales Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"In order to reduce the role of the United States Government in the furnishing of defense articles and defense services to foreign countries and international organizations, and return such transactions to commercial channels, the United States Government shall reduce its sales, credit sales, and guaranties of such articles and defense services as soon as, and to the maximum extent, practicable."

(2) Section 3 is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2) of subsection (a) and inserting before "unless" the following: "and not to use or permit the use of such article for purposes other than those for which furnished";

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) of subsection (a) as paragraph (4) and inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) the country or international organization shall have agreed that it will maintain the security of such article and will provide substantially the same degree of security protection afforded to such article by the United States Government; and";

(C) by inserting the following immediately before the last sentence of subsection (a):

"In considering a request for approval of any transfer of any weapon, weapons system, munitions, aircraft, military boat, military vessel, or other implement of war to another country, the President shall not give his consent under paragraph (2) to the transfer unless the United States itself would

transfer the defense article under consideration to that country, and prior to the date he intends to give his consent to the transfer, the President notifies the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate in writing of each such intended consent, the justification for giving such consent, the defense article for which he intends to give his consent to be so transferred, and the foreign country to which that defense article is to be transferred. In addition, the President shall not give his consent under paragraph (2) to the transfer of any significant defense articles on the United States Munitions List unless the foreign country requesting consent to transfer agrees to demilitarize such defense articles prior to transfer, or the proposed recipient foreign country provides a commitment in writing to the United States Government that it will not transfer such defense articles, if not demilitarized, to any other foreign country or person without first obtaining the consent of the President."; and

(D) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (d), any foreign country which hereafter uses defense articles or defense services furnished such country under this Act, in substantial violation of any provision of this Act or any agreement entered into under this Act, shall be immediately ineligible for further cash sales, credits, or guaranties.

"(d) No sophisticated weapons, including sophisticated jet aircraft or spare parts and associated ground equipment for such aircraft, shall be furnished under this or any other Act to any foreign country on or after the date that the President determines that such country has violated any agreement it has made in accordance with paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section or section 505(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any other provision of law requiring similar agreements. Such country shall remain ineligible in accordance with this subsection until such time as the President determines that such violation has ceased, that the country concerned has given assurances satisfactory to the President that such violation will not reoccur, and that, if such violation involved the transfer of sophisticated weapons without the consent of the President, such weapons have been returned to the country concerned."

(3) Section 22 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. PROCUREMENT FOR CASH SALES.—(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the President may, without requirement for charge to any appropriation or contract authorization otherwise provided, enter into contracts for the procurement of defense articles or defense services for sale for United States dollars to any foreign country or international organization if such country or international organization provides the United States Government with a dependable undertaking (1) to pay the full amount of such contract which will assure the United States Government against any loss on the contract, and (2) to make funds available in such amounts and at such times as may be required to meet the payments required by the contract, and any damages and costs that may accrue from the cancellation of such contract, in advance of the time such payments, damages, or costs are due.

"(b) The President may, when he determines it to be in the national interest, accept a dependable undertaking of a foreign country or international organization with respect to any such sale, to make full payment within 120 days after delivery of the defense articles or the rendering of the defense services. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used to meet the payments required by the contracts for the procurement of defense articles and defense services and shall be reimbursed by the amounts subsequently received from the

country or international organization to whom articles or services are sold."

(4) In section 24(c)—

(A) strike out "pursuant to section 31" and insert in lieu thereof "to carry out this Act"; and

(B) insert "principal amount of" immediately before the words "contractual liability" wherever they appear.

(5) In section 31(a), strike out "\$40,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972" and insert in lieu thereof "\$325,000,000 for fiscal year 1974".

(6) In section 31(b), strike out "(excluding credits covered by guaranties issued pursuant to section 24(b), (and the face amount of guaranties issued pursuant to sections 24(a) and (b) shall not exceed \$550,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972, of which amount not less than \$300,000,000 shall be available to Israel only)" and insert in lieu thereof "and of the principal amount of loans guaranteed pursuant to section 24(a) shall not exceed \$730,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974, of which amount not less than \$300,000,000 shall be available to Israel only".

(7) In section 33(a)—

(A) strike out "cash sales pursuant to sections 21 and 22";

(B) strike out "(excluding credits covered by guaranties issued pursuant to section 24(b)), of the face amount of contracts of guaranty issued pursuant to sections 24(a) and (b)" and insert in lieu thereof "of the principal amount of loans guaranteed pursuant to section 24(a)"; and

(C) strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000,000".

(8) In section 33(b)—

(A) strike out "cash sales pursuant to sections 21 and 22"; and

(B) strike out "(excluding credits covered by guaranties issued pursuant to section 24(b)), of the face amount of contracts of guaranty issued pursuant to sections 24(a) and (b)" and insert in lieu thereof "of the principal amount of loans guaranteed pursuant to section 24(a)".

(9) Section 33(c) is repealed.

(10) In section 36, strike out subsections (a) and (b).

(11) In section 37(b), insert after "indebtedness" the following: "under section 24(b) (excluding such portion of the sales proceeds as may be required at the time of disposition to be obligated as a reserve for payment of claims under guaranties issued pursuant to section 24(b), which sums are made available for such obligations)".

(12) Add at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 47. DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this Act, the term—

"(1) 'excess defense article' has the meaning provided by section 644(g) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; and

"(2) 'value' means, in the case of an excess defense article, not less than the greater of—

"(A) the gross cost incurred by the United States Government in repairing, rehabilitating, or modifying such article, plus the scrap value; or

"(B) the market value, if ascertainable."

AMENDMENTS TO FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1971

SEC. 26. The Act entitled "An Act to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act, and for other purposes", approved January 12, 1971 (84 Stat. 2053), is amended as follows:

(1) Section 8(a) is amended by inserting immediately before clause (1) the following: "(less amounts to be transferred under section 632(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961)".

(2) Section 8(b) is amended—

(A) by striking out "The provisions" and inserting in lieu thereof "In the case of excess defense articles which are generated abroad, the provisions"; and

(B) by striking out "\$185,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$150,000,000".

(3) Section 8(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) For purposes of this section, the term 'value' has the same meaning as given it in section 644(m) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961."

(4) Section 9 is repealed.

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN MUNITIONS CONTROL LICENSES

SEC. 27. Section 414 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Licenses issued for the export of articles on the United States Munitions List in excess of \$100,000 shall be reported promptly to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, which report shall contain—

"(1) the items to be exported under the license;

"(2) the quantity of each such item to be furnished;

"(3) the name and address of the consignee and of the ultimate user of each such item; and

"(4) an injunction whenever appropriate, concerning the necessity to protect the confidentiality of the information provided."

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

SEC. 28. Section 17 of the Asian Development Bank Act is amended by striking out "\$60,000,000 for fiscal year 1972 and \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000".

ACCESS TO CERTAIN MILITARY BASES ABROAD

SEC. 29. None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be used to provide any kind of assistance to any foreign country in which a military base is located if—

(1) such base was constructed or is being maintained or operated with funds furnished by the United States; and

(2) personnel of the United States carry out military operations from such base; unless and until the President has determined that the government of such country has, consistent with security, authorized access, on a regular basis, to bona fide news media correspondents of the United States to such military base.

TERMINATION OF INDOCHINA WAR

SEC. 30. No funds authorized or appropriated under this or any other law may be expended to finance military or paramilitary operations by the United States in or over Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia.

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 31. No funds authorized or appropriated under any provision of law shall be made available for the purpose of financing directly or indirectly any military or paramilitary combat operations by foreign forces in Laos, Cambodia, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, or Thailand unless (1) such operations are conducted by the forces of that government receiving such funds within the borders of that country, or (2) specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

POLITICAL PRISONERS

SEC. 32. It is the sense of Congress that the President should deny any economic or military assistance to the government of any foreign country which practices the internment or imprisonment of that country's citizens for political purposes.

ALBERT SCHWEITZER HOSPITAL

SEC. 33. There is authorized to be appropriated to the President for fiscal year 1974, \$1,000,000 to make grants, on such terms and conditions as he may specify, to the Albert Schweitzer Hospital in Gabon.

PRISONERS OF WAR AND INDIVIDUALS MISSING IN ACTION

SEC. 34. (a) The Congress declares that—
(1) the families of those one thousand three hundred individuals missing in action during the Indochina conflict have suffered extraordinary torment in ascertaining the full and complete information about their loved ones who are formally classified as missing in action;

(2) United States involvement in the Indochina conflict has come to a negotiated end with the signing of the Vietnam Agreement in Paris on January 27, 1973, and section 307 of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1973, requires that "None of the funds herein appropriated under this Act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in or over Cambodia, Laos, North Vietnam, and South Vietnam or off the shores of Cambodia, Laos, North Vietnam and South Vietnam by United States forces, and after August 15, 1973, no other funds heretofore appropriated under any other Act may be expended for such purpose.";

(3) the question of the return of prisoners of war and accounting for individuals missing in action and dead in Laos is covered by article 18 of the Protocol signed by representatives of the Lao Patriotic Front (Pathet Lao) and the Royal Laotian Government in Vientiane on September 14, 1973 (which implements article 5 of the Agreement signed by the Pathet Lao and that government in Vientiane on February 21, 1973, requiring the release of all prisoners "regardless of nationality" captured and held in Laos), and paragraph C of such article 18 provides that, within "15 to 30 days" from the date of the signing of the Protocol, each side is to report the number of those prisoners and individuals still held, with an indication of their nationality and status, together with a list of names and any who died in captivity; and

(4) few of the United States men lost in Laos during the military engagements in Indochina have been returned, and with knowledge about many of these men not yet being fully disclosed, and the North Vietnam cease-fire provisions calling for inspection of crash and grave sites and for other forms of cooperation have not been fully complied with.

(b) It is, therefore, the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the provisions for the release of prisoners and an accounting of individuals missing and dead, as provided for in article 18 of the Protocol signed on September 14, 1973, by the Pathet Lao and the Royal Laotian Government, be adhered to in spirit and in deed; and

(2) the faithful compliance with the spirit of the Laotian Agreement and Protocol on the question of individuals missing in action will encourage all parties in Indochina to cooperate in providing complete information on all nationals of any nation who may be captured or missing at any place in Indochina.

RIGHTS IN CHILE

SEC. 35. It is the sense of the Congress that (1) the President should request the Government of Chile to protect the human rights of all individuals, Chilean and foreign, as provided in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, and other relevant international legal instruments guaranteeing the granting of asylum, safe conduct, and the humane treatment or release of prisoners; (2) the President should support international humanitarian initiatives by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the International Committee of the Red Cross to insure the protection and safe conduct and resettlement of political refugees, the humane treatment of political prisoners, and the full inspection of detention facilities

under international auspices; (3) the President should support and facilitate efforts by voluntary agencies to meet emergency relief needs; and (4) the President should request of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to undertake an immediate inquiry into recent events occurring in Chile.

REVISION OF SOCIAL PROGRESS TRUST FUND AGREEMENT

Sec. 36 (a) The President or his delegate shall seek, as soon as possible, a revision of the Social Progress Trust Fund Agreement (dated June 19, 1961) between the United States and the Inter-American Development Bank. Such revision should provide for the—

(1) periodic transfer of unencumbered capital resources of such trust fund, and of any future repayments or other accruals otherwise payable to such trust fund, to the Inter-American Foundation, to be administered by the Foundation for purposes of part IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 (22 U.S.C. 290f and following);

(2) utilization of such unencumbered capital resources, future repayments, and other accruals by the Inter-American Development Bank for purposes of sections 1 and 2 of the Latin American Development Act (22 U.S.C. 1942 and 1943) in such a way that the resources received in the currencies of the more developed member countries are utilized to the extent possible for the benefit of the lesser developed member countries; or

(3) both the transfer described in paragraph (1) and the utilization described in paragraph (2).

(b) Any transfer or utilization under this section shall be in such proportions as may be agreed to between the United States and the Inter-American Development Bank.

(c) Any transfer under subsection (a) (1) shall be in the amounts, and in available currencies, determined in consultation with the Inter-American Foundation, to be required for its program purposes.

(d) The revision of the Social Progress Trust Fund Agreement pursuant to this section shall provide that the President or his delegate shall specify, from time to time, after consultation with the Inter-American Development Bank, the particular currencies to be used in making the transfer or utilization described in this section.

(e) Not later than January 1, 1974, the President shall report to Congress on his action taken pursuant to this section.

PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO NORTH VIETNAM

Sec. 37. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds authorized by this Act shall be expended to aid or assist in the reconstruction of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam), unless by an Act of Congress assistance to North Vietnam is specifically authorized.

REPORT CONCERNING CERTAIN USE OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE IN AFRICA

Sec. 38. The President of the United States shall, as soon as practicable following the date of the enactment of this Act, make a determination and report to Congress with respect to the use, if any, by any non-African country in support of its military activities in its African territories of—

(1) assistance furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) defense articles or services furnished after such date under the Foreign Military Sales Act; or

(3) agricultural commodities furnished after such date under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

WORLD FOOD SHORTAGES

Sec. 39. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that the United States should participate fully in efforts to alleviate current and future food shortages which threaten the world. To this end, the President shall—

(1) encourage, support, and expedite studies relating to the long-range implications of the world food situation (including studies of national and world production, distribution, and utilization of agricultural commodities and other foodstuffs) and support the organizing of a world food conference under United Nations auspices in 1974;

(2) request the member nations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to explore the means for assuring equitable access by all nations to national markets and mineral and agricultural resources;

(3) consult and cooperate with appropriate international agencies, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, in determining the need for, the feasibility of, and cost on an equitably-shared basis of, establishing an international system of strategic food reserves; and

(4) report his findings and recommendations to the Congress on the implementation of this section no later than December 31, 1974.

(b) It is further the sense of the Congress that—

(1) in making assessments which would affect or relate to the level of domestic production, the Executive Branch should include in the estimates of overall utilization the expected demands for humanitarian food assistance through such programs as are carried out under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480); and

(2) legislation providing increased flexibility for responding to emergency and humanitarian requirements for food assistance should be considered as promptly as possible to the end that the last sentence of section 401 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), may be amended by striking the period and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "unless the Secretary determines that some part of the exportable supply should be used to carry out the national interest and humanitarian objectives of this Act."

USE OF LOCAL CURRENCIES

Sec. 40. Effective July 1, 1974, no amount of any foreign currency (including principal and interest from loan repayments which accrues in connection with any sale for foreign currency under any provision of law may be used under any agreement entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act, or any revision or extension entered into after such date of any prior or subsequent agreement, to provide any assistance to any foreign country to procure equipment, materials, facilities, or services for the common defense, including internal security, unless such agreement is specifically authorized by legislation enacted after such date.

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the Senate bill and agree to the same.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
DANTE B. FASCELL,
W. S. MAILLIARD,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
WM. S. BROOMFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

H. H. HUMPHREY,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1443) to authorize the furnishing of defense articles and services to foreign countries and international organization, 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:

The House struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The House also amended the title of the bill.

The committee of conference recommends a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment to the text of the Senate bill. The committee of conference also recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill.

Except for clarifying, clerical, and necessary conforming changes, the differences between the two Houses and the adjustments made in the committee of conference are noted below:

The Senate passed two foreign aid authorization bills.

S. 1443 authorized \$770,000,000 for grant military assistance, military training, supporting assistance other than for Indochina, and foreign military credit sales for fiscal year 1974.

S. 2335 authorized economic assistance of \$1,218,222,000, plus \$6,500,000 in foreign currencies, for fiscal year 1974 and \$812,722,000 for fiscal year 1975.

In each of the Senate bills the House struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment.

The substance of the House amendments to each bill was identical and contained authorizations for economic assistance in the amount of \$1,610,868,000 for fiscal year 1974 and \$821,068,000 for fiscal year 1975, plus \$7 million in foreign currencies for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

Each House amendment also provided an authorization of \$1,155,000,000 for grant military assistance, military training, supporting assistance other than for Indochina, and foreign military credit sales for fiscal year 1974 only.

Neither of the Senate bills nor the House amendment contained authorizations for fiscal year 1975.

The committee of conference agreed to a single bill (S. 1443) containing authorizations for economic and military assistance for fiscal year 1974 of \$2,392,243,000, which represents a reduction of \$373,634,000 in the House figure, an increase of \$404,012,000 in the Senate figure, and a reduction of \$395,266,000 below the amount requested by the Executive and authorizations for economic assistance for fiscal 1975.

The amounts recommended by the committee of conference compared to the amounts requested by the executive and recommended by the House and Senate follow:

[In millions of dollars]

	Executive request	House ¹	Senate ²	Conference agreement ³
Economic assistance:				
Indochina postwar reconstruction for South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.....	632.0	632.0	376.0	504.000
International organizations.....	124.8	127.8	127.822	127.800
Indus Basin grants.....	15.0	15.0	14.0	14.500
Old development loan/grant categories:				
Loans (including Alliance for Progress).....	351.4			
Grants (including Alliance for Progress).....	251.8			
Population.....	(116.0)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)
New development assistance categories: ⁵				
Food and nutrition.....		300.0	282.0	291.000
Population planning and health.....		150.0	141.0	145.000
Education and human resources.....		90.0	94.0	90.000
Selected development problems.....		60.0	47.0	53.000
Selected countries and organizations.....		50.0	28.0	39.000
Miscellaneous categories:				
American schools and hospitals abroad.....	10.0	* 20.0	* 19.0	* 19.000
International narcotics control program.....	42.5	50.0	40.0	42.500
Contingency fund.....	30.0	30.0	23.5	30.000
Partners of the Alliance.....		.968	.9	.934
Administrative expenses (AID).....	53.1	53.1	24.0	45.000
Arab refugees.....		2.0		2.000
African famine relief.....		* 30.0		* 25.000
Albert Schweitzer Hospital.....			1.0	1.000
Total economic assistance.....	1,510.6	1,610.868	1,218.222	1,429.734
Military assistance:				
Grant military assistance.....	652.0	550.0	420.0	* 512.500
Security supporting assistance (outside Indochina).....	100.0	125.0	125.0	* 125.0
Military credit sales.....	525.0	450.0	200.0	¹⁰ 325.0
Military training.....	(⁶)	30.0	25.0	(⁶)
Total military assistance.....	1,277.0	1,155.0	770.0	962.5
Total economic and military assistance.....	2,787.6	2,765.868	1,988.222	2,392.234

¹ Economic aid authorizations are for fiscal year 1975 also except for African famine relief, Indochina assistance, and international organizations (open ended authorization for fiscal year 1975).

² The same amounts are authorized for fiscal year 1975 for all economic aid programs with the exception of: (1) the international narcotics control program for which \$30,500,000 is authorized for fiscal year 1975, and (2) American schools and hospitals abroad, the Albert Schweitzer Hospital, and Indochina postwar reconstruction, for which funds are authorized only for fiscal year 1974. The amounts for military assistance are for fiscal year 1974 only.

³ The same amounts are authorized for fiscal year 1975 for all economic aid programs with the exception of the Albert Schweitzer Hospital, Indochina postwar reconstruction assistance, and African famine relief. For fiscal year 1975, the amount authorized for international organizations is \$150,000,000. The amounts authorized for military assistance are for fiscal year 1974 only.

⁴ A separate appropriation of \$116,000,000 was requested by the executive branch. The Senate earmarked \$125,000,000 out of economic assistance funds for population programs in fiscal year

1974 and \$150,000,000 in fiscal year 1975. The House earmarked \$125,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1974 and 1975. The conferees approved \$125,000,000 for fiscal year 1974 and \$130,000,000 for fiscal year 1975.

⁵ Not more than 50 percent of the amounts appropriated for the categories may be used for grants under the Senate bill. In addition, repayments on outstanding foreign assistance loans would be available for new loans in fiscal year 1974 under the House bill.

⁶ In addition, excess foreign currencies are authorized (\$6,500,000 in the Senate bill; \$7,000,000 in the House bill). The bill authorizes \$6,500,000 in excess foreign currencies for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

⁷ To remain available until expended.

⁸ \$27,500,000 of this approved for military training. The Executive requested an open end authorization for this purpose. The Executive appropriations request was \$33,000,000.

⁹ \$50,000,000 earmarked for Israel.

¹⁰ A ceiling of \$730,000,000 established, of which \$300,000,000 earmarked for Israel.

CHANGE OF TITLE OF ACT AND NAME OF AGENCY

The House amendment changed the name of the Foreign Assistance Act to the Mutual Development and Cooperation Act and of the Agency for International Development to the Mutual Development and Cooperation Agency.

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

POLICY—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION

The committee of conference reconciled four differences between the Senate bill and the House amendment that dealt with section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act relating to statement of policy.

Development of employment-intensive technologies

The Senate bill included a provision that the President should place appropriate emphasis on a requirement that the "United States should concentrate in particular on the development of employment-intensive technologies suitable to the less developed countries."

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

Multilateral approaches to development

The Senate bill included new language that urged a shift to multilateral approaches to development and required a report from the Secretary of State on consultations, negotiations, and recommendations regarding such a shift.

The House amendment included in its statement of policy a declaration that U.S. development assistance should continue to

be available through bilateral channels until it is clear that multilateral channels exist which can do the job with no loss of development momentum.

The House and Senate receded.

Role of U.S. private investment

The House amendment contained a statement that emphasized the role of U.S. private investment to the maximum extent practicable in economic and social development programs, specifying that arrangements should be continually sought to provide stability and protection for such investment.

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded with an amendment which deleted the requirement to continually seek arrangements for the protection of such investment.

Coordination of U.S. development-related activities

The Senate bill provided for the coordination of all United States development-related activities by the administering agency under the policy guidance of the Secretary of State, and required the head of the agency to advise the President of actions affecting development and to inform the Congress about the progress of the less developed countries.

The House amendment simply specified the Mutual Development and Cooperation Agency as the agency responsible for the coordination, without spelling out any specific requirement to advise the President or inform the Congress.

The Senate receded, with a technical amendment to substitute "the agency primarily responsible for administering this part" for the name of the agency.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE—CATEGORIES

Food and nutrition

The Senate bill added a new section 103 to the Foreign Assistance Act to provide development assistance for food and nutrition. It authorized an appropriation of \$282 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for this purpose.

The House amendment contained a similar provision that authorized an appropriation of \$300 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

The committee of conference agreed to an authorization for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 in the amount of \$291 million.

Population planning and health

The Senate bill added a new section 104 to the Foreign Assistance Act that authorized an appropriation of \$141 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for population planning and health assistance.

The House amendment authorized an appropriation of \$150 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for this purpose.

The committee of conference agreed to an authorization of \$145 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for population planning and health.

Education and human resources development

The Senate bill added a new section 105 to the Foreign Assistance Act that authorized an appropriation of \$94 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for education and human resources development.

The House amendment authorized an appropriation of \$90 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for these purposes.

The Senate receded.

Selected development problems

The Senate bill added a new section 106 to the Foreign Assistance Act that authorized an appropriation of \$47 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for selected development problems.

The House amendment authorized an appropriation of \$60 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for this purpose.

The committee of conference agreed to an authorization of \$53 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

Selected countries and organizations

The Senate bill added a new section 107 to the Foreign Assistance Act that authorized an appropriation of \$28 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for development assistance to selected countries and organizations.

The House amendment authorized an appropriation of \$50 million for each of the fiscal years for this purpose.

The committee of conference agreed to an authorization of \$39 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

The Senate bill authorized a limited transfer of funds from one sector to another under new sections 103-107 of chapter I but prohibited the use of sections 610(a) and 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act with respect to transactions involving sector funds.

The House amendment provided similar authority for the transfer of funds without the restrictive language.

The House receded with an amendment which permitted the transfer of funds under the authority of sections 610(a) and 614(a) into but not out of the funds for development assistance under chapter I.

COST SHARING AND FUNDING LIMITS

The Senate bill required the host country to participate in the financing of bilateral projects to the extent of at least 25 percent of the entire costs, in any fiscal year, of the program, project, or activity. It also provided that disbursements for a bilateral capital project under all five functional categories of development assistance would be limited to 36 consecutive months and that efforts should be made before, during, and after the period of disbursement to find local and external sources of funding for such project.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded with an amendment striking "in any fiscal year" and making the limitation applicable to grant assistance only. Any extension of the expenditure period beyond 36 months is subject to further justification satisfactory to the Congress. It was also agreed that the 36-month disbursement period will not begin until project disbursements start in-country, excluding preliminary disbursements for planning and preparation costs outside the recipient country.

FUNDING OF FOLLOW-ON PROJECTS

The Senate bill provided that no amounts available under sections 103 through 107 of the act could be obligated for any follow-on project which links that project with any other project without further congressional authorization.

The House did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

USE OF RECEIPTS

The Senate bill limited the use to not more than one-third of prior years loan reflows for any one of the functional categories of development assistance in any fiscal year.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

LIMITATION ON GRANTS

The Senate bill limited grants under the functional sectors to not more than 50 per-

cent of the funds appropriated each fiscal year for sections 103-107.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF COOPERATIVES

The Senate bill provided that not less than \$20 million made available during fiscal years 1974 and 1975 should be available only for assistance in the development of cooperatives in less developed countries.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

PROHIBITING POLICE TRAINING

The Senate bill prohibited police training and related programs for any foreign country under any law except those relating to certain crimes and administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, or with respect to any authority of the Drug Enforcement Administration, or the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded with an amendment applying the prohibition to programs in a foreign country and to funds made available under the Foreign Assistance Act. The prohibition is not applicable to any contract entered into prior to the date of enactment of this act that provides personnel to conduct, or assist in conducting, any such program but it prohibits extension of those contracts. Further, it is the intent of Congress that present programs being conducted by the Agency for International Development in foreign countries should not be transferred to some other agency of the Government in order to avoid this prohibition. The new language is meant to phase out such programs financed hereunder and the objective should not be circumvented by using other funds for this purpose.

INTEGRATION OF WOMEN INTO NATIONAL ECONOMIES

The Senate bill provided that development assistance programs should be administered with particular attention to the integration of women into the national economies of foreign countries.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

LIMITING USE OF FUNDS FOR ABORTIONS

The Senate bill prohibited the use of funds in any manner, directly or indirectly, to pay for abortions, abortifacient drugs or devices, the promotion of the practice of abortion, or support of research to develop methods of abortion.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded with an amendment prohibiting the use of funds to pay for the performance of abortions or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortion.

This provision is not intended to interfere with or curtail support for preventive maternal and child health and family planning services and related research which are provided on a voluntary basis and in accordance with the prevailing local customs and medical practice and it is not intended to apply to funds obligated prior to the date of enactment of this bill.

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND, FISCAL PROVISIONS

The Senate bill repealed section 203 of the Foreign Assistance Act which makes dollar receipts from previous loans available for new loans for development assistance.

The House amendment extended the authority of section 203 to fiscal years 1974 and 1975 and expanded the authority to include dollar receipts from loans made prior to 1954.

The Senate receded with amendments that delayed the repeal of section 203 until July 1, 1975, and provided that not more than 50 percent of the dollar receipts scheduled for

repayment would be available. The committee of conference intended, based on AID's congressional presentation, that, under this limitation, approximately \$161.5 million and \$184 million in new loan authority would become available in fiscal years 1974 and 1975, respectively.

COUNTRY LIMITATION

The House amendment added to word "directly" to the forty-country limitation on technical assistance and development grants contained in the act to make clear that the limitation applies only to bilateral assistance furnished directly by the United States Government to governments of less developed countries.

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

AMERICAN SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS ABROAD

The Senate bill authorized an appropriation of \$19 million and \$6.5 million in excess currencies for fiscal year 1974 for assistance to American schools and hospitals abroad. It did not authorize assistance for fiscal year 1975 but requested a study and report including recommendations by the Secretary of State with respect to future assistance for schools and hospitals outside the United States.

The House amendment authorized \$20 million and \$7 million in excess local currencies for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975. The House amendment also contained a limitation on assistance in any fiscal year to no more than four institutions in the same country, of which not more than one shall be a university and not more than one a hospital.

The committee of conference agreed to the authorization of an appropriation of \$19 million and \$6.5 million in excess local currencies for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

The House receded on its limitation but the committee of conference agreed that the agency which administers this program should make every effort to administer this program so as to achieve a more equitable geographic distribution of assistance and to limit financial support for operations and maintenance activities. The committee of conference also agreed that the report and recommendation by the Secretary of State should be made by June 30, 1974.

It is the intent of the committee of conference that the report shall include recommendations for equitable geographical distribution of U.S. assistance and such possible solutions to the problems relating to long term commitments to institutions as the Secretary of State deems desirable.

HOUSING GUARANTIES

The Senate bill increased the worldwide ceiling for housing guaranties which may be outstanding at any one time from \$205 million to \$349.9 million, and extended the program to June 30, 1975.

The House amendment increased the worldwide ceiling to \$305 million, an increase of \$100 million, and extended the program to June 30, 1976.

The committee of conference accepted the House ceiling of \$305 million and the Senate date of June 30, 1975.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

The House amendment extended the issuing authorities of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for investment and guaranty activities from June 30, 1974 to June 30, 1975. It also renewed the agriculture credit and self-help community development pilot project authority from June 30, 1973 to June 30, 1975.

The Senate bill did not contain any comparable provision.

The Senate receded with an amendment extending the authorities to December 31, 1974.

PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

The Senate bill authorized an appropriation of \$900,000 for grants to the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

The House amendment authorized an appropriation of \$968,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for such grants.

The committee of conference agreed to an authorization of an appropriation of \$934,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

PROGRAMS RELATING TO POPULATION PROGRAMS

The Senate bill provided that not less than \$125 million in fiscal year 1974 and \$150 million in fiscal year 1975 of part I funds shall be available for programs relating to population growth.

The House amendment earmarked \$125 million of part I funds in each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for this purpose.

The committee of conference agreed to earmark \$125 million in fiscal year 1974 and \$130 million in fiscal year 1975 for programs relating to population growth.

INDEPENDENT REVIEW GROUPS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE INSTITUTIONS

The House amendment added a new subsection which required the President to actively seek the establishment of independent groups within the United Nations and its affiliated organizations to review and evaluate their programs. It further required the President to transmit to the Congress and the Comptroller General reports prepared by such units.

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATION

The Senate bill authorized an appropriation of \$127,822,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

The House amendment authorized an appropriation of \$127,800,000 for fiscal year 1974 and "such sums as may be necessary" for fiscal year 1975.

The committee of conference agreed to \$127,800,000 for fiscal year 1974 and \$150 million for fiscal year 1975.

INDUS BASIN AUTHORIZATION

The Senate bill authorized an appropriation of \$14 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for grants for the Indus Basin development.

The House amendment authorized an appropriation of \$15 million for each of the two fiscal years.

The committee of conference agreed to an authorization of an appropriation of \$14,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

UNICEF CONTRIBUTION

The House amendment earmarked \$18 million of international organizations funds for each of fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for contributions to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

ARAB REFUGEE TRAINING

The House amendment authorized an appropriation of \$2 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for technical and vocational training of Arab refugees.

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

CONTINGENCY FUND AND DISASTER RELIEF AUTHORITY

The Senate bill authorized an appropriation of \$23.5 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for assistance primarily for disaster relief purposes.

CXIX—2395—Part 29

The House amendment authorized an appropriation of \$30 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for contingencies and authorized such amounts as may be required from time to time to provide extraordinary disaster relief.

The committee of conference accepted the House authorization of an appropriation of \$30 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, and accepted the purpose language of the Senate bill.

COUNTRY NARCOTICS CONTROL PERFORMANCE

The Senate bill amended the Act to require the President to make an affirmative finding, to be transmitted to the Congress, that a country has taken adequate steps to control the production, distribution, transportation, and manufacture of opium and its derivatives. The Senate bill further required the President to suspend all aid, except narcotics control programs, to any country if the Congress passed a concurrent resolution rejecting the findings.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON NARCOTICS CONTROL PROGRAM

The House amendment added a new requirement for quarterly reports to Congress on the programming and obligation of foreign assistance funds for narcotics control programs, and semiannual reports on the activities and operations carried out under this program.

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AUTHORIZATION

The Senate bill authorized an appropriation of \$40 million for fiscal year 1974 and \$30,500,000 for fiscal year 1975 for the international narcotics control program.

The House amendment authorized an appropriation of \$50 million for each of fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

The committee of conference agreed to the authorization of an appropriation of \$42,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for this purpose.

COOPERATIVE ECONOMIC EXPANSION

The House amendment added a new chapter 10 authorizing the use of \$2 million of part I funds for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for cooperative economic expansion.

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

STATEMENT OF POLICY—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The Senate bill repealed sections 501 and 502 of the Foreign Assistance Act, relating to policy and purposes for which military assistance can be furnished.

The House amendment did not contain comparable provisions.

The Senate receded.

EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES

The Senate bill provided that excess defense articles should be furnished whenever possible in preference to the procurement of new items.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE—GENERAL AUTHORITY

The Senate bill repealed section 503 relating to general authority and provided general authority to furnish grant military assistance to any foreign country otherwise eligible to receive assistance. The Senate language eliminated the requirement that the aid-receiving country be "friendly," as well as the President's authority to furnish military assistance to international organiza-

tions, and to loan defense articles and defense services. It also struck out the authority in section 503(b) to make financial contributions to multilateral programs to acquire or construct facilities for collective defense and in section 503(c) to provide financial assistance incidental to the U.S. Government's participation in regional or collective defense organizations.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded with an amendment which authorized the loan of defense articles and defense services but specified conditions under which loans could be made and provided that "out of pocket" expenses incidental to making the loan and the cost of "depreciation" shall be charged to the appropriation for military assistance for each fiscal year or part thereof that the item is on loan.

It is the intention of the committee of conference that the provisions of this section shall not apply when short term loans are made in connection with disaster relief efforts in response to earthquakes, floods, or other natural disasters.

The House receded with respect to the repeal of subsections (b) and (c) of section 503.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION

The Senate bill repealed section 504(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act relating to authorization for military assistance, and provided separate authorizations for eight countries totaling \$270 million. It also authorized up to \$25 million of the funds to be used to furnish excess defense articles to any foreign country or international organization not specifically identified. The Senate bill further provided a separate authorization for such sums as may be necessary, as well as a special drawdown authority subject to future reimbursement, for furnishing defense articles to South Vietnam and Laos, and authorized \$150 million to be appropriated for military assistance to Cambodia.

The House amendment provided an authorization of an appropriation of \$550 million for fiscal year 1974.

The Senate receded from its provisions and the committee of conference agreed to an authorization of \$512.5 million, including military training, for fiscal year 1974. The number of countries eligible to receive military grant assistance, other than training in the United States, was reduced from forty to thirty-one.

SOPHISTICATED WEAPONS

The Senate bill repealed the proviso clause and subsection (b) of section 504 of the Foreign Assistance Act but included a similar provision which prohibited the furnishing by grant credit sale, or guaranty of sophisticated weapons systems to underdeveloped countries unless the President determines that furnishing such weapons systems is important to United States national security.

The House amendment did not contain any comparable provisions.

The committee of conference agreed to retain existing law.

CONDITIONS OF ELIGIBILITY

The Senate bill repealed section 505 of the Foreign Assistance Act relating to conditions of eligibility but provided similar conditions of eligibility with one new requirement. The new eligibility condition required that funds received by a foreign country in disposing of U.S.-furnished weapons should be paid to the United States Government for use in meeting its local currency expenses, including international educational and cultural exchange activities.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded on the repeal of section 505 and the House accepted the additional condition of eligibility beginning July 1, 1974.

TRANSFER OF DEFENSE ARTICLES TO THIRD COUNTRIES

The Senate bill contained a provision relating to conditions of eligibility that would require Presidential approval for the transfer of U.S.-furnished defense articles from one country to another under specified conditions. This provision was similar to the provisions of section 9, Foreign Military Sales Act Amendments, 1971, which the Senate bill repealed.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed to include a similar provision in both section 505 of the Foreign Assistance Act relating to grant military assistance and section 3 of the Foreign Military Sales Act, relating to the sale of defense articles.

SPECIAL DRAWDOWN AUTHORITY

The House amendment contained a provision which renewed the President's special authority to draw down defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense and defense services up to \$300 million in fiscal year 1974 when he determines it to be vital to the security of the United States, subject to subsequent reimbursement from military assistance program funds.

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded with an amendment authorizing a draw down ceiling of \$250 million. The drawdown authority may be used when it is in the security interests of the United States. This authority is not to be used to supplement MAP funds routinely to meet unforeseen, non-emergency requirements for military assistance.

It is the intent of the committee of conference that up to \$200 million of the emergency military assistance requirements for Cambodia be furnished pursuant to the authority contained in this section.

RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY AID TO LATIN AMERICA AND AFRICA

The Senate bill repealed sections 507 and 508 of the Foreign Assistance Act relating to restrictions on military assistance for Latin America and Africa.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded. A ceiling on the amount of military assistance and sales that can be made or furnished to Latin America and Africa in any fiscal year is provided in section 33 of the Foreign Military Sales Act, as amended.

CERTIFICATION OF RECIPIENTS CAPABILITY

The Senate bill repealed section 509 of the Foreign Assistance Act which requires the chief of the appropriate military assistance advisory group representing the United States to certify in writing that the recipient country has the capability to effectively utilize defense articles furnished by the United States.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

RESTRICTIONS ON TRAINING FOREIGN MILITARY STUDENTS

The Senate bill repealed section 510 of the Foreign Assistance Act but placed an identical limit on the number of foreign military students to be trained in the United States in any fiscal year.

The House amendment repealed section 510.

The committee of conference agreed to retain section 510 of the law.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE ADVISORY GROUPS AND MISSIONS

The Senate bill repealed section 512 of the Foreign Assistance Act which required certain reductions in military assistance advisory groups and military groups by September 30, 1972.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION FOR LAOS

The Senate bill contained a provision which required the transfer of authorizations for military assistance and sales programs for Laos and South Vietnam from the Department of Defense to the Foreign Assistance and Military Sales Acts effective June 30, 1973.

The House amendment provided for the transfer of such military assistance and sales authorizations effective June 30, 1974.

The committee of conference agreed to transfer military assistance and sales authorizations for Laos effective June 30, 1974, with the understanding that funds obligated for assistance to Laos prior to the date specified in section 513 which are in the "pipeline" at that time may be provided regardless of when the defense articles are actually delivered or the defense services actually rendered.

SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNTS

The Senate bill repealed section 514 of the Foreign Assistance Act but included a similar provision which required the establishment of special foreign currency accounts in which any government receiving grant military defense articles, including excess defense articles, and military training would deposit local currencies to meet official costs of the United States Government in the recipient country.

The House amendment repealed section 514 of the Foreign Assistance Act.

The Senate receded.

It is the intent of the committee of conference that billings for foreign currency payments under section 514 shall end with deliveries for the quarter ending December 31, 1973.

LIQUIDATION ACCOUNT FOR PRE-FISCAL YEAR 1969 FOREIGN MILITARY SALES CREDITS

The Senate bill repealed section 524 of the Foreign Assistance Act which established a special liquidation account in the Treasury for pre-fiscal year 1969 sales credits and guaranties.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The Senate bill separated grant military training from the material assistance program and authorized the appropriation of \$25 million to the Secretary of State for military training in fiscal year 1974.

The House amendment also provided under separate authority \$30 million for an international military education and training program for fiscal year 1974.

The committee of conference agreed to retain the grant military training program as an integral part of the military assistance program and added \$27,500,000 to the authorization for grant military assistance in section 504(a) for fiscal year 1974. The House receded on numerous technical conforming amendments contained in the House amendment which would have been necessary separately to authorize funds for military education and training.

CAMBODIA CEILING WAIVER

The Senate bill included a provision as a technical amendment to perfect the bill in such a way that the Cambodia ceiling of section 655(c) would not apply to assistance furnished under the act.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

SECURITY SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

The Senate bill repealed the provisions of existing law relating to security supporting assistance, but included similar authority to furnish security supporting assistance and authorized an appropriation of

\$125 million for fiscal year 1974, of which \$65 million was to be available solely for Jordan and \$50 million solely for Israel.

The House amendment authorized \$125 million for security supporting assistance of which not less than \$50 million was to be available solely for Israel.

The committee of conference agreed to retain the general authority language of existing law for security supporting assistance and to repeal section 533 relating to United States Refund Claims.

The Senate receded and accepted the House authorization and earmarking provision.

SMALL BUSINESS

The Senate bill contained a provision rewriting section 602 of the Foreign Assistance Act, which required that insofar as practicable the President should assist American small business to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities, defense articles, and services (including defense services) financed with funds made available for grant military assistance.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed to retain existing law.

SHIPPING ON U.S. VESSELS

The Senate bill contained a provision similar to section 602 of the Foreign Assistance Act, which provided that ocean transportation between foreign countries of commodities and defense articles purchased with foreign currencies made available or derived from appropriations under this act should not be governed by the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, or any other law relating to the ocean transportation of commodities on U.S.-flag vessels.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed to retain existing law.

PROCUREMENT

The Senate bill contained a provision similar to section 604 of the Foreign Assistance Act, relating to procurement of commodities outside the United States.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed to retain existing law.

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

The Senate bill provided that military assistance and sales could, if not sooner terminated by the President, be terminated by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

The House amendment retained existing law which permits the termination by concurrent resolution of assistance furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act and allows funds to remain available for 12 months from the termination date for the necessary expenses of winding up programs.

The Senate receded with an amendment reducing the windup period from 12 to 8 months.

EXPROPRIATION POLICY

The Senate bill modified section 620(e)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act—the Hickenlooper amendment—by permitting the President to waive its sanctions when he determined that such a waiver was "important to the national interests of the United States." Any waiver was to be reported promptly to the Congress.

The House amendment deleted section 620(e)(1) and added a new section requiring termination of assistance to any country which, after the enactment of this section, expropriated property that was at least 50 percent beneficially owned by U.S. citizens, unless one of three conditions was met: (1) prompt, adequate, and effective compensation had been paid; (2) the dispute was

submitted to arbitration under the rules of the Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes; or (3) good faith negotiations were in progress aimed at providing prompt, adequate, and effective compensation. The amendment did not permit the President to waive its application in the national interest.

The House receded.

ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES WHICH TRADE WITH NORTH VIETNAM

The House amendment contained a provision which permitted the President to waive the prohibition against assistance to countries trading with North Vietnam or permit vessels or aircraft under their registry to transport goods to North Vietnam. Each waiver required a Presidential finding that it was in the national interest. Each finding had to be reported to the Congress, together with assurances that North Vietnam was cooperating fully in providing for a full accounting of any remaining prisoners of war and all missing in action.

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

AID TO GREECE

The Senate bill contained a provision that would terminate all military assistance, sales, credit sales, or guaranties to Greece pending completion of a Presidential study and report which concluded that the Government of Greece is in full compliance with its political and military obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN POLICY

The Senate bill contained a provision similar to section 622(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act emphasizing the responsibility of the Chief of each diplomatic mission to submit recommendations concerning security assistance from personnel in his mission.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed to retain existing law.

STATUTORY FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

The Senate bill changed the responsibility of the Secretary of State for the "general direction" of military assistance activities, as currently set forth in section 622(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act, to responsibility for "direction" of those activities.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

ACCESS TO AND FAILURE TO PROVIDE INFORMATION

The Senate bill included a provision to assure the General Accounting Office or any committee of Congress access to information in the possession of any agency carrying out provisions of law with funds made available under the Foreign Assistance Act. After the expiration of any 35-day period following a written request by the General Accounting Office or a congressional committee for any document, paper, communication, audit, review, finding, recommendation, report, or other material in the custody of such agency, none of the funds available to such agency could be obligated unless and until the request had been honored. Communications between the President and any officer or employee of the agencies concerned were expressly excluded from the operations of this section.

The Senate bill also amended section 634 of the Foreign Assistance Act and provided for a similar exclusion of Presidential communications.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE INFORMATION

The Senate bill contained a provision requiring that there be made public that portion of any record showing the name of any recipient of military assistance and the amount of such assistance intended to be provided or the amount that has been provided by the United States.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

The committee of conference agreed that the provisions of section 634(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act, requiring the President to make public all information concerning operations under the Act, should be construed as calling for full public disclosure of military assistance information, except during periods of critical international developments when classifying such data is in the national security interest. In any case, such information should be fully available to appropriate congressional committees.

REPORTS AND INFORMATION

The House amendment repealed section 634(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act and replaced it with two new subsections. New subsection (f) required the submission of semiannual reports on the status of each outstanding loan, contract of guaranty or insurance, credit sale of defense articles, defense services, or agricultural commodities, and each Export-Import Bank loan, guaranty, or insurance. Only transactions in excess of \$1 million would be reported individually. New subsection (g) required annual reports showing the debt-servicing problems of foreign countries, debt relief granted by the United States, and the consequences thereof.

The Senate bill repealed section 634(f) of the law.

The Senate receded.

The committee of conference understands that a delay of 90 to 180 days may occur in providing the first semiannual report under the new subsection (f); however, all subsequent reports should be forwarded as promptly as possible but no later than 60 days after the report is due.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The Senate bill authorized an appropriation of \$24 million for administrative expenses for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

The House amendment authorized an appropriation of \$53,100,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for such expenses.

The committee of conference agreed to an authorization of an appropriation of \$45 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, with the understanding that program funds available under part I and part V may be used to defray additional administrative expenses up to the level provided in the House amendment.

PEACE CORPS ASSISTANCE

The Senate bill amended section 638 of the Foreign Assistance Act by changing its title from "Peace Corps Assistance" to "Exclusions".

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded to this technical amendment.

FAMINE AND DISASTER RELIEF

The House amendment contained a provision which would have amended section 639 of the Foreign Assistance Act to permit the furnishing of disaster relief assistance notwithstanding any provision of law.

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

FAMINE AND DISASTER RELIEF TO THE AFRICAN SAHEL

The House amendment contained an authorization of an appropriation of \$30 million for relief and rehabilitation of African Sahel and gave congressional endorsement

for long-term planning for the preservation and development of the Sahel region in cooperation with the United Nations and other international and regional organizations.

The Senate bill contained a provision which asked the President to consult with international organizations on how to solve the West African famine problem, but did not authorize any funds.

The Senate receded with an amendment to authorize an appropriation of \$25 million for these purposes.

DEVELOPMENT COORDINATION COMMITTEE

The Senate bill amended the Foreign Assistance Act by adding a new section providing for coordination of United States development policies and programs. It provided for the establishment of a Development Coordination Committee, named members thereof by their positions in the government, required the Chief of the U.S. mission in a country to be the development coordinator, and required reports to the Congress and the President by both the Committee and the country coordinator.

The House amendment contained a comparable provision which named as members of the Committee representatives of designated agencies and required the President to develop appropriate procedures for coordinating overseas activities and to report to Congress.

The Senate receded with an amendment that the President prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination among both (1) departments and agencies of the U.S. having representatives in diplomatic missions abroad, and (2) U.S. representatives in each country under the direction of the Chief of the U.S. diplomatic mission.

SHIPPING DIFFERENTIAL

The House amendment provided for the payment of the differential in shipping costs between U.S.- and foreign-flag vessels.

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

DEFINITION OF EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES

The Senate bill redefined defense articles in such a way as to restrict them to those items which are excess to the needs of the Department of Defense for other than military assistance purposes, thereby transferring items in "long supply" from the category of excess defense articles to the category of nonexcess defense articles.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

The purpose of the new definition is to require that a defense article must not be treated as "excess" for purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or the Foreign Military Sales Act unless it has been screened against the requirements of all the military departments and Defense agencies, thus correcting a problem cited in a recent study by the General Accounting Office of the use of "excess" defense articles in the military assistance program. The Department of Defense states that the current administrative practice is consistent with the new definition.

DEFINITION OF VALUE

The Senate bill defined the "value" of excess defense articles as "actual value" but not less than one-third of acquisition cost. It also defined the "value" of nonexcess defense articles and defense services to include "a proportional share of the administrative expenses incurred by the United States Government in supplying" such articles and services, except that personnel pay and allowances would be excluded from the computation of "administrative expenses" for this purpose as it relates to military assistance (excluding grant military training).

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed that

"value" means (1) in the case of excess defense articles, the actual value of the article plus the gross cost incurred by the United States Government in repairing, rehabilitating, or modifying the article, except that only such gross costs shall be taken into consideration for purposes of reimbursement to the supplying agency; (2) with respect to nonexcess defense articles delivered from inventory, the acquisition cost to the United States Government adjusted as appropriate for conditions and market value; (3) with respect to nonexcess defense articles delivered from new procurement, the contract or production costs; and (4) with respect to a defense service, the cost to the United States of such service.

PRESIDENTIAL FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS

The Senate bill repealed section 654 of the Foreign Assistance Act, relating to Presidential findings and determinations, and included language similar in purpose.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

USE OF U.S. ARMED FORCES

The Senate bill rewrote section 650 of the Foreign Assistance Act which provides that the furnishing of economic, military, or other assistance under the act shall not be construed as a commitment to use Armed Forces of the United States for the defense of any foreign country.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded and existing law, containing a similar provision, is retained.

ANNUAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE REPORT

The Senate bill repealed section 657 of the Foreign Assistance Act and included language requiring essentially the same information to be submitted annually to the Congress, together with data on all exports of significant defense articles on the United States munitions list.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The Senate bill contained a provision requiring the submission of quarterly reports on the sale or guaranty of defense articles and services, grant of excess defense articles, defense articles and defense services, and the number of U.S. Government personnel detailed to military assistance advisory groups or organizations.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

SPECIAL REPORT ON MAP AGREEMENTS

The Senate bill contained a provision calling for a report from the President by January 31, 1974, listing all military assistance agreements entered into prior to that date and recommending which should be continued.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

ANNUAL NATO REPORT

The House amendment contained a provision requiring the Secretaries of State and Defense to report annually on or before January 15 to the Speaker of the House and to the Senate Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations on the direct, indirect, and unallocated costs to the United States of its participation in NATO in the immediately prior fiscal year, in the current fiscal year (estimated), and in the budget fiscal year (budget request).

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

INDOCHINA POSTWAR RECONSTRUCTION

The Senate bill amended the Foreign Assistance Act by adding at the end thereof a new part V, authorizing an appropriation of \$376 million for fiscal year 1974 for postwar relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction in South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, of which not less than \$10 million was to support humanitarian programs of the Indochina Operations Group of the International Red Cross in South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

The House amendment contained a comparable provision, authorizing an appropriation of \$632 million for fiscal year 1974 and providing that no funds could be used for police support or prison construction and administration within South Vietnam.

The committee of conference agreed to a \$504 million authorization for the fiscal year 1974. The House receded on its statement of policy and the Senate receded on the earmarking of funds for the Indochina Operations Group and on the prohibition on the use of funds for police support or prison construction and administration within South Vietnam.

REDUCTION IN GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION

The Senate bill contained a provision calling for a reduction in the role of the United States Government in the furnishing or sale of defense articles and defense services to foreign countries and international organizations by reducing its sales, credit sales, and guaranty of such articles and defense services to the maximum extent practicable.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

ILLEGAL SEIZURE OF U.S. PRIVATE FISHING VESSELS

The Senate bill repealed section 3 of the Foreign Military Sales Act which prohibits the sale (cash, credits or guarantees) to any country within a year's period after such country seizes, or takes into custody, or fines an American fishing vessel for fishing more than 12 miles from the country's coast, unless the President waives the prohibition on the basis that it is important to U.S. security or that he has received reasonable assurances from the country that similar seizures will not occur in the future.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

PENALTY FOR UNAUTHORIZED TRANSFER OF SOPHISTICATED WEAPONS TO A THIRD COUNTRY

The Senate bill contained a provision which prohibited the furnishing of sophisticated weapons, including sophisticated jet aircraft, to any foreign country which transferred defense articles provided by the United States in violation of an agreement requiring U.S. consent to such a transfer.

The House amendment contained a similar provision, but permitted restoration of eligibility when the President determines that the violation has ceased and he has received satisfactory assurances that the violation will not reoccur, and provided that in the case of unauthorized transfer of sophisticated weapons, such weapons have been returned to the original recipient.

The Senate receded.

CASH SALES FROM STOCK

The Senate bill repealed section 21 of the Foreign Military Sales Act and included a provision authorizing cash sale of defense articles and services from the stocks of the Department of Defense.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

PROCUREMENT FOR CASH SALES

The Senate bill repealed section 22 of the Foreign Military Sales Act and included lan-

guage to require purchasers of defense articles or defense services to pay to the United States Government, in addition to the cost of such items, an amount equal to the administrative costs incurred in procuring such articles and services. The Senate bill also eliminated the President's authority to sell defense articles on a fixed price basis and prohibited cash sales of defense articles and services by the U.S. Government to a developed country if such articles are generally available from commercial sources in the United States.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded with an amendment deleting the prohibition on the sale of defense articles to economically developed countries, and the requirement to pay administrative costs.

It is the intent of the committee of conference that the current administrative practice of charging an appropriate amount to cover overhead expenses, when feasible, be maintained.

CREDIT SALES

The Senate bill repealed section 23 of the Foreign Military Sales Act and included a similar provision authorizing credit sales of defense articles and defense services to economically less developed countries. Repayment would be required within 10 years after delivery.

The House amendment increased the repayment period from 10 to 20 years.

The committee of conference agreed to retain existing law.

SALES CREDITS AT CONCESSIONAL RATES AND REPAYABLE IN LOCAL CURRENCY

The Senate bill contained a provision which authorized credit sales on concessional terms to countries that received grant military assistance in fiscal year 1973 in amounts not exceeding the level of grant assistance provided during that fiscal year. During fiscal years 1974 and 1975, sales could be made which were repayable in local currency and without interest. In fiscal years 1976 through 1978 sales could be made at interest rates not less than 3 percent a year to the extent the local currencies were needed for U.S. Government requirements.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

GUARANTY AUTHORITY

The Senate bill repealed section 24 of the Foreign Military Sales Act and included a similar provision.

The House amendment amended section 24 to authorize the President to issue guaranties to persons doing business outside the United States. It also permitted funds made available under the Act to be obligated for the 25 percent guaranty reserve, and amended the Act to allow the calculation for the purposes of the guaranty reserve, the aggregate ceiling on Foreign Military Sales credits, and the regional ceiling on military sales on the basis of the principal amount of the contractual liability which would preclude guaranteed interest from counting against the ceilings.

The committee of conference agreed to the House amendment with the exception of the provision which would have allowed guaranties to be issued to persons doing business outside the United States.

FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT SALES

The Senate bill authorized an appropriation of \$200 million to the Secretary of State for military sales credits for fiscal year 1974 and set an aggregate ceiling on military credit sales at \$700 million for fiscal year 1974, of which \$300 million was to be available only for Israel.

The House amendment authorized \$450 million for military sales credits for fiscal

year 1974, provided an aggregate ceiling of \$760 million for fiscal year 1974, and earmarked \$300 million for Israel.

The committee of conference agreed to authorize the appropriation of \$325 million and established an aggregate ceiling of \$730 million for fiscal year 1974, of which \$300 million shall be available only for Israel.

PROHIBITION ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The Senate bill repealed section 32 of the Foreign Military Sales Act which prohibited the Export-Import Bank of the United States from participating in any new extension of credit in connection with the purchase of defense articles or defense services to any economically less developed country.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

AGGREGATE LATIN AMERICA AND AFRICA REGIONAL CEILING

The Senate bill repealed section 33 of the Foreign Military Sales Act and included a similar provision which established an aggregate ceiling of \$150 million on the total amount of military assistance and sales that can be made to Latin America in any fiscal year and a corresponding ceiling of \$40 million for Africa. It also eliminated the President's authority to waive an amount equal to 50 percent of such regional ceilings.

The House amendment increased the ceiling for Latin America to \$150 million and excluded cash sales from counting against the aggregate ceiling for both Latin America and Africa.

The committee of conference agreed to retain existing law with the changes proposed in the House amendment and to eliminate the Presidential waiver authority as provided in the Senate bill.

PRIOR CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF MILITARY SALES

The Senate bill contained a provision requiring the President to submit to the Congress, prior to entering into any relevant sales or guaranty agreement, written information on any cash sale, credit sale, or guaranty of over \$25 million to any country under the Foreign Military Sales Act. The President could not complete such an agreement if either House of the Congress adopted a resolution disapproving it. The same procedure applied to every sale, in whatever amount, to a country that had purchased more than \$50 million in a fiscal year.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

REPORTS ON COMMERCIAL AND GOVERNMENTAL MILITARY EXPORTS

The Senate bill repealed section 36 of the Foreign Military Sales Act and included a similar provision relating to reports of the export of significant defense articles on the U.S. munitions list.

The House amendment repealed section 36(a) of the Foreign Military Sales Act relating to the export of significant defense articles.

The committee of conference agreed to the repeal of subsections 36 (a) and (b) of the act.

DEPOSITS IN THE GUARANTY RESERVE

The House amendment amended section 37(b) of the Foreign Military Sales Act to authorize a portion of the proceeds from the sale of notes generated by credit extended under section 23, to be obligated as a reserve for the guaranty of the payment of such notes without additional charge against current appropriations.

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

GENERAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS—FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT

The Senate bill repealed chapter 4 of the Foreign Military Sales Act, relating to general, administrative, and miscellaneous provisions.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

REPEAL OF MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1956

The Senate bill repealed section 108 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended, thereby placing future military assistance programs on an obligation, direct-citation-of-funds basis.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

SPECIAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1971

The Senate bill repealed the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 with the exception of section 7 which prohibits the introduction of United States ground combat troops into Cambodia.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT AMENDMENT, 1971

The Senate bill repealed the Foreign Military Sales Act Amendments, 1971 with the exception of section 12 which repealed the "Joint resolution to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia".

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

The committee of conference agreed to amend section 8 with respect to excess defense articles and included the provisions of section 9 as an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act and the Foreign Military Sales Act.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CONVENTIONAL ARMS

The Senate bill repealed section 5 of the Foreign Military Sales Act Amendment, 1971 which expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should negotiate with the Soviet Union and other powers a limitation on arms shipments to the Middle East; and section 6 of the same act which expresses the sense of the Congress that the President initiate a thorough and comprehensive review of military assistance and sales programs of the Department of Defense. In lieu thereof, the Senate bill included a provision which directed the President to make a concerted effort to convene an international conference of major arms suppliers within 18 months to negotiate an agreement placing a workable ceiling on arms transfers.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

The committee of conference agreed that the President should make every effort to negotiate with the Soviet Union and other powers an agreement which would bring about workable controls over the transfer of conventional arms.

EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES

The Senate bill repealed section 8 of the Foreign Military Sales Act Amendments, 1971 and included a provision that excess defense articles furnished under MAP authority by any agency of the United States Government should be considered to be an expenditure made from funds appropriated for military assistance.

The House amendment continued the exemption of \$185 million on the value of excess defense articles, regardless of where gen-

erated, which might be ordered under any authority during any fiscal year before the value of those articles is chargeable against funds appropriated under part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

The Senate receded with an amendment reducing the exemption from \$185 million to \$150 million of the value of excess defense articles which may be furnished before being charged against funds appropriated under part II of the Foreign Assistance Act, provided that such excess articles are generated outside of the United States. The value of any excess defense articles generated within the United States and furnished as military assistance shall be charged off against funds appropriated for military grant assistance. The committee of conference expects that no action will be taken which would have the effect of circumventing the purpose of this new restriction.

PRIOR AUTHORIZATION

The Senate bill repealed section 10 of the Foreign Military Sales Act Amendments, 1971, and included a similar provision requiring an authorization before appropriated funds may be obligated or expended.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF EXPORT OF MUNITIONS LISTS ITEMS VALUED IN EXCESS OF \$100,000

The Senate bill contained a provision which required that the Congress be notified of licenses issued for the export of items on the Munitions List valued in excess of \$100,000.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

TRANSFER OF MILITARY VESSELS AND BOATS

The Senate bill contained a provision which prohibited the transfer of any vessel or boat of the United States, to any foreign country or international organization except in accordance with foreign assistance, sales, or other specific legislation.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO SOUTH VIETNAM, LAOS, AND CAMBODIA

The Senate bill contained a provision which:

(1) limited assistance to South Vietnam and Laos to that permitted by the respective cease-fire agreements. A similar provision related to a limitation on military assistance to Cambodia if and when a cease-fire agreement is reached;

(2) authorized the President to furnish emergency military assistance to South Vietnam if the President found and reported to the Congress that the cease-fire agreement was no longer in effect; and

(3) required the President to submit a quarterly report to the Congress on the nature and quantity of all types of foreign assistance provided to South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia and the number and types of United States personnel present in those countries, involved in providing such assistance.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

MEDIA ACCESS TO U.S.-FINANCED BASES

The Senate bill contained a provision which prohibited the programing of assistance to any country in which a military base is located if the base had been constructed, maintained, or operated with United States funds and used by United States personnel to carry out military operations, unless the President determines and reports in writing

to the Congress that the government of such country has, consistent with its own security, authorized access to those military bases, on a regular basis, to bona fide news media correspondents of the United States.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded with an amendment deleting the requirement that the President report in writing to the Congress.

TERMINATION OF INDOCHINA WAR

The Senate bill contained a provision which prohibited the use of funds authorized or appropriated under this or any other law to finance military or paramilitary operations by the United States in or over Cambodia, Laos, or South Vietnam.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

There are similar prohibitions on the use of funds contained in Public Law 93-50 (The Second Supplemental Appropriations Act) enacted July 1, 1973; Public Law 93-52 (The Continuing Resolution Authority for fiscal year 1973) enacted July 1, 1973; Public Law 93-126 (The Department of State Appropriations Authorization) enacted October 18, 1973; and Public Law 93-155 (Military Procurement Authorization Act), enacted November 16, 1973.

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

The Senate bill contained a provision prohibiting the use of funds to finance directly or indirectly "military or paramilitary operations" by third country forces in Laos, Cambodia, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, or Thailand, unless specifically authorized by legislation.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded with an amendment adding the word "combat" after "paramilitary" and before "operations".

POLITICAL PRISONERS

The Senate bill contained a provision expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should deny economic and military assistance to any country which interns or imprisons that country's citizens for political purposes.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

ALBERT SCHWEITZER HOSPITAL

The Senate bill authorized an appropriation of \$1 million for fiscal year 1974 for grants to the Albert Schweitzer Hospital in Gabon.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

PRISONERS OF WAR AND INDIVIDUALS MISSING IN ACTION

The Senate bill expressed the sense of the Congress that the provisions of article 18 of the Protocol signed on September 14, 1973, by representatives of the Lao Patriotic Front (Pathet Lao) and the Royal Laotian Government, relating to prisoners of war and individuals missing in action, be adhered to in spirit and in deed.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

PROHIBITIONS TO FURNISHING ASSISTANCE TO NORTH VIETNAM

The House amendment contained a provision prohibiting assistance to the Government of North Vietnam unless that assistance is specifically authorized by legislation.

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

REVISION OF SOCIAL PROGRESS TRUST FUND AGREEMENT

The House amendment directed the President to seek a revision of the Social Progress

Trust Fund Agreement to provide that its funds might be transferred to or utilized by the Inter-American Foundation, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Department of State and/or the U.S. Treasury.

The Senate bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded with an amendment, striking subsection (1) (B) and (C) which called for periodic transfer of trust funds to the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Treasury.

USE OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE IN AFRICA

The Senate bill amended the Foreign Assistance Act by adding a new section which prohibited the use of any U.S. military or economic aid or other U.S. exports to maintain the status of the African territories of Portugal and required termination of aid and military sales and military exports requiring a validated license if the President determined that those items were being used by Portugal in support of its military activities in its African territories.

The House amendment provided that assistance to Portugal should be suspended when the President makes a determination and reports to Congress that Portugal has used U.S. assistance in support of its military activities in its African colonies. The restoration of such assistance was made contingent on appropriate corrective action by Portugal.

The Senate receded with amendments (1) making the provision applicable to "any non-African country," (2) striking the parenthetical reference in the House amendment to sales "whether for cash or by credit, guarantee or any other means," and (3) striking the requirement to suspend assistance.

ENTRY OF SOVIET JEWS INTO AUSTRIA

The Senate bill contained a sense of the Senate resolution asking the President to urge the Austrian Government to take whatever action is necessary to permit and facilitate travel of Soviet Union emigrants through Austria.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA LOAN SETTLEMENT

The Senate bill provided that any settlement of the debt owed to the United States by India that is less than the full amount owed must be authorized by the Congress.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

It is the intent of the committee of conference, however, that the administration report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, as well as to the Senate and House Agriculture Committees, the terms of any proposed settlement with India, with the right to review, 30 days prior to entering into such settlement.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has asked the General Accounting Office for a detailed study of the entire situation concerning U.S.-owned foreign currencies.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHILE

The Senate bill contained a sense of the Congress provision that the President should deny any military or economic assistance to Chile until he finds that the Government of Chile is protecting human rights of all individuals, Chilean and foreign; support certain other steps to insure the protection of human rights; be prepared to provide asylum and resettlement opportunities for a reasonable number of political refugees; support and facilitate efforts by voluntary agencies to meet emergency relief needs; and request the Inter-American Commission on Human

Rights to undertake an immediate inquiry into recent events in Chile.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded with an amendment striking out the language which would deny aid and substituting the expression of Congress that the President should request the Government of Chile to protect human rights in Chile. The committee of conference also agreed to delete the reference to providing asylum and resettlement opportunities for political refugees.

BUREAU OF HUMANITARIAN AND SOCIAL SERVICES

The Senate bill expressed the sense of Congress that there should be created a new Bureau of Humanitarian and Social Services in the Department of State, to be headed by a new Assistant Secretary of State, with responsibility for continuing guidance and coordination of U.S. Government efforts related to refugee relief assistance, victims of international disasters, migration and visa affairs, the field of international human rights, overall government liaison with the United Nations and other appropriate international agencies and nongovernmental organizations.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded.

HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE IN SOUTH ASIA

The Senate bill authorized the President to use \$6 million of funds appropriated to carry out the Foreign Assistance Act to furnish humanitarian assistance to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees in support of the repatriation and exchange of minority populations between Pakistan and Bangladesh.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate receded. Existing law (section 2(c) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-510)) already authorizes the President to transfer up to \$10 million of Foreign Assistance Act funds in any fiscal year to meet unexpected urgent refugee and migration needs.

WORLD FOOD SHORTAGES

The Senate bill contained language urging full participation by the United States in efforts to alleviate current and future food shortages, the establishment of a high level commission to study and report on the world food situation, consultation with various international organizations involved in this field, and proposing revision of Public Law 480 to permit greater utilization of United States food production in meeting emergency and humanitarian requirements for food assistance.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded with amendments expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the world food situation and steps deemed necessary to deal with it.

LOCAL CURRENCIES USED FOR MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The Senate bill amended section 104(c) of Public Law 480, which authorizes the President to enter into agreements with foreign governments to use foreign currencies generated under the Act to procure articles for the common defense, by requiring that any such agreement must be specifically authorized by statute.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed that effective July 1, 1974, no amount of any foreign currency (including principal and interest from loan repayments) which accrues in connection with any sale for foreign currency under any provision of law may be used under any agreement or any revision or extension of any prior or subsequent agreement, entered into after the date of the enactment of this act, to provide any

assistance to any foreign country to procure equipment, materials, facilities, or services for the common defense, including internal security, unless such agreement is specifically authorized by legislation enacted after such date.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

The Senate bill amended the Asian Development Bank Act (Public Law 92-245) to carry forward authorizations from fiscal year 1972 and fiscal year 1973 totaling \$100 million.

The House amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The House receded.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
DANTE B. FASCELL,
W. S. MAILLIARD,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
WM. S. BROOMFIELD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

H. H. HUMPHREY,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

THE PENDING ENERGY CRISIS

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, in the week before Thanksgiving the Senate of the United States passed an emergency energy crisis bill that to me takes us back to a very sad day in August 1964 when the House and Senate of the United States turned to the President of the United States over the Bay of Tonkin incident and said, "Mr. President, we abdicate, you run your war." That simple action tore this Nation apart for a great many years following.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, there might be some precedent in that since certainly Southeast Asia is foreign policy, but it is absolutely appalling to me that the Senate and this House could possibly consider passing a bill in the field of domestic policy, a matter of the basic jurisdiction of the U.S. Congress, which would give the President of the United States the most dictatorial powers ever given to a Chief Executive without a nation being in a state of war.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues, and seriously suggest this Congress assert itself by establishing a policy that would force us to establish policy for the energy crisis rather than again abdicating our role, and turning to the President and saying, "You, Mr. President, do your thing and not the people's thing."

SOMETHING FOR THE ARAB LEADERS TO THINK ABOUT

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree with the gentleman who just left the well in his analysis of the bill that is to come before the House. I have no intention of voting to turn all of these superpowers over to this President or any President. And while I am on the subject, I think it might be well for somebody to point out to the leaders of the Arab States that they are not being quite as smart as they think they are, and that they are not going to be allowed to even-

tually bring down the civilization of Western Europe and America, to which they have contributed nothing for 2,000 years.

I had a little chat with an Ambassador from one of those countries the other day, and he said, "You wouldn't dare invade us." I said, "Why not?" He said, "The Russians would come to our rescue." I said, "Well, they did not come to the rescue when Khrushchev was the top man in the Communist world when Eisenhower sent Marines into Lebanon, and that is a lot closer to Russia than your country."

Then he went on to say that, "You have got to make the Israeli do this, and do that, and if you do not we will have to shut off your oil." Well, that remains to be seen. These potentates and dictators down there have only three things that they are really interested in and that is their air-conditioned Cadillacs, their air-conditioned palaces, and their air-conditioned harems. You know, the welfare of the majority of the people of the world might come ahead of those priorities.

WE MUST IMMEDIATELY OPEN NAVAL OIL RESERVES

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

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to suggest in the strongest terms possible the immediate opening of the Naval Petroleum Reserve at Elk Hills and the post haste development of Naval Reserve No. 4 on the North Slope of Alaska.

Prior to the Arab embargo and the cut-off of fleet resupply in Singapore, the military was drawing 350,000 barrels per day from domestic sources and 350,000 barrels per day from foreign sources. Today all but a small amount must come from domestic sources. No one denies or should deny that our Armed Forces must be supplied on a No. 1 priority basis. This, Mr. Speaker, is what oil reserves are all about. The 180,000 barrels per day from Elk Hills would be a great help now. Orders have gone out to all domestic refiners to establish a priority for the military of 800,000,000 gallons of all types of fuel. The need is great, the time is now. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request your immediate attention and that of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee to act now to open Elk Hills at least for military supply.

UNIFORM SPEED LIMITS FOR ALL VEHICLES

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the administration proposal that the lumbering giants of the highway—buses and trucks—be permitted 55-mile-an-hour speed while automobiles are limited to 50 should be rejected by the Congress.

Whatever limit is established should apply uniformly to all vehicles.

No doubt some engines perform more

efficiently at higher speed than do others, but this can be said of automobile engines as well as truck and bus engines.

The efficiency gain-loss involved in 5 miles an hour can hardly justify the other hazards that could occur if the double standard in highway speeds is attempted.

Trucks and buses would forever be passing automobiles, and this would create horrendous hazards especially on narrow two-lane pavements. Moreover, the outrage every automobile driver will inevitably feel as the big vehicles roar past will introduce the greatest hazard of all.

Several State Governors have already seen the danger and absurdity of the double standard and so should the Congress.

I AM CONCERNED

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

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned. I am in doubt—but I refuse to accept "fear" as a foundation to build upon the future.

I am concerned because I am an American. I am in doubt because as an American I do not want to be deceived—I want to believe and I have faith in ourselves as Americans.

I concur with the President in the objective of "Project Independence" but I refuse to believe that America cannot achieve that goal prior to 1980.

I am certain "independence" never was—cannot now and never will be achieved by slowing down, turning down the heat, shutting off the lights, and getting into bed. In the short run or in the long run—that purported leadership is negative. It is not the high road of conquest over challenge—any challenge worthy of our best effort. I respectfully submit it is but a recognition of the problem—totally void of seasonable solutions to the deficiency of the supply of heating fuels, gasoline, petroleum, and petroleum products.

I am concerned for the security of America. I am concerned because negative leadership may invite an unprovoked attack from any "would be aggressor" that is ignorant of our real capacity of performance on land, in the air, and on the seas.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 9256, TO INCREASE CONTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT TO COSTS OF HEALTH BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9256), to increase the contribution of the Government to the costs of health benefits for Federal employees, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none, and ap-

points the following conferees: Messrs. DULSKI, HENDERSON, WALDIE, GROSS, and HOGAN.

ADMINISTRATION OF LEAVE SYSTEM FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1284) to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the administration of the leave system for Federal employees, with Senate amendments thereto, concur in Senate amendments Nos. 1 through 7, and concur in Senate amendment No. 8 with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 22, strike out "subsections (b) and (d)" and insert "subsections (b), (d), and (e)".

Page 2, line 24, strike out "subsection:" and insert "subsections:".

Page 3, line 3, strike out "such" and insert "the".

Page 3, line 6, strike out "such" and insert "the".

Page 3, line 8, strike out "such" and insert "the".

Page 3, line 21, strike out "title." and insert "title".

Page 3, after line 21, insert:

"(e) Annual leave otherwise accruable after June 30, 1960, which is lost by operation of this section because of administrative error and which is not credited under subsection (d) (2) of this section because the employee is separated before the error is discovered, is subject to credit and liquidation by lump-sum payment only if a claim therefor is filed within 3 years immediately following the date of discovery of the error. Payment shall be made by the agency of employment when the lump-sum payment provisions of section 5551 of this title last became applicable to the employee at the salary rate in effect on the date of the lump-sum provisions became applicable."

Page 5, strike out all after line 20 over to and including line 5 on page 6 and insert:

Sec. 7. (a) Section 5562(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "Notwithstanding other statutes, an employee in a missing status on or after January 1, 1965, is entitled—

"(1) to payment for annual leave which accrued to his account on or after January 1, 1965, but which was forfeited under section 6304 of this title because he was unable to use that leave by virtue of his missing status; or

"(2) to have all of that accrued leave credited to his account for use. An employee shall make an election in writing, within 90 days, after the date of enactment of his sentence or 90 days immediately following the termination of that missing status, whichever is later, whether he desires that payment or credit. Payment under clause (1) of his subsection shall be at the employee's rate of basic pay in effect on the first day the employee could have made the election."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to former employees or their beneficiaries.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, we can act on this if the gentleman will explain briefly the nature of the amendments and the necessity for the amendments.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment No. 8 amends section 7 of the House bill, relating to leave lost by employees in a missing status.

The Senate amendment would permit such employees the option of accepting a lump-sum payment for the accrued leave or having such leave credited to their accounts for future use. The House bill authorized only payment for such leave.

The amendment I am offering would make two minor changes in the language of the Senate amendment.

First, my amendment would provide that any leave restored to the employee for future use shall be credited to a separate leave account in accordance with the provisions of section 6304(d) (2) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by H.R. 1284.

The effect of this change is to assure that such restored leave is not commingled with the annual leave currently earned by the employee and to require that the use of such restored leave be administered in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission under section 6304(d) (2).

In addition, my amendment would provide that the lump-sum payment for any leave forfeited by an employee in a missing status shall be based on the employee's rate of pay in effect at the time the leave was forfeited. The Senate amendment provides that such payment shall be based on the rate of pay in effect at the time the employee elects to receive the payment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and urge the adoption of the bill, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WALDIE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALDIE moves that the House concur in Senate amendments Nos. 1 through 7, and concur in Senate amendment No. 8 with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by Senate-engrossed Amendment No. 8 insert the following:

Sec. 7. (a) Section 5562(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee in a missing status on or after January 1, 1965, is entitled—

"(1) to payment for annual leave which accrued to his account on or after January 1, 1965, but which was forfeited under section 6304 of this title because he was unable to use that leave by virtue of his missing status; or

"(2) to have all of that leave restored to him and credited to a separate leave account in accordance with the provisions of section 6304(d) (2) of this title.

An employee shall elect in writing, within 90 days immediately following the date of enactment of this sentence or within 90 days immediately following the termination of his missing status, whichever is later, whether he desires payment for the leave under clause (1) of this subsection or credit of the leave under clause (2) of this subsection. Payment under clause (1) of this

subsection shall be at the employee's rate of basic pay in effect at the time the leave was forfeited."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply to former employees or their beneficiaries.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1284, LEAVE SYSTEM FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 381) authorizing the Clerk of the House to make a technical correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1284.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 381

Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to make a technical correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1284

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 1284 entitled "An Act to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the administration of the leave system for Federal employees", the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to make the following additional change in the provisions of such bill: On page 3, line 12, of the House engrossed bill, insert " , or under clause (2) of section 5562(a) of this title," immediately after the word "subsection".

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7446) to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 14, 1973.)

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

The conference report on the bill H.R. 7446 represents a final step in the efforts of the Congress to provide a logical and

workable organization to carry forward the planning and direction of the Nation's bicentennial observance on the Federal level. The basic form of the bill as it passed both Houses was worked out over weeks of effort in committee in the early part of this year.

The Senate amended the bill, and embodied those changes in six amendments. The first amendment amended section 4 of the bill. This is the section defining the functions of the new American Revolution Bicentennial Administration and responsibilities of the Administrator. The amendment provided that, in preparing the administration's plans and programs, the Administrator is to give due consideration to any related plans and programs developed by State, local, and private groups. It is further provided that he may designate special committees with representatives from such bodies to plan, develop, and coordinate specific activities.

The conferees agreed to the language of this amendment amending section 4 of H.R. 7446. This language is consistent with the basic principle of the legislation in encouraging State and local participation in the bicentennial observance.

The second amendment of the Senate amended section 7(a)(1) of the House bill by placing a ceiling of \$10,000,000 annually for the expenses of the administration. It further provided language which would have continued a program for annual grants to each of the States and territories of \$45,000 a year which had been provided for 2 years in the existing law. This would have been accomplished by providing that not more than \$2,475,000 for annual grants of \$45,000 to the Bicentennial Commission of each State, Territory, the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. This provision for the \$45,000 grants was contained in a parallel amendment to section 9 of the bill which authorized the Administrator to make equal grants from appropriated funds of not more than \$45,000 to each of the recipients.

The conferees agreed to reduce the \$45,000 figure to \$25,000 per entity and the annual authorization for this grant program to \$1,375,000. These grants would only be made to State Bicentennial Commissions for use in Bicentennial activity in accordance with regulations of the Bicentennial Administration.

Section 7(a)(2) as added by the Senate authorized an appropriation of not more than \$20,000,000 for grants-in-aid on a matching basis to the several States to assist them in developing and supporting bicentennial programs and projects as provided in the new section 9(b) as added by the Senate, the amount to remain available until expended but no later than June 30, 1976. The conferees changed this date to December 31, 1976, because of the continuing celebrations and commemorations anticipated throughout the calendar year of 1976.

The language of section 9(b) as contained in the Conference Report is the revised language agreed to by the Conferees. The Senate language provided that the amounts received under Section 9(b) by any State could not exceed

\$400,000 per State on a matching basis. In conference, it was agreed to change this language so that each recipient would be entitled to not less than \$200,000 in grants on a matching basis under the Subsection. In addition, the District of Columbia, the territories and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico were included as eligible recipients. The conferees recognized that each jurisdiction would, therefore, be assured of the right to participate in this grant program up to the amount of \$200,000 on a matching basis. The language of the subsection makes it clear that these grants are subject to regulations prescribed and approved by the Board. The \$200,000 amount is available for grants to each jurisdiction and considered obligated for that purpose, which, if not used, would lapse. It is not intended that the unused portion of the \$200,000 minimum earmarked for each jurisdiction will be available for distribution to any other jurisdiction or for any other purpose. The remaining funds under the authorization, that is, the \$9,000,000 remaining after the amount reserved for the States and other eligible jurisdictions is deducted, are therefore available for grants to any eligible jurisdiction that presents a program found acceptable to the administration.

The conferees retained Senate amendment No. 4. It is merely a conforming amendment made necessary by the renumbering changes in subsection (a) of Section 9.

The Senate conferees receded from Senate amendment No. 6 which would have provided that the Administrator would serve as Chairman of the American Revolution Bicentennial Board and the Vice Chairman shall be elected by members of the Board from members of the Board. The conferees agreed to retain the original House language providing that the Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected by members of the Board from members of the Board other than the Administrator.

As is emphasized in the conference report, the conferees intended that the regulations provide a reasonable period for applications for grants by eligible entities. This, of course, recognizes that the eligible jurisdictions must promptly formulate their plans and present them to the administration.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, how much is this above the bill as it left the House?

Mr. DONOHUE. In the bill as it left the House, we did not authorize the appropriation of any specific amount. The provision in the House bill, in effect, has stated that the amount to be appropriated would be left up to the Appropriations Committee as the Appropriations Committee thought necessary and needed for the carrying out of the American Bicentennial program. This, of course, would be changed by the language in the conference report which does impose limitations in authorizing appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. It is reported that this

bill is \$20 million above the authorization that left the House. Could that be possible?

Mr. DONOHUE. There was no authorized amount provided in the bill as passed by the House. It was sort of open ended, permitting the Appropriations Committee to appropriate such sums as it thought was necessary and needed.

It is true that in the conference report there is a provision authorizing \$20 million as a result of a Senate amendment, but I must call to the attention of the gentleman from Iowa that this \$20 million is on a matching basis. In order to get the \$200,000, that State or that entity must match it with \$200,000 out of its own treasury.

Mr. GROSS. Well, the facts of the matter are that there will be an increase of \$20 million in the authorization; is that not correct?

Mr. DONOHUE. There would be \$20 million available to assist the States, the particular States and also a provision for limited grants to State bicentennial commissions to assist the State bicentennial commissions to carry out their plans and their programs.

Mr. GROSS. How much has already been spent on this project, if the gentleman has a round figure? How much is contemplated to be spent?

Mr. DONOHUE. Up until and through 1973, there was approximately \$11,541,000, and deducting what was granted to the States from that amount would leave the amount at \$6,741,000. In other words, the American Bicentennial Commission on the Federal level has had available to it \$6,741,000 dating back from 1969 through 1973.

Mr. GROSS. This project has had some very bad administration. Does the gentleman think the administration has been improved or will be improved?

Mr. DONOHUE. I am quite confident it will be improved decidedly under the provisions of the amended legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Well, does the gentleman think that by 1976 there will be enough energy left in this country to stage a bicentennial celebration?

Mr. DONOHUE. I sincerely hope so.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman sincerely hopes so.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I participated in the conference deliberations on behalf of the House. I urge the adoption of this conference report as a legitimate compromise between the views of the House and the Senate.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this conference report on the creation of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration. This legislation is an example of how unbalanced our priorities remain despite our country being in the midst of a severe national energy crisis.

In a time when we should be devoting every effort and dollar toward solutions and alternatives to a petroleum-deficient society, we have instead voted to spend over \$30 million over the next 3 calendar years for a commemorative event. I can-

not stress enough my own belief that this money should instead be spent to confront the energy problems that face us now—and not for a bureaucracy whose past has been marred by partisanship and bungling bureaucratic ineptitude.

Mr. Speaker, I would propose that this money instead be put into an energy research trust fund which can make the Nation energy free by 1976. There is no better way for America to redeclare its independence. This Nation can no more be half-sufficient than half-free.

The energy research and development fund could be named in honor of the Bicentennial and become the cornerstone of the energy trust fund, which could be supplemented by a 4-cent tax per gallon of gasoline and a small graduated tax on other energy. It could thus be developed into a \$6 billion fund to be used for energy research and development. Among the types of energy that could be developed by such a fund are—

Solar energy for electricity and heating and cooling;
Oil shale;
Coal gasification and liquidification;
Geothermal energy;
Fusion research;
Wind power and the utilization of tidal currents;
Improved transmission of electrical energy;
Improved generation of electricity—MHD;

New forms of conservation devices;
Alternatives to petroleum as a fuel, such as hydrogen; and
Utilization of ocean thermal gradients.
Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There is no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. WYDLER. 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 357, nays 34, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 595]

YEAS—357

Abdnor	Bray	Casey, Tex.
Abzug	Breaux	Cederberg
Adams	Breckinridge	Chamberlain
Addabbo	Brinkley	Chappell
Andrews, N.C.	Brooks	Chisholm
Annunzio	Broomfield	Clancy
Archer	Brotzman	Clark
Arends	Brown, Calif.	Clausen
Armstrong	Brown, Mich.	Don H.
Aspin	Brown, Ohio	Clawson, Del
Baker	Broyhill, N.C.	Clay
Barrett	Broyhill, Va.	Cleveland
Bell	Burgener	Cochran
Bennett	Burke, Fla.	Conable
Bergland	Burleson, Tex.	Conte
Beverly	Burlison, Mo.	Corman
Biaggi	Burton	Cotter
Blester	Butler	Coughlin
Bingham	Byron	Cronin
Boland	Camp	Culver
Bolling	Carey, N.Y.	Daniel, Dan
Bowen	Carney, Ohio	Daniel, Robert
Brademas	Carter	W., Jr.
Brasco		

Daniels	Jordan	Robinson, Va.
Dominick V.	Karth	Robison, N.Y.
Danielson	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Davis, Ga.	Kazen	Roe
Davis, S.C.	Kemp	Rogers
Davis, Wis.	Ketchum	Roncallo, N.Y.
de la Garza	King	Rooney, Pa.
Delaney	Kluczynski	Rose
Dellums	Koch	Rosenthal
Denholm	Kuykendall	Rostenkowski
Dennis	Kyros	Roush
Dent	Latta	Rousselot
Derwinski	Leggett	Roy
Devine	Lehman	Roybal
Dickinson	Long, La.	Runnels
Dingell	Long, Md.	Ruppe
Donohue	Lott	Ruth
Dorn	Lujan	Ryan
Drinan	McClary	St Germain
Dulski	McCloskey	Sandman
Duncan	McCollister	Sarasin
du Pont	McCormack	Sarbanes
Edwards, Ala.	McDade	Satterfield
Edwards, Calif.	McEwen	Scherle
Elberg	McKay	Schneebeli
Erlenborn	McKinney	Sebelius
Esch	McSpadden	Selberling
Eshleman	Madden	Shipley
Ewins, Tenn.	Madigan	Shoup
Fascell	Mahon	Shriver
Findley	Mailliard	Sikes
Fish	Mallory	Sisk
Flood	Mann	Skubitz
Flowers	Maraziti	Slack
Ford, Gerald R.	Martin, Nebr.	Smith, Iowa
Forsythe	Martin, N.C.	Smith, N.Y.
Fountain	Mathias, Calif.	Spence
Fraser	Mathis, Ga.	Staggers
Frelinghuysen	Matunaga	Stanton
Frenzel	Mayne	J. William
Frey	Mazzoli	Stanton
Fulton	Meeds	James V.
Fuqua	Meicher	Stark
Gaydos	Metcalfe	Steed
Gettys	Mezvinisky	Steelman
Gialmo	Michel	Steiger, Wis.
Gibbons	Minford	Stephens
Ginn	Minish	Stratton
Goldwater	Mink	Stubblefield
Gonzalez	Minshall, Ohio	Stuckey
Goodling	Mitchell, Md.	Studds
Grasso	Mitchell, N.Y.	Sullivan
Green, Oreg.	Moakley	Symington
Green, Pa.	Mollohan	Talcott
Griffiths	Montgomery	Taylor, Mo.
Grover	Moorhead, Calif.	Taylor, N.C.
Gude	Moorhead, Pa.	Teague, Calif.
Gunter	Morgan	Teague, Tex.
Guy	Mosher	Thomson, Wis.
Haley	Moss	Thone
Hamilton	Murphy, Ill.	Thornton
Hammer-	Myers	Towell, Nev.
schmidt	Natcher	Treen
Hanley	Nedzi	Udall
Hanna	Nelsen	Ullman
Hanrahan	Nichols	Vander Jagt
Hansen, Idaho	Nix	Veysey
Harrington	Obey	Vigorito
Harsha	O'Brien	Waggoner
Harvey	O'Neill	Walsh
Hastings	Owens	Wampler
Hays	Parris	Ware
Hébert	Passman	Whalen
Heckler, Mass.	Patten	White
Heinz	Pepper	Whitehurst
Helstoski	Perkins	Whitten
Henderson	Pettis	Widnall
Hicks	Peyser	Wiggins
Hillis	Pickle	Williams
Hogan	Pike	Wilson, Bob
Holifield	Poage	Winn
Holt	Podell	Wolff
Holtzman	Powell, Ohio	Wright
Horton	Preyer	Wyatt
Hosmer	Price, Ill.	Wylder
Howard	Price, Tex.	Wyllie
Huber	Pritchard	Wyman
Hudnut	Quillen	Yates
Hungate	Rallsback	Yatron
Hunt	Randall	Young, Fla.
Hutchinson	Rarick	Young, Ill.
Ichord	Regula	Young, S.C.
Johnson, Calif.	Reuss	Young, Tex.
Jones, Ala.	Rhodes	Zablocki
Jones, N.C.	Rinaldo	Zion
Jones, Okla.		Zwack
Jones, Tenn.		

NAYS—34

Anderson, Calif.	Collier	Fisher
Bafalis	Collins, Tex.	Flynt
Bauman	Conlan	Froehlich
Beard	Crane	Gilman
	Eckhardt	Gross

Hawkins	Roncallo, Wyo.	Vanik
Hechler, W. Va.	Schroeder	Waldie
Landgrebe	Shuster	Wilson
Miller	Snyder	Charles H., Calif.
Murphy, N.Y.	Steiger, Ariz.	Young, Alaska
Rangel	Symms	
Riegle	Thompson, N.J.	
Roberts	Van Deerlin	

NOT VOTING—42

Alexander	Diggs	Litton
Anderson, Ill.	Downing	Macdonald
Andrews	Evans, Colo.	Mills, Ark.
N. Dak.	Foley	Mizell
Ashbrook	Ford	O'Hara
Ashley	William D.	Patman
Badillo	Gray	Rees
Blackburn	Gubser	Reid
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, N.Y.
Boggs	Hinshaw	Steele
Buchanan	Jarman	Stokes
Burke, Calif.	Johnson, Pa.	Tierman
Collins, Ill.	Keating	Wilson
Conyers	Landrum	Charles, Tex.
Dellenback	Lent	Young, Ga.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Patman.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Mizell.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Badillo.
Mrs. Collins of Illinois with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Tierman.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mrs. Burke of California.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Young of Georgia with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Litton with Mr. Dellenback.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Keating.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Steele.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 7446, AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 382) authorizing the Clerk of the House to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 7446.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 382

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 7446) to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed in the second sentence of section 9(a) to strike out "as he may prescribe" and insert in lieu thereof "as may be prescribed".

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report on the bill H.R. 7446.

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

There was no objection.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME ACT OF 1973

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 718, Rept. No. 93-665), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 718

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. 11324) to provide for daylight saving time on a year-round basis for a two-year trial period. 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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed in the bill as an original bill for amendment under the five-minute rule, and all points of order against section 5 of said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7, Rule XVI are hereby waived. At the conclusion of such consideration, 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.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 718 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 718?

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 Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 349, nays 40, not voting 44, as follows:

[Role No. 596]

YEAS—349

Abzug	Fascell	Melcher
Adams	Findley	Metcalfe
Addabbo	Fish	Mezvinsky
Anderson,	Fisher	Michel
Calif.	Flood	Millford
Andrews, N.C.	Flowers	Miller
Annunzio	Ford, Gerald R.	Minish
Archer	Forsythe	Mink
Arends	Fountain	Minshall, Ohio
Armstrong	Fraser	Mitchell, Md.
Aspin	Frelinghuysen	Mitchell, N.Y.
Bafalis	Frenzel	Moakley
Baker	Frey	Mollohan
Barrett	Fröhlich	Montgomery
Bauman	Fulton	Moorhead,
Beard	Fuqua	Calif.
Bell	Gaydos	Moorhead, Pa.
Bennett	Gettys	Morgan
Bergland	Gialmo	Mosher
Bevill	Gibbons	Moss
Blaggi	Gilman	Murphy, Ill.
Biester	Gonzalez	Murphy, N.Y.
Bingham	Goodling	Myers
Boland	Grasso	Natcher
Bolling	Green, Oreg.	Nedzi
Bowen	Green, Pa.	Nelsen
Brademas	Griffiths	Nichols
Brasco	Grover	Nix
Breaux	Gude	Obey
Breckinridge	Gunter	O'Brien
Brinkley	Guyer	O'Neill
Brooks	Hamilton	Owens
Broomfield	Hanley	Parrisi
Brotzman	Hanna	Passman
Brown, Calif.	Hanrahan	Patten
Brown, Mich.	Hansen, Idaho	Pepper
Brown, Ohio	Harrington	Perkins
Broyhill, N.C.	Harsha	Pettis
Broyhill, Va.	Harvey	Peyster
Burgener	Hawkins	Pickle
Burke, Fla.	Hays	Pike
Burke, Mass.	Hébert	Poedel
Burlison, Mo.	Heckler, Mass.	Powell, Ohio
Burton	Heinz	Preyer
Butler	Helstoski	Price, Ill.
Byron	Henderson	Pritchard
Camp	Hicks	Quile
Carey, N.Y.	Hillis	Quillen
Carney, Ohio	Hinshaw	Rallsback
Casey, Tex.	Hogan	Rangel
Cederberg	Holt	Regula
Chamberlain	Holtzman	Reuss
Chappell	Horton	Rhodes
Chisholm	Hosmer	Riegle
Clancy	Howard	Rinaldo
Clark	Huber	Roberts
Clausen,	Hudnut	Robinson, Va.
Don H.	Hunt	Robison, N.Y.
Clawson, Del	Ichord	Rodino
Clay	Johnson, Calif.	Roe
Cleveland	Johnson, Colo.	Rogers
Cochran	Jones, Ala.	Roncallo, Wyo.
Cohen	Jones, N.C.	Roncallo, N.Y.
Collier	Jones, Tenn.	Rooney, Pa.
Collins, Tex.	Jordan	Rose
Conable	Karth	Rosenthal
Conte	Kastenmeier	Rostenkowski
Corman	Kemp	Roush
Cotter	Ketchum	Rousselot
Crane	King	Roy
Cronin	Kluczynski	Roybal
Culver	Koch	Runnels
Daniel, Dan	Kuykendall	Ruppe
Daniel, Robert	Kyros	Ruth
W., Jr.	Latta	Ryan
Daniels	Leggett	St Germain
Dominick V.	Lehman	Sandman
Danielson	Lent	Sarasin
Davis, Ga.	Long, La.	Sarbanes
Davis, S.O.	Long, Md.	Satterfield
Davis, Wis.	Lott	Schneebeli
Delaney	Lujan	Schroeder
Dellums	McClory	Seiberling
Dennis	McCloskey	Shipley
Dent	McCollister	Shoup
Derwinski	McCormack	Shriver
Devine	McDade	Shuster
Dickinson	McEwen	Sikes
Dingell	McFall	Sisk
Donohue	McKay	Skubitz
Dorn	McKinney	Slack
Drinan	Madden	Smith, Iowa
Dulski	Madigan	Smith, N.Y.
du Pont	Mallory	Snyder
Eckhardt	Mann	Staggers
Edwards, Ala.	Maraziti	Stanton,
Edwards, Calif.	Martin, N.C.	J. William
Eilberg	Mathias, Calif.	Stanton,
Erlenborn	Matsunaga	James V.
Esch	Mazzoli	Stark
Eshleman	Meeds	Steelman
Evins, Tenn.		Steiger, Wis.

Stephens	Van Deerlin	Wilson,
Stratton	Vander Jagt	Charles H.,
Stubblefield	Vanik	Calif.
Stuckey	Veysey	Winn
Studds	Vigorito	Wolf
Sullivan	Waggonner	Wright
Symington	Waldis	Wyder
Talcott	Walsh	Wyllie
Taylor, N.C.	Wampler	Wyman
Teague, Calif.	Ware	Yates
Thompson, N.J.	Whalen	Yatron
Thomson, Wis.	Whitehurst	Young, Alaska
Thone	Whitten	Young, Fla.
Thornton	Widnall	Young, Ill.
Towell, Nev.	Wiggins	Zablocki
Treen	Williams	Zion
Udall	Wilson, Bob	Zwach
Ullman		

NAYS—40

Abdnor	Hechler, W. Va.	Randall
Bray	Hungate	Rarick
Burleson, Tex.	Hutchinson	Scherle
Carter	Jones, Okla.	Sebelius
Conlan	Kazen	Spence
de la Garza	Landgrebe	Steed
Denholm	McSpadden	Steiger, Ariz.
Duncan	Mahon	Symms
Flynt	Martin, Nebr.	Taylor, Mo.
Ginn	Mathis, Ga.	Teague, Tex.
Gross	Mayne	White
Haley	Mizell	Young, S.C.
Hammer-	Poage	Young, Tex.
schmidt	Price, Tex.	

NOT VOTING—44

Alexander	Diggs	Macdonald
Anderson, Ill.	Downing	Mailliard
Andrews,	Evans, Colo.	Mills, Ark.
N. Dak.	Foley	O'Hara
Ashbrook	Ford,	Patman
Ashley	William D.	Rees
Badillo	Gray	Reid
Blackburn	Gubser	Rooney, N.Y.
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Steele
Boggs	Hastings	Stokes
Buchanan	Hollifield	Tierman
Burke, Calif.	Jarman	Wilson,
Collins, Ill.	Johnson, Pa.	Charles, Tex.
Conyers	Keating	Wyatt
Coughlin	Landrum	Young, Ga.
Dellenback	Litton	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider House Resolution 718.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York and Mr. Dellenback for, with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas against.

Mr. Reid and Mr. Stokes for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mr. Steele and Mrs. Boggs for, with Mr. Jarman against.

Mr. Diggs and Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Coughlin.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Buchanan.
Mrs. Collins of Illinois with Mr. Evans of Colorado.

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Tierman with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Young of Georgia with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Litton with Mr. Keating.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Wyatt with Mr. Landrum.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California (Mr. SISK), is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee

(Mr. QUILLEN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 718 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 11324, a bill to provide for year-round daylight saving time in the United States for a 2-year trial period.

House Resolution 718 provides that it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

House Resolution 718 also provides that all points of order against section 5 of said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7, rule XVI—the germaneness provision—of the Rules of the House of Representatives are waived.

H.R. 11324 provides that the standard time of each time zone into which the United States is divided would be advanced one hour beginning at 2 a.m. on the first Sunday which occurs more than 30 days after the date of enactment of the legislation and terminating at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday of April 1975.

The only provision of the bill requiring additional expenditures is section 3 which requires the Secretary of Transportation to submit a report to the Congress on the operation and effects of the legislation on or before June 30, 1975. This report is expected to cost approximately \$300,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of House Resolution 718 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 11324.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the able gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) explained, this is an emergency measure.

Mr. Speaker, with the fuel and energy crisis which we have confronting us, whatever we can do for the benefit of all the people of this country we should do.

The committee report states that the savings will amount to up to 2 percent in the use of electricity and energy if this bill goes into effect.

It is my hope the committee will offer an amendment to see that daylight saving time goes into effect sooner when the bill is before the House.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 718 provides for the consideration of H.R. 11324, the Daylight Saving Time Act of 1973, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. The rule also makes it in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute from the committee as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and all points of order against section 5 of the substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI, dealing with germaneness.

The primary purpose of H.R. 11324 is to provide for year-round daylight saving time for a 2-year period in order to reduce energy consumption in the United States.

The bill would take effect on the first Sunday which occurs more than 30 days after the date of enactment and terminate on the last Sunday of April 1975,

when regular daylight saving goes into effect for the summer of 1975.

The bill requires that the Secretary of Transportation report to the Congress on the effects of the bill by June 30, 1975. The report is to provide data indicating whether year-round daylight saving time should be continued.

The authority of the Secretary of Transportation to alter time zone limits would be suspended while the legislation is in effect.

Finally, the FCC would be directed to permit daytime AM radio stations which are not otherwise eligible for presunrise operating authority to operate up to 1 hour in advance of local sunrise, insofar as this is in the public interest and does not conflict with existing treaties.

The cost of this bill is estimated to be about \$300,000, which funds will be used to prepare the report to Congress on the effects of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this important piece of legislation and urge the adoption of this rule.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. 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. 11324) to provide for daylight saving time on a year-round basis for a 2-year trial period.

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. 11324, with Mr. MONTGOMERY 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 West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentlemen from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I think most of us are conversant with the bill and what its intent is.

We have had this issue of daylight saving time up before us in the Congress several times previously. This is for all intents and purposes a year-round application of the concept of daylight saving time.

This legislation was requested by the President because we are dealing with an energy emergency. The President has stated that this would be a major and important part of the Government's attempt to save energy in America.

He sent a message to the Congress stating that this is one means of energy conservation, and that this is a bill that he wants to have passed as soon as possible.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia said that we have had this legislation before the House of Representatives on other occasions. When did we ever have a year-round daylight savings time bill before the House of Representatives?

Mr. STAGGERS. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that I think the gentleman misunderstood what I said. In general, the text of what we have here, we have had before the House before. This has been before the House at least twice before during wartime when we have had daylight saving.

Mr. GROSS. How many years have elapsed since World War II?

Mr. STAGGERS. I think the gentleman from Iowa can figure that out as well as I can. That was in 1945.

Mr. GROSS. We have not had year-round daylight saving time since World War II, have we?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And after the end of the Second World War one of the first wartime powers acts that was repealed was the one for year-round daylight saving, was it not, because the country was sick and tired of year-round daylight saving time, and the gentleman knows that.

I would further ask the gentleman as to when the last mass meeting held in West Virginia took place in favor of daylight savings time the year around, asking for this particular legislation. Did such a mass meeting occur in West Virginia?

Mr. STAGGERS. No; the President of the United States went on television and said that we were in the midst of an energy crisis in America, and stated that he wanted to have year-round daylight saving time in order to save energy. He further told the people of this Nation that this was one of the sacrifices, among others, that they would have to make in order to conserve energy. That is the reason for this bill being on the floor today.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman still has not answered my question, and that was: When was the last mass meeting held in West Virginia for year-round daylight saving time?

Mr. STAGGERS. I do not know whether they were held in Iowa or elsewhere, and that is neither here nor there. This is a problem that the President has brought up before this Congress, and the issue is before us, and we have to meet it.

Mr. Chairman, the bill would go into effect on the first Sunday which occurs more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this legislation. However, there have been many Members in the Senate and many Members in the House, and others who have said that they would like to have this take effect the first Sunday which occurs more than 15 days after the enactment of this legislation. I would be agreeable to that, and I will offer an amendment at the proper time to make it become effective at that time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me.

Actually, much of the evidence that was presented before the committee regarding this daylight saving time bill was concerning merely estimates; is that true?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is true.

Mr. CARTER. Do we really know that this will result in the saving of this amount of energy?

Mr. STAGGERS. I might say that the Secretary of the Interior said that if we enacted this bill, in the testimony given before our committee, that we would save 95,000 barrels of oil each day.

Mr. CARTER. Did he say we would save that?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Or that that was in the realm of possibility? As I heard those hearings, everyone said that it was their best understanding that we possibly could save this much energy.

Mr. STAGGERS. That was the estimate, that is right.

Mr. CARTER. If the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will yield further, is it not true that in the gentleman's district and in other mountainous areas such as that of the gentleman's district and my own, that many of our school-children are bused to school before daylight each day, is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct. But let me say to the gentleman from Kentucky that as far as any State in the Union is concerned, that they can change their school opening time if they want to do so. There is nothing to prohibit the gentleman's State of Kentucky or my own State of West Virginia changing the school day, if they want to do so. That is in the local school district's control. It is up to them to do what they desire.

Mr. CARTER. It is possible that they might do so, but I want to state further to the distinguished chairman that there are other States who merely want to have extra time for play in the evening, and that much of the desire for this is not so as to save energy, but rather so as to get extra playtime in the evening, and that this applies particularly to some of our so-called Sunshine States.

Mr. STAGGERS. I do not disagree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. CARTER. No doubt, the distinguished Chairman will remember the testimony of the mayor's office in California which stated that that was one of the reasons they supported this legislation, and to increase playtime in the afternoon.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would agree with the gentleman, but I will say I do not believe that is the reason that the President of the United States gave when he said that this was one of the "must" bills in the energy crisis that we are having right now, and that we need it.

Mr. CARTER. I am sure that the President has his reasons.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CARTER. This House is here to work its will.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right.

Mr. CARTER. The legislation passed here will be by the will of the Members.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, is there anything in this bill that will let the individual States have a say in whether or not they want to go to daylight saving time?

Mr. STAGGERS. It is binding on all States because we felt if there was going to be a sacrifice in any way, it should be universal.

Mr. KAZEN. But the only choice they have is combining the two, so we would not have two different time zones.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right.

Mr. KAZEN. But does the State legislature in any State have the right to come in and say, No, we do not want daylight saving time in the State of West Virginia or in the State of Texas, or any place else?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, they do not.

Mr. KAZEN. This is a mandatory bill under which the entire United States will have to go on daylight saving time?

Mr. STAGGERS. Our people are going to have to recognize that they are in an energy crisis, and all of them must suffer equally, if we are going to suffer at all.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, I think that the degree of suffering in the various parts of the country is different.

Mr. STAGGERS. It surely is.

Mr. KAZEN. Therefore, the situation should be different in different parts of the country, and the States themselves are not unpatriotic. If they find that it is going to save fuel, and if they find that their economy is not going to be disrupted, and there are many other elements that enter into it, they may or may not desire to go into this program.

Mr. STAGGERS. We know that.

Mr. KAZEN. But this fixes it so they cannot do it.

Mr. STAGGERS. Only as long as we are in an energy crisis. This is only a temporary bill; it is not a permanent bill.

Mr. KAZEN. This is a 2-year bill; is it not?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, it is not. It runs out in April, 1975, which will be about 14 months. Then we shall have a study by the Department of Transportation to see how effective it is, to see whether it does save energy, to see whether it does prevent crime in America.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with everything the gentleman has said, but these investigations should have been made before this bill was presented.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman from West Virginia knows, the State of Arizona is against this bill. We feel that it will cause hardships to the people in our State if this

bill is passed as it now reads. Nevertheless, I should like to say to my good friend, the distinguished Chairman, that I will support the bill. I think it is good legislation, and I would hope that it will pass.

The Senate bill which has been reported by the committee in the other body, has a provision which I will commend to the gentleman from West Virginia and his committee. It appears in the Senate bill, in the report. It, in my opinion, would go a long way to resolving some of the perhaps unforeseeable problems which we might have in various States, and it reads like this. It is on page 6 of the Senate report.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a State, by proclamation of its governor, makes a finding prior to the commencement of a period of advanced time under this subsection that an exemption from the operation of this subsection or a realignment of time zone limits is necessary to avoid undue hardship or to conserve fuel in such State or part thereof, the President may grant such exemption or realignment.

This is not mandatory language; it is permissive language; but I do think it might be efficacious in the future in perhaps suggesting some problems that we cannot now foresee by the passage of this bill.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding.

Indiana is grateful to the committee for looking out for its interests. However, there are some questions which I think should be raised.

As I understand it, in section 2(b), that would apply only to the State of Indiana because of action that it has previously taken to take care of its rather unique summer months if by legislative action 2(a), Mr. Chairman, it provides:

except that any State with parts thereof in more than one time zone may by law exempt the entire area of the State lying within one time zone from the provisions of this subsection.

My question is this: Does this section permit Indiana to remain on standard time during the winter months and to adopt daylight saving time during the summer months if it by legislative action so chooses?

Mr. STAGGERS. I would say to the gentleman, if he would read section 2(b) he would find Indiana is covered by that section.

Mr. ROUSH. Will the gentleman repeat his answer.

Mr. STAGGERS. Under the provisions of section 2(b) the State of Indiana could by law provide that the exemption which is deemed to be in effect under this legislation shall no longer apply, in which case the Northwest and Southwest corners of Indiana which are in the central time zone would observe advanced central time and the remainder of Indiana which is in the eastern time zone would observe advanced eastern time until this legislation terminates on the last Sunday of April 1975.

Mr. ROUSH. But Indiana would not be prohibited, would it, Mr. Chairman, from changing its mind and adopting the daylight saving time provisions of this bill?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, that is right. It could be done as I have already stated by law waiving the exemption that section 2(b) deems to apply.

Mr. ROUSH. If Indiana chose to do that, it would have to be bound by that choice during the winter months. Is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. ROUSH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the managers of this legislation have delivered a very thorough explanation of the daylight saving bill, H.R. 11324. I will therefore limit my remarks to urging its passage and to congratulating the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for including an amendment to this legislation which will allow several hundred daytime only AM radio broadcasting stations to stay on the air and to remain in business.

Section 5 of this bill requires the Federal Communications Commission to permit, consistent with the public interest, daytime AM radio broadcast stations to operate not more than 1 hour before local sunrise.

To have failed to include this amendment would have forced these small local radio stations to come on the air 1 hour later than the general public would awaken under the advanced time this bill contemplates. For technical reasons, FCC presently permits daytime only AM radio stations to begin operation at local sunrise, which we will assume to be 7:30 a.m. in mid-winter. Since the imposition of daylight saving time will move back the clock 1 hour, but not the sunrise, FCC would have not permitted these stations to come on the air until 8:30 a.m. advanced time under current law.

To have allowed this condition to have remained in effect would have deprived these stations of their most profitable business hours of the day. This period is known in the radio business as "prime drive time," when most of the commuting public is en route to work, and stations of this type cannot stay in business and perform their excellent service to small communities and small businesses if they are deprived of this advertising time.

The action by the committee in recognizing and solving this problem to the satisfaction of the Federal Communications Commission is to be highly commended. I know that the small radio broadcasters and their listening public appreciate this amendment.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion the bill is one we all recognize is an emergency measure. It is a temporary bill. Its operation and effects will be studied and we will have the recommendations of the administration before it is extended.

I recommend passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the remarks made by the members of the committee on this bill. I think the chairman of the committee and the committee have been expeditious in handling this bill.

Even though this legislation might create some inconvenience for some sections of our country, I think at the present time this is very necessary and I commend the committee for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the winter of 1973-74 holds the promise of the most serious energy crisis in the history of this Nation. The curtailment of oil from the Middle East has aggravated an already growing shortage of wintertime petroleum supplies. We as a nation must now turn toward measures to cut unnecessary energy consumption without seriously harming our economy or the comfort of our citizens.

The President, in his November 8 energy message, stated that he would seek legislation to "authorize an immediate return to daylight saving time on a year-round basis." The legislation we are considering today, H.R. 11324, is in response to this request for authority sought by the President.

The principal purposes of H.R. 11324, as reported from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, are: First, to provide for year-round daylight saving time in the United States on a 2-year trial basis; and second, to provide data on which to base a determination as to whether year-round observance of daylight saving time should be continued.

Various studies by independent and governmental agencies have indicated that year-round daylight saving time will yield significant energy savings in the form of lowered demand for electrical energy.

According to the fact sheet accompanying the President's energy message, the observance of year-round daylight saving time could reduce electricity and heating demands, particularly in the northeastern areas, by as much as 3 percent.

However, no information is available which estimates with certainty that an overall reduction in energy consumption will directly result from the year-round observance of daylight saving time.

Nonetheless, there is evidence that there is a high probability of such a reduction. In testimony presented before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Mayor Bradley of Los Angeles estimated that daylight saving time on a year-around basis would save his city approximately 200,000 barrels of oil annually. He also noted that Southern California Edison Co. has estimated a savings of 500,000 barrels per year.

The American Public Power Association, representing local publicly owned power companies, estimated that year-around observance of daylight saving time could save that portion of the industry the equivalent of between 4.3 and 8.6 million barrels of oil during the 1974-75 winter period.

Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, in a recent study using conservative estimates, projected a savings of 4 million barrels of oil annually.

Year-around daylight saving time may have beneficial effects besides direct energy conservation. There is evidence that added daylight during the evening rush hours will significantly reduce traffic fatalities. Great Britain, during its 3-year period of year-around daylight saving time, experienced a 3.8-percent reduction in the number of motor vehicle fatalities and serious accidents.

In large urban areas, additional daylight in the evening hours may reduce street crime.

There is the possibility that an extra hour of daylight in the evening will contribute to the economic well-being by adding additional shopping hours after 5 p.m. and by increasing the number of hours of overlay between the United States and European business day.

Changing to daylight saving time in April and back again in October has proved confusing and costly for certain segments of our economy. Adjustments in train, plane, and other schedules involve some expense for industry and some confusion for the traveler.

Farmers have traditionally been troubled by this switch in time, particularly the dairy farmers. Year-around daylight saving time will eliminate this switching back and forth and at least alleviate those problems associated with adjusting to new time.

However many advantages it may have, the observance of year-around daylight saving time also presents problems. Children required to travel considerable distances to school in darkness poses a safety problem. It is hoped that this problem could be lessened by the States and local school districts adopting a later beginning time for schools, and the committee endorsed this approach.

Another problem resulting from enactment of this legislation is its effect on standard-AM-radio broadcasting stations operating during daylight hours only. There are approximately 2,270 stations in this category throughout the country. H.R. 11324, in directing the Federal Communications Commission to permit daytime standard-AM-radio broadcast stations to operate up to 1 hour in advance of local sunrise, I believe adequately and fairly meets this problem.

Because data on the effects of year-round daylight saving time is so limited, the additional provision directing the Secretary of Transportation to submit a report on these effects to the Congress on or before June 30, 1975, will enable the Congress to make a considered determination as to whether year-round daylight saving time should be continued in the future.

Under normal circumstances I would

be reluctant to support the continuation of daylight saving time on a year-round basis. However, the magnitude of the energy shortage has necessitated a concerted effort on all fronts to cut back on energy consumption, and I believe the observance of daylight saving time on a year-round basis will contribute to this effort.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. My purpose today is to discuss a bill which I have strongly supported and cosponsored, H.R. 11324, calling for the initiation of daylight saving time on a year-round basis. I strongly believe that this legislation is a logical and necessary proposal, especially when one considers the current energy crisis facing our country.

Only twice in the Nation's history has daylight saving time been uniformly observed throughout the land since Benjamin Franklin first suggested it in 1784. The United States began experimenting with daylight saving time in 1918 largely as a result of World War I. With the advent of World War II, the United States put into effect "war time" in order to aid war production. Unfortunately, immediately after both wars many areas abandoned daylight saving time altogether. We are now facing another crisis in the field of energy which calls for the reinstitution of daylight saving time on a nationwide level.

The energy crisis has brought the question of daylight saving time into a very important perspective. Consideration of gasoline and fuel oil rationing, reduction of speed limits, curtailing outdoor electrical advertising, taxing excessive uses of energy, all are drastic measures. It is strange that in a conservation-conscious period we have not initiated an easy way to conserve. The implementation of daylight saving time is certainly an easy and proper means of providing for the utilization of more daylight. We would conserve a tremendous output of electricity used to light our homes, offices, and shops in that last hour of lost afternoon sunlight. The fuel used to produce the current and also the attendant pollution therefrom would be saved. Daylight saving time would cause a reduction of peak load demand for electricity by some 5 percent. That alone will not cure the energy problem, but it is a step in the right direction.

While the issue of conserving power is the most convincing argument for the adoption of daylight saving, there are several other important benefits to the initiation of H.R. 11324.

Police statistics show that the peak crime hours are right after dark. The millions of Americans who must travel home at 5 o'clock during the early darkness that standard time so conveniently affords would be much safer from the muggers and purse snatchers during daylight traveling.

Traffic officials agree that the peak accident hours are right after dark, when during winter months America's commuters are driving home from work. With standard time we have the hour of light in the morning when many people

are still asleep and not utilizing the safer traveling conditions.

Other social benefits would result from this proposal, including an increase in recreation time. The Nation's population is now overwhelmingly urban and for these citizens daylight saving time allows evening outdoor activities and recreation so vital to our mental and physical health.

We should learn from the example set by the British in 1968, when they adopted daylight saving time. It is time to "bring our clocks more into phase with the needs of our urban society."

We are facing a crucial problem with conserving energy of the proportions seen during World War II. It is obvious that the simple act uniformly setting our clocks ahead 1 hour and maintaining this standard on a year-round basis can go far in the attempt to meet and solve our energy crisis. Our Nation and its people must learn to cope with the shortages of energy supplies and adjust properly.

It is extremely disappointing to see crime, traffic and recreational considerations fall by the wayside.

It is extremely wasteful, indeed, to not utilize an extra hour of natural energy.

We need not waste any more time—the benefits of this bill are evident. I urge its swift passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER).

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

I would like to ask the gentleman a question. In Tennessee we as a two-zone State have the privilege in our legislature to waive the provisions in this bill in one time zone.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. In one time zone only.

Mr. BAKER. If the legislature decided the eastern time zone of Tennessee would not respond to the action of this order, would this be proper?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. In one time zone only, it could not exempt the whole State.

Mr. BAKER. May I ask one more question? The President, so far as daylight saving time is concerned, has presented this in a manner which affects commerce; is that correct? The attitude of the people generally is not a matter of consideration. The only concern in the Federal statutes so far as the establishment of daylight saving time or standard time is only how it affects commerce; am I correct there?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The daylight saving time effect, of course, is to change the patterns of travel, the patterns of business or commerce, and by so doing it does have the

effect of saving energy. I do not know if that answers the gentleman's question. I am not sure I understand his question.

Mr. BAKER. If the gentleman will yield, if in the committee's judgment it is decided to change from standard to daylight saving time, is this favorable to commerce in this instance?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I would say it is going to have an effect. Are you saying it is going to have a bad effect on certain segments of commerce?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I am seeking enlightenment. I think there is definitely some business which would suffer an overall effect.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. It would not have a bad effect on all commerce. The effect of this legislation is to reduce consumption of energy which is in the overall public interest.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY).

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, Michigan is also one of those States that is divided into two time zones. This question of daylight saving time has been a very controversial question, indeed, in our State. We have had two special referendums on it within the past few years, and more than 2 million people voted in each election with not more than 51 percent voting one way or the other. We at first rejected daylight saving time, and in the last vote accepted daylight saving time.

What I want to be sure of, and I would ask my chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), whether he could answer me; as I read section 2(a) of the bill, the last portion of the last sentence says:

Except that any State with parts thereof in more than one time zone may by law exempt the entire area of the State lying within one time zone from the provisions of this subsection.

Mr. Chairman, as I read that, I would say to my chairman that I see in that language the same flexibility that we have had in the past. In other words, our State, if it wishes, can determine that one of the time zones in our State shall be exempt from daylight saving time, is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. The gentleman is correct in his assumption. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN).

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has had worlds of experience in the field of power, and I think the committee deserves to hear his expertise.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, many of us who live on the farms of America have long had our concerns about daylight saving, because the dew comes on the hay at the same time of day regardless of the laws we pass. Many of us have also had great concern about the youngsters standing out on the streets and on the highways waiting for the schoolbus in the dark under the daylight saving

system, and this does not help rural families very much.

But there is a very important factor involved here. That is the power problem, the fuel crisis in the Nation today. In the power business, one of the real concerns involves peak load. If the peak falls at one time of the day, you have to have plant capacity to meet that peak. If you can spread that peak, you can then make the power system capable of handling more kilowatt hours during the day, and in this manner the crisis can be eased.

One of the real problems we had in the Rural Electrification Administration program was to get suitable interconnection, so that one system could help another, thereby spreading their peaks and making total use of their powerplant capacities.

Before our committee, the only real, logical, convincing argument that I could see, was that by virtue of utilizing daylight savings, we would accomplish a tremendous saving of electrical capacity and fuel by spreading out the peak load period. While I would be most reluctant to continue the daylight saving program indefinitely, I want to point out that this measure would permit year-round daylight saving only until April of 1975 by which time we hope to have the current energy crisis better in hand.

So I am willing to go along with our good committee chairman, who is cooperatively going along with the administration in trying to help solve this problem. I am going to support our chairman and our ranking minority member in their endeavor here to bring this bill into realization.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CONLAN).

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill.

I think the evidence is not clear that we are going to realize very much in the way of savings; we are not going to realize anywhere near the savings that are proposed.

I rise mainly in opposition because of the suggestion of the other gentleman from Arizona, who spoke previously, pointing out that this bill is unnecessarily authoritarian in that it does not allow some of the local option features which we have had before.

Mr. Chairman, if the bill had the local option provision that was in the Senate bill, then I think it might be more palatable. If the bill does not have that provision in it, then I will have to vote against it.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11324, the Daylight Saving Time Act of 1973.

I introduced similar legislation, under the title of the Energy-Daylight Conservation Act of 1973, and my bill had 25 cosponsors.

The bill proposed today provides one efficient means of meeting the challenges of energy management. The return to daylight saving time, as a tactic in our

energy conservation strategy, has proven its utility before, both at home and abroad.

Daylight-conservation studies, conducted by researchers at the Rand Corp., of Santa Monica, Calif., indicate a 2-percent savings in electricity consumption during the winter months. The resultant fuel oil dividend could heat 50,000 to 75,000 homes.

A significant factor in the risk involved in homeward-bound commuting has been alcohol abuse. The intoxicated driver, going home in the dark, compounds the danger to himself and others.

To a large extent, crimes striking homeward-bound workers depend upon the cover of darkness. Added sunlight at the end of the working day will have a disinfecting effect upon the plague of personal assaults.

Statistically, daylight use of mass-transit is greater than nighttime, and ridership suffers a decline when the Nation reverts to standard-time. Riders, switching to safer means of transportation like their cars, swell the existing demands upon energy resources.

Year-round daylight-saving time was imposed during both world wars, and proved successful in conserving significant amounts of fuel. It is needed to conserve energy. It is needed to curtail twilight-hour crime and reduce auto accidents. When weighed against the onerous task of revising personal, industrial, governmental and professional schedules to achieve the same ends, it is a remarkably practical course.

Year-round daylight-saving time is not going to solve the energy crisis. But it will help alleviate some of the misery. In my region of the country—up there in New England—supplies of home heating oil are expected to fall 30 percent short of demand. Even with perfect obedience to the energy conservation measures proposed by President Nixon on Sunday, New England would still have a 20 percent shortfall of heating oil. So the situation is desperate. I ask my colleagues, without further delay, to enact this energy conservation legislation.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding me this time.

I would like to commend the gentleman and the members of the committee for bringing out this measure with such expedition. While it does not represent a new idea, there is novelty in that it is being considered in peacetime as an energy saving measure. Up until a few months ago, support for the idea was limited to a few forward-looking people, including some of my constituents, particularly senior citizens who felt that extending daylight saving time would improve public safety both in regard to crime and traffic accidents.

Now the need is much more acute. In October the Arabs began a policy of oil blackmail, challenging the freedom and independence of western nations to decide their own foreign policy and control their own economies. This blackmail was followed then by a sad spectacle of

proud nations knuckling under to the oil boycott threat because of their dependence on Arab oil. Only the United States with its lesser dependence on Arab oil and the brave nation of the Netherlands have stood firm.

In response to this turn of events, on October 16 I introduced H.R. 10917, which I believe was the first temporary 2-year daylight saving bill in the House. My bill was aimed at saving a substantial amount of energy—estimated at about 2 percent—as well as symbolizing our Nation's determination to follow our own course without submitting to blackmail of any kind. In a way, it is a declaration of independence against an oppressive policy which if successful could encourage other small nations in control of needed raw materials to adopt similar blackmail policies.

Daylight saving time year-round, or energy saving time, as it could be called, will affect every citizen in our country and make us fully aware of the need to conserve our limited energy supplies. Too long we have indulged in energy wastefulness. Since 1940 our population has grown by 82 percent but our energy consumption has increased by 290 percent. We are only 6 percent of the world's population but we consume 30 percent of the world's energy supplies. How long could we expect the world's resources to satisfy this energy appetite of ours? Energy use awareness and conservation are long overdue. In time we may thank the Arabs for forcing us to adopt energy conservation policies and to launch a concerted effort to become energy independent by finding alternative sources of energy.

Sunday, December 16, which conceivably could be the effective date of "energy saving time," if we act quickly, our Nation will celebrate the 200th anniversary of another American act against oppression, the Boston "tea party." Like a modern day George III, King Feisal and other Arab leaders are underestimating the spirit of our citizens to fight oppressive policies and our ability to profit by adversity. Energy saving time as the beginning of "operation independence" will put the world on notice that those who use the blackmail of withholding scarce commodities may find themselves eventually sitting on obsolete products.

The bill before us—H.R. 11324—as recommended by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is very similar to my proposal. It provides for a year-round daylight saving time in the United States for a temporary 2-year period and requires a report to Congress by the Secretary of Transportation on or before June 30, 1975, on the operation and effects of the legislation, particularly in regard to energy savings. To prevent States from requesting time zone changes and negating the beneficial effects of the proposal, the bill suspends the Secretary of Transportation's authority under the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to change such time limits while the legislation is in effect.

The estimates of energy saving from year-round daylight saving time—DST—range from 1.5 percent to 3 percent. This

saving is expected to come from reduced needs for artificial lighting which uses 24 percent of our Nation's electricity generated by utilities consuming about one-third of our Nation's energy resources. A recently released Rand Corp. research study estimated that daylight saving time would save 1 percent of the fuel used for the generation of electricity and twenty-five hundredths percent of the Nation's total energy supply. This translates into a saving of 150,000 to 450,000 barrels of crude oil a day which puts a good dent in the estimated shortage this winter of 2 to 3 million barrels a day. As for other types of energy saving, the Rand study projected a 2-percent savings of fuel oil and natural gas resulting from decreased commercial and residential heating needs. These figures represent the estimated direct effect of enactment of this legislation; there is no telling what additional energy saving will be realized because of the increased public awareness "energy saving time" will bring.

To many senior citizens and auto commuters in my district the nonenergy benefits of an extra hour of light in the evening are of great importance. While there are no figures to support the contention that year-round daylight saving time will reduce crime, commonsense suggests that it will. Statistics do show that robberies, muggings, and purse snatchings are most frequent during early evening when most people are returning from work or shopping. Older people especially feel more secure in daylight hours and they have been among the first to suggest year-round daylight saving time. The Justice Department insists that criminals will adjust to the new daylight hours, but when darkness does fall, they may find less people on the streets to victimize than under the old standard time.

Reduction in traffic fatalities and serious accidents could also follow from this legislation. In the winter months in the United States, much homeward bound commuting by automobile is done in darkness at a time when drivers are fatigued by work and occasionally under the influence of alcohol. These disadvantages on the whole do not operate in the morning. The British found that there was a 3.8-percent decrease in the number of serious accidents during their 3-year experiment with year-round daylight saving time. There is no reason why we cannot expect a similar, if not greater, reduction.

While I have dwelled on the benefits of this legislation, I do recognize the adverse effects year-round daylight saving time will have on certain groups whose activities are tied to the rising and setting of the sun more directly than most. The committee, with foresight, has included a provision allowing the FCC to make adjustments in the operating hours of certain radio stations which would otherwise lose broadcast time because of the bill. This was a problem brought out in the committee hearings.

I would like to point out one problem that I do not think was brought out in the hearings on this legislation and ask the comment of the chairman of the committee in this regard.

Among the groups that will be seriously inconvenienced by this bill are the orthodox and conservative Jews of our country who must make their daily prayers after sunrise. They cannot conduct their daily services until the sun has risen. That means in the winter months communities that observe this religious obligation—and there are estimated to be more than 2 million Jews in that category—may not be able to arrive at work on time. For example, I calculate that in some parts of the country sunrise will not occur until as late as 8:56 a.m. in the depths of the winter.

I would hope that we could make some legislative history here and that it would be the committee's intention that employers, including the State, local, and Federal Governments, will take this matter into account and make accommodation for employees who have such obligations so that they will be able to make up the lost time in some other way.

May I ask the chairman if he would agree that that would be the hope and intent of the committee that employers would take these religious obligations into account?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes. I am sure every member of the committee would agree with the gentleman in the well that they should be taken into consideration, and I am sure they will be.

If they do not, there could be application for relief under the Civil Rights Act. However, I am sure that such individuals will be given every consideration, and it is our intent that this should be done.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the chairman.

I take it what the chairman is saying is that if voluntary cooperation on the part of employers is not enough, employees adversely affected would have the opportunity to seek relief under various national acts, such as the Civil Rights Act if something like religious discrimination were involved. We hope that will not be necessary, but the remedy is there. I take it that is the intent of the chairman.

Mr. STAGGERS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, whether or not I can support this legislation will depend in part on what happens to some of our small radio stations which is the only daily source of information for our farmers. I am talking about the little radio stations that operate in the limited areas usually countywide and operate on from 170 to 200 watts.

I understand the committee made an effort somewhere along the line to adjust to some of them, but we should remember there are two categories. There are those mentioned in the report and also in the bill that they will be given an additional hour but only for those stations which do not now have presunrise operating authority. There are a large number of these small stations that do have pre-sunrise operating authority at the present time.

Most of them are little stations that are needed to let the farmers know the latest weather information, and also whether or not there is going to be school in the case of severely inclement weather.

The chairman indicated he has an amendment to offer, and I am hoping to get a little time under the 5-minute rule to inquire about that. I understand that at the request of the Federal Communications Commission that there will be an amendment offered, which will strike out the words at page 4, lines 19 and 20 of H.R. 11324 "stations which are not eligible for presunrise operating authority." With these words out I assume that the adjustment of 1 hour prior to local sunrise would apply to all stations, is that correct?

Would the chairman of the committee care to respond?

Mr. STAGGERS. I will be glad to respond to the inquiry of the gentleman from Missouri. My amendment will take out that portion of the bill and apply it to all of the stations. I want to temper that by saying that we cannot include the stations which are under treaty obligations of Mexico and Canada, but all the rest of them I am talking about it.

Mr. RANDALL. Of course, I understand that the Federal Communications Commission proposed amendment, and the chairman's amendment, all of them must respect existing treaty and other agreements, but I want to be certain that this so called adjustment will apply to all stations. Will it apply to any and all AM stations, whether they have or have not presunrise authority at the present time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this extra time.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the gentleman from Missouri, and say that with the exceptions of those stations that I have mentioned, being those that are under treaty exemption, all others would be covered.

Mr. RANDALL. Only those that are barred by treaty?

Mr. STAGGERS. I might say that there are approximately 2,200 standard—AM—daylight radio stations in the land, and about 1,700 of them have already received presunrise authorizations. And there are others that have the right to such authority, but they have not applied for it.

Mr. RANDALL. That is what I am talking about; those other 500.

Mr. STAGGERS. I might add that there would be about 125 daytime standard broadcast radio stations not now entitled to presunrise operating authority which would be granted authority to operate before local sunrise under this legislation.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 11324, the Daylight Saving Time Act of 1973.

For several Congresses, I have proposed bills to limit daylight saving time to the period between Memorial Day and

Labor Day. The people in northwest Iowa have voiced strong support for these proposals and at the same time have urged me to help defeat any attempt to extend daylight saving time.

Their reasons for opposing extended daylight saving time are numerous and convincing. Their children are subjected to serious inconvenience and danger in the dark hours of the early morning when, in many rural areas including northwest Iowa, the children have to wait at bus stops in remote areas or walk long distances to school, exposed to unnecessary health and safety hazards.

Farmers find they must achieve maximum utilization of morning daylight hours in their jobs, particularly in the spring soil preparation and planting season and in the fall harvest season. They find they are unable to get in their fields until late morning because of dew or moisture from an evening shower and then must work until late evening to take advantage of the sunlight. This causes conflict with farm laborers, many of whom live in small towns and want to work by the clock rather than the sun, in order to avoid disruption of their normal home life and social activities. With the customary business day ended, while a few hours of daylight remain due to daylight saving time, any unforeseen breakdown of equipment can result in the loss of valuable working time for the farmer.

Passage of this bill will thrust adverse economic effects as well as numerous inconveniences on the farmers of America. In addition to their actual tilling of the soil, most farm families participate actively in affairs of the community in which they live. This bill would force them to make a choice between being forced away from their farming during daylight hours or finding it impossible to attend activities that are normally scheduled in the evening.

We are now presented with a new appeal for year-round daylight saving time based on the assumption that year-round daylight saving time would conserve energy. But this is an assumption only as the committee report readily admits when it states:

However, no studies have been carried out and no information is available which establishes with certainty that an overall reduction in energy consumption will directly result from the year-around observance of daylight saving time.

I know my constituents are more than willing to do their part in conserving energy during this time of genuine energy shortage and would not want me to oppose legislation that would clearly aid this country in its attempts to conserve energy. Despite the many disadvantages daylight saving time presents to the people of northwest Iowa, I am confident they would gladly accept the inconveniences if it could be convincingly shown that year-round daylight saving time would, in fact, save substantial amounts of our Nation's energy.

However, little evidence exists to support the contention that year-round daylight saving time would save energy. Proponents contend that daylight saving time achieved substantial savings of

electricity during World War II. But conditions have changed dramatically from those wartime years when peak demand for electricity was much more sensitive to lighting loads than is true today. Many more electrical appliances are now in use, and heating and air-conditioning loads make up a much greater part of the total load. Any possible savings in electric lighting energy are likely to be more than offset by increased gasoline consumption by recreational drivers taking advantage of longer daylight hours after work.

The sponsors of this bill also contend that year-round daylight saving time would decrease the number of motor vehicle accidents. However, the Department of Transportation has responded that having the morning rush hour occur during darkness might increase the concentration of traffic due to traveling at somewhat lower speeds. In testimony before the Senate committee, DOT representatives also recognized the safety hazard to school children traveling to school or waiting for buses in the darkness of the early morning. Proponents also make the unsupported claim that year-round daylight saving time would reduce crime; certainly this was not verified by the Justice Department which instead reports that it is difficult to quantify the effects of year-round daylight saving time on the incidence of crime.

I, therefore, stand in opposition to H.R. 11324 because no one has been able to substantiate the contention that this bill will really help conserve energy. On the other hand the disadvantages and hardships which year-round daylight saving time will thrust upon rural America are clearly evident. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing legislation which has been presented to us today as an energy conservation measure, when there has been no adequate showing that it will actually save energy in any significant amount.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairman STAGGERS and the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for responding so constructively and expeditiously to the energy crisis which confronts the United States, by reporting out H.R. 11324, which provides for year-round daylight saving time on a 2-year trial basis.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation on its merits. The truth of the matter is that adoption of year-round daylight saving time will save a small, yet dramatically significant, percentage of our energy needs this winter.

According to a White House fact sheet, observance of year-round daylight saving time could reduce electricity and heating demands, particularly in the northern areas of the country, by 2 to 3 percent. We are all aware that peak usage of electricity occurs at dusk. Daylight saving time during the winter months would dissipate this peak usage, which is not only inefficient, but more costly to produce than the same number of kilowatts at other times of the day.

Why, Boston Edison, the largest electrical utility in my area, has predicted that it would save 30,000-50,000 bar-

rels of oil this winter if year-round daylight saving time were adopted. That amounts to approximately 1 day's quota.

The New England States are very dependent upon the Arab oil supply. A recent study by the Library of Congress indicates that loss of this supply could effect up to 35 percent of electrical generating power in New England. Already some of our people have been denied oil deliveries, and some contracts for schools and government oil needs have not received one bid.

Rogers Morton said over the weekend that New England could expect brown-outs and blackouts this winter. Why? Because, for one reason, residual heating fuel oil, upon which New England heavily relies, is approximately 13 percent short of expected demand. Thus, it is imperative for the Congress to enact daylight saving time as one necessary response to the energy deficit and as a key method of energy conservation.

Year-round daylight saving time will mean that the average commuter will be traveling home from work during the daylight in the evening. This would reduce the occurrence of motor accidents at dusk which is more than twice that of the morning hours.

Business establishments would operate in daylight hours, thus conserving more electricity and heating.

Year-round daylight saving time could reduce the incidence of street crime by permitting greater numbers of workers and children to return home from work and school in daylight instead of dusk. While a safety problem exists for some children in the western portion of the various time zones going to school during darkness, local school boards could alleviate the problem by adopting a later beginning time for schools.

Year-round daylight saving time is not a panacea for resolving the eminent energy crisis. But it is a positive and immediately available means to lessen the impact of the Nation's energy shortage.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak to the Daylight Saving Time Act of 1973 which is before us today.

H.R. 11324, which amends the Uniform Time Act of 1966, would have a number of desirable results. The most important effect of continuous daylight saving time would, of course, be a saving in energy estimated to run as high as 3 percent in the northern areas of the Nation. Local publicly owned power companies which account for 13 percent of the total sales of electricity estimate that year round daylight saving time would save between 4 million and 8 million barrels of oil during the 1974-75 winter period. Figures from Consolidated Edison of New York, projected nationwide, confirm the above findings.

In addition to the direct energy savings, I believe that this legislation would increase public awareness of the gravity of the Nation's energy problem; this could account for further conservation.

There are other areas which would benefit directly from the passage of this legislation. It is believed, from available traffic statistics, that there would be a decrease in motor vehicle fatalities and serious accidents. Because much home-

ward bound commuting is done in darkness when drivers are fatigued it is felt that the decrease in serious accidents would be of considerable proportions. A study in Great Britain from 1968-71 showed that there was a 3.8-percent decrease in the number of traffic fatalities during continuous daylight saving time.

In addition, by permitting greater numbers of people to return home from work during daylight in the winter months, year round daylight saving time could reduce the incidence of street crimes.

Consideration of any one of these factors might suggest the importance of this legislation. Taken as a whole, the evidence overwhelmingly suggests that we should insure the passage of this needed measure without delay.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the Daylight Saving Time Act of 1973.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill H.R. 11324 which would authorize year round daylight saving time for the entire United States on a 2-year trial basis. I feel passage of this legislation will provide us with tremendous assistance in our efforts to conserve our rapidly dwindling supply of energy.

Simple logic points out the advantages of this bill to our overall energy conservation needs. It is estimated that conversion to year-round daylight saving time could reduce electricity and heating demands by as much as 5 percent nationwide. In addition it could also result in the savings of up to 4 million barrels of oil annually. In light of the continuing "blackmail diplomacy" being carried out by the Arab nations with respect to oil imports, this saving takes on added significance.

In addition to these energy conserving advantages, year-round daylight saving time will have additional positive effects for the overall Nation including:

A reduction in the number of traffic fatalities and serious accidents since many American commuters would be able to drive from work in the daylight hours, thus reducing the risk of accident.

A reduction in the numbers of street crimes which traditionally occur more often in the early evening hours than in the daytime.

We must begin to formulate more of this kind of logical, inexpensive legislation if we are to lick this energy crisis. We in the Congress must begin a major crusade to eliminate our dependence on foreign sources for energy by calling for more stringent conservation measures here at home.

In addition we must begin to more fully develop the various research and development programs aimed at producing new domestic supplies of energy. For example, passage of this bill could easily hasten the development of a comprehensive solar energy program, by permitting the maximum use of daylight hours.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the initiative of the Congress in reporting this bill to the floor. Let this be the starting point for more comprehensive legislation which will achieve the important goal of assur-

ing an adequate supply of energy for every American.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 11324 to establish year-around daylight saving time. I feel that this legislation is an important first-step toward conservation of our increasingly valuable and less available energy sources.

Setting our clocks back 1 hour will help us to take greater advantage of the most abundant, inexpensive and reliable energy source we have—the sun—with minimal inconvenience and expense to every citizen. Symbolically, it will also be a reminder of the need for each individual to do whatever he can, no matter how insignificant it may seem, to help conserve energy.

This simple energy saving step has added value in that it has already been tested for usefulness. Daylight saving time was first used in the United States during World War I and has been used several times since as an energy saving device. England has also made use of clock resetting to save on energy consumption.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting the passage of this legislation.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, it is commonsense that we will use less energy for lighting and heating if we can have more people awake during daylight hours and more people asleep during the hours of darkness.

For reasons I find somewhat difficult to understand, we have developed a traditional working schedule under which the average American gets up after sunrise, thus wasting time during which he could have operated without artificial light. He then remains awake for several hours after sunset, requiring energy-consuming artificial light, plus a higher degree of artificial heat than he will need when he is asleep under warm blankets.

Ideally we should have 16 hours of daylight the year round. Of course we cannot do this. It is beyond the power of Congress of the United States in all its majesty—it is even beyond the powers of the President—to affect the rate at which the earth rotates on its axis. But we can shift our living schedules to eliminate the wasted morning daylight, and to eliminate 1 hour of the evening energy-consuming period.

There is some question over whether the energy saving will be 2 or 3 or 4 percent of total electric and heating consumption. Whatever the figure, it is significant, and we must have it. Additional benefits will be reductions in traffic accidents in street crime. I commend the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for reporting the bill and President Nixon for suggesting it. I hope we will pass it overwhelmingly.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11324, which provides for the year-round observance of daylight saving time, a practice intended to reduce U.S. consumption of petroleum during this period of severe shortages.

In the President's energy message of November 8, he stated that the country's

petroleum supplies would fall 17 percent short of demand. Mr. John Buckley, vice president of the Northeast Petroleum Co., Massachusetts' largest independent fuel distributor, has estimated that the adoption of year-round daylight saving time would decrease national petroleum use by 1 to 2 percent. Most of this curtailment would be effected by reducing demand for electricity in peak early evening hours, when the demand level is swollen by offices and factories having to operate in winter darkness.

Such a reduction in electrical use and heating requirements would in turn reduce the need for "residual" or No. 6 oil, necessary for the generation of electricity. Substantial conservation of residual oil, largely a product of the Middle East, would greatly soften the effects of the Arab embargo on petroleum.

Thus far, Mr. Chairman, the President's recommendations pertaining to conservation have been directed almost wholly at the individual consumer. Adjustment of thermostats, elimination of unnecessary lighting, and observance of year-round daylight saving time impose the burden of action on individuals. In light of the enormous third quarter profits of the oil companies, however, it seems to me essential that the President and Congress address the energy crisis much more directly, by confronting the unchecked monopoly power of the major companies. These firms must be made to open their records on current fuel production and available reserves. They must be made to divulge precise records of production costs. They must be made to adjust their refinery runs so as to produce less gasoline and more fuel oil, thus distributing the shortage of crude oil in a more desirable manner among various end products.

And, most importantly, the country's total available supplies of petroleum must be made subject to a nationwide program of rationing administered by the Government. This is not an appealing alternative, but it offers the hope that essential consumers of fuel in the United States will have adequate resources this winter.

Before closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that industry and government alike have been grossly negligent in anticipating and preparing for the impending shortage—which should not have come as a surprise, despite the actions by the Arab States. Yet, though rough estimates, like Mr. Buckley's, are available on the possible efficacy of year-round daylight saving time, the committee report accompanying this bill states that:

No studies have been carried out and no information is available which establishes with certainty that an overall reduction in energy consumption will directly result from the year-round observance of daylight saving time.

The failure of foresight illustrated in this observation statement is a sharp indictment of the Federal Government's competence. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that Congress should take immediate steps to design some national capacity—centered in the executive branch, the legislative branch, or the private sec-

tor—to address this problem of inadequate information. We have to act now to mitigate, as best we can, our national state of energy unpreparedness.

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Chairman, the Nation is now in the midst of an energy shortage which could severely affect our style of living, our economy, and our national security. To avert serious consequences, the administration, the Congress, private industry, and the American consumer are recommending energy conservation measures which will cause minimal inconvenience to our daily living patterns, and at the same time, maximum fuel savings.

One of these suggestions is year-round daylight saving time, a measure we are considering today. In May, well before the severity of the energy shortage was known and well before talk of cold, dark winters and increased unemployment became prevalent, I polled the constituents of the Fifth District of Connecticut on this subject. Sixty-nine percent responded in favor of the adoption of the proposal.

The benefits of year-round daylight saving time far off-set any potential disadvantages. It is expected that daylight saving time would yield a 1 to 2 percent nationwide reduction in the demand for electricity, equivalent to at least 30,000 barrels of oil per day. Translated into dollars, Americans can save as much as \$600 million on electric bills.

In addition to energy and monetary savings, it is also anticipated that it would greatly reduce the frequency of murders and muggings which occur between the hours of 5 p.m. and nightfall, the normal traveling time of people leaving work. Also, if the results of a similar daylight saving time experiment in Britain will hold true for America, we can expect at least a 3-percent reduction in the number of vehicle fatalities and serious accidents.

The implementation of daylight saving time will not only mean conservation of energy, but will also serve as a reminder for everyone to help ease the energy shortage in all aspects of our daily living, from now until the situation has been resolved.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to identify with the remarks of my California colleague, Mr. HOSMER, a recognized pioneer in the move for year-round daylight saving.

Compared with Mr. HOSMER, I was a late-comer—though my own bill, introduced last May 1, was the first to propose the limited test period of 2 years, such as we are about to adopt.

Questions have been raised during this debate—and raised with absolute sincerity, I am certain—whether the artificial change in clocks will actually result in energy savings. Much has been made of the fact that our committee report, prepared with admirable restraint, falls to cite proof that d.s.t. will help.

It is precisely because we cannot be absolutely certain that the committee opted for the test period.

It would seem that at the very least, d.s.t. during wintertime would relieve some of the pressure on generating capacity, particularly in our urban areas.

I am advised that yearly peaks of demand for electric power are reached with the falling of darkness in early December. Generators hum to produce the power then needed to light and heat homes and offices. Perhaps if we could "postpone" the setting of the sun for 60 minutes, by keeping d.s.t. in effect all year round, most people could get home before dark on even the shortest days of the year, and the pressure on our generating capacity would be significantly alleviated.

Year-round d.s.t. has been tried before, of course, and proven successful. The wonder is that we ever reverted to our present on-again, off-again procedures.

From February 1942, to October 1945, d.s.t. was in effect on a year-round basis throughout the United States. The purpose of this wartime measure was to conserve electricity—and it worked.

More recently, for a 3-year period ending in 1971, Britain conducted a similar test. Studies indicated a dramatic leveling off peak period demands for electricity, with a concurrent 3.8 percent drop in traffic accidents, but following the trial Parliament did in fact terminate the year-round daylight saving experiment. Primarily responsible for the decision to discontinue the system was the discontent of the states to the north and west of England proper—they were genuinely inconvenienced. Because of their location in relation to England, the sun simply did not appear until too late in the day for them.

It is possible that some agricultural States in our own country might be similarly inconvenienced by year-round d.s.t. And generally speaking, these States would be those—predominantly rural in nature—where the energy crisis is least acute.

In any event, it is incumbent on us to act, and the sooner the better. We can no longer afford the luxury of procrastination.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11324, the bill which maintains daylight saving time year round, rather than only during the summer. The sun, which provided us the energy we have used until the present, and which is being heavily relied on for our future energy, is available to help us now to conserve a small portion of the energy we use so lavishly and need so desperately.

I have already joined many of my colleagues in the introduction of a package of legislation to establish a major national program of research, development, and demonstration of fuels and energy technologies. There is a definite possibility, for instance, that clean solar energy will be heating and cooling buildings within a decade, and providing electric power shortly thereafter.

Because of the magnitude of the crisis now facing us, however, we must approach our current energy problem almost on a barrel by barrel basis, scrimping for each possible Btu of saved energy, and taking every step, no matter how small, if its benefits outweigh its cost.

Why would continuing daylight saving time year round save energy? Peak

usage of electricity occurs at dusk. Daylight saving time during the winter months would dissipate this peak usage, which is very inefficient and therefore more costly to produce than the same number of kilowatts at other times of the day.

Obviously, artificial lighting is the primary use of energy that would be reduced. But later daylight might also affect other forms of electric consumption and even motor fuel consumption to some extent. In addition, the extra light in the afternoon would reduce crime and increase highway safety.

W. R. Harris, in a preliminary study sponsored by the Rand Corp., reported that electric consumption between October and April might be reduced between 0.9 and 1.5 percent, a savings of overall national energy of between 0.2 and 0.4 percent. The Middle Atlantic generating region reported to the Federal Power Commission that daylight saving time during the winter might lead to savings of as much as 235,000 tons of coal over 6 months.

The available estimates of energy savings that would result are all very conjectural, however, and have only one thing in common. They are small. No one contends that magnificent amounts of power will be conserved by remaining on daylight saving time. But it is clear that some energy will be saved. Perhaps it will only be enough to heat 1 or 2,000 homes this winter more than would otherwise be heated. It may be enough to prevent an entire city from being blacked out. It may even be enough to enable us to squeak through this winter, combined with other conservation measures and mild weather. But some energy will be saved. It is clear to me that such a step is worth taking.

There are other reasons to enact H.R. 11324, which offers us perhaps the best means of demonstrating to the American people that their government is serious about conserving energy. No one will move his clock back an hour without giving at least some thought to the reasons for it. Perhaps the savings of energy that will be prompted by a popular realization of the need to conserve, and a popular effort to turn off lights, drive slower, keep homes and offices cooler, will outweigh the direct benefits. American citizens have always been willing to undertake a major effort when called on to do so. Perhaps going back on daylight saving time will trigger such an effort.

I believe it is a step well worth taking.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the concept embodied in the legislation before us today is certainly not a new one. It has been utilized several times in our history to conserve energy in a time of crisis. In my opinion, the committee's quick action in reporting this legislation in this new time of crisis was the responsible thing to do. I fully support the bill as reported and agree with the committee's reasons for enacting year-round daylight savings at this time.

I would, however, just like to take a few moments to add what I have long believed are other equally significant reasons for supporting legislation of this

type. These are reasons which the present energy shortage notwithstanding, would themselves be sufficient to justify undertaking a 2-year experiment of this type.

When I first introduced similar legislation in the last Congress, I felt that enactment of that measure would serve as a deterrent to such crimes as aggravated assault, robbery and murder, which occur most frequently in the early evening hours. While it is obvious that a mere adjustment in our system of keeping time will not completely eliminate crime on the streets, a study that was prepared for me by the Chicago Police Department shows that such a move would be a positive step toward achieving that end.

The Chicago police statistics show that in the early evening, the number of police emergency calls is the highest. For example, at 6 p.m., the number of emergency calls in Chicago is 21 percent higher in December than in July. At 7 p.m., the difference is 23 percent. Proportionately, the number of police calls is greater during this period of the day. Therefore, the additional hour of daylight provided by this bill should insure greater safety for commuters.

This legislation would also facilitate the movement of evening rush hour traffic. In Chicago, this would be particularly beneficial for drivers who must contend with often hazardous driving conditions: icy streets, drifting snow, and slippery intersections.

A reevaluation of the time question would admittedly affect some initial inconvenience to time-scheduled industries. But, broadcasting, interstate trucking, and other common carriers would ultimately benefit from a standardized program of operation. I believe that the expenditures necessary for schedule alteration will be more than justified by greater efficiency of service.

The present system, instituted as part of the Uniform Time Act of 1966, provides for a 6-month period of daylight saving time. This is confusing to a great many persons who must change their clocks in April and again in October. As the Chicago police statistics have indicated, an additional hour of daylight is more important in the evening than in the morning.

In closing, I would hope that the Secretary of Transportation's report that is required by section 3 of the bill to be sent to Congress will include not only an analysis of the impact of this legislation on energy consumption, but also a review of its effects on crime in the early evening hours. I am convinced that such a review will provide us with sufficient incentive to eventually transform this 2-year experiment into a permanent adjustment of our present time standard.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the energy conservation crisis facing our people in the Northeast section and throughout the Nation today I most earnestly urge and hope that this House will speedily and overwhelmingly approve this pending bill, H.R. 11324, the Daylight Saving Time Act of 1973.

It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that some positive program must be promptly ini-

tiated in order to attempt to effectively deal with and overcome our energy shortage and the reinstitution of daylight saving time will be a substantial first step in such a program.

Past experience, during two World Wars, with the reinstitution of daylight saving time, in my own State and throughout our Northeast region, where the energy shortage will have perhaps the most severe consequences, proves that year-round daylight saving time can be very helpful in alleviating the hardship of energy shortages.

The authorities have estimated that through the reestablishment of daylight saving time the total use of electricity would be decreased by as much as 2 percent which could amount to a saving, to our Massachusetts and New England people, of some 30,000 to 50,000 barrels of oil this winter and that amount of oil saving is surely worthwhile.

Past experience has also demonstrated that beyond energy conservation year-round daylight saving time results in a significant and wholesome lessening of crime, especially those affecting elementary and secondary schoolchildren, and motor vehicle accidents.

Mr. Chairman, while the return of daylight saving time would be particularly helpful to our people in the Northeast who are facing an ever-increasing energy crisis it is also of tremendous importance to our overall national objective of energy conservation and I, therefore, hope that this measure will be resoundingly approved, without extended delay, in the public interest.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, today, our country is facing an energy crisis of ever-increasing magnitude. Every day our newspapers predict greater and greater shortages of oil, a form of energy on which our country is highly dependent. The world and national political situation is fraught with uncertainty.

The President addressed the Nation on November 7 and called on Congress to enact specific legislation which would help alleviate our pressing energy crisis. I am pleased to see that the House now has before it the bill, H.R. 11324, to provide for daylight saving time on a year-round basis for a 2-year trial period.

There is little information available on the effects of year-round daylight savings. For this reason the committee bill provides for year-round, daylight saving time for a period of 2 years. During this time its effects will be carefully studied and analyzed by various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States. When this information is received by the Congress, we will be better equipped to determine whether or not year-round daylight saving time should be continued in the future.

There is clear evidence that year-round daylight saving time will reduce nationwide demand for electricity by more than 1 to 2 percent. This effect would vary, however, by region, depending upon whether a region's peak demand occurs during the winter or summer.

There is nothing sacred about standard time. Throughout the world, there

are countries which add 15, 30, or even 45 minutes to the standard time of their respective zones.

During World War II, Congress enacted legislation which advanced the standard time of each zone by 1 hour. This enactment of daylight saving applied throughout the entire year to assist in dissipating evening peaks in the Nation's electrical power consumption, which were threatening to exceed the capacity available for nondefense purposes. During this period, from 1942 to 1945, the Office of Production Management estimated that year-round daylight saving time saved almost 1 percent of our electrical requirements.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to waste time at this date. Some of our people have already been denied oil deliveries; some contracts for schools and government oil needs have not received one bid. The situation will reach a critical point if we do not act decisively on energy conservation matters.

Peak usage of electricity occurs at dusk. Daylight saving time during the winter months would dissipate this usage which is very inefficient and therefore more costly to produce than the same number of kilowatts at other times of the day. Thus, even though our mornings would be darker, the total use of electricity would decrease.

Aside from the absolute energy conservation potential, the extension of daylight saving time would have important ancillary effects:

Available traffic statistics suggest that year-round daylight saving time would decrease the number of motor vehicle fatalities and serious accidents. Although daylight saving time in winter would mean that more of the morning commuting to work would be done in darkness, thereby tending to increase the morning rush hour fatality rate, there are overriding factors indicating that the increase would be less than the decrease achieved in the evening.

Schoolchildren would have the advantage of an extra hour of daylight in the afternoon for leisure and school activities. The problem has been raised, however, that the schoolchildren would be traveling to school in early morning darkness during the winter months. HEW does not have any information which would be helpful in this area, but the suggestion has been made that school starting times could be postponed to overcome this darkness problem.

Mr. Chairman, it is the responsibility of Congress to move in a positive and relatively painless way to lessen the impact of the impending energy shortage. It is my belief that the enactment of this legislation will save a small, though significant, percentage of our energy needs this winter.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, it is noteworthy that the House of Representatives is moving with dispatch to enact this legislation authorizing year-round daylight saving time. It should be pointed out that this legislation is entirely a congressional initiative and whatever delay there has been in action on it is entirely attributable to the fact

that the Nixon administration withheld support for the bill until the energy crisis became an unavoidable fact of life.

In rising to support H.R. 11324, I want to commend its original author, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER), and my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), whose Energy-Daylight Conservation Act of 1973 I was pleased to cosponsor earlier this year. It is to be hoped that the Senate will now move promptly to enact similar legislation so that the President will have an opportunity to sign the measure into law no later than mid-December.

No one pretends that year-round daylight saving time is going to solve our energy crisis. The situation has progressed too far for such a measure to have more than a modest effect. But year-round daylight saving time will produce a fuel and electrical energy saving of approximately 2 percent and in these critical times, that saving cannot be ignored.

It is significant that the preliminary findings of a Rand Corp. study indicate that year-round daylight saving time would curtail electrical consumption nationally by 1.77 percent or more. The study estimates that fuel oil and natural gas savings could be even greater. In addition to saving fuel, American consumers and industries could save almost \$600 million on their electrical bills alone.

Other advantages to year-round daylight saving time include a reduction in traffic fatalities and serious accidents, and the additional protection against crime that would be occasioned by more daylight.

This measure is but a small element in what must be a far-reaching, comprehensive, and effective national energy policy. So far, neither the administration nor the Congress has established the dimensions and ingredients of such a policy, but the crisis that is upon us is sure to generate action. The time for piecemeal measures, half-steps, voluntarism and wishful thinking is long since past. We are going to have to face up to some difficult times by adopting policies and programs that will force a change in our way of life. The alternative, however, is disaster.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, for years, millions of Americans have consistently turned their clocks forward and backward in the spring and fall to alternate between daylight saving time and standard time each year.

This country is presently facing the most serious energy shortage of its history. We must take immediate action to counteract this energy crisis. One of the most direct and most efficient ways in which we can conserve energy is to establish a daylight saving program on a year-round basis.

We need continuous daylight saving time for several reasons. As a way to save energy, daylight saving time could conserve from 1 to 2 percent of the Nation's total energy needs in electricity, natural gas and fuel oil. Studies indicate

that permanent daylight saving time would reduce America's fuel consumption by a minimum of 2 percent. Translated into barrels of oil, a 2-percent savings would equal conservation of at least 30,000 barrels of oil each day.

The Department of Transportation recently reported that year-round daylight saving would decrease the number of motor vehicle fatalities during evening rush hours and would provide bicyclists with an extra hour of light for traveling in congested traffic.

Statistics show that generally auto drivers are more exhausted, less alert, and more often under the influence of alcohol during evening rush hours than in morning rush hours—so additional hours of daylight would assist in reducing early evening accidents.

Another noteworthy benefit would be the reduction in street crime. Statistics indicate that robberies, muggings, and purse snatchings are most frequent during the early evening. With an extra hour of daylight saving time at a time when most of the work force is going home deterring criminal attacks at this time.

Year-round daylight saving time would mean that a bigger share of most people's active working day would take place in daylight. As we anticipate increased energy demands, daylight saving time on a year-round basis is one of the wisest conservation moves we could make and at no cost or loss to anyone.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation under consideration today which would provide for daylight saving time on a year-round basis for a 2-year trial period.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11324, the Daylight Saving Time Act. This legislation provides for a 2-year experiment and requires the Secretary of Transportation to report back to the Congress June 30, 1975, on the operation and effect of the bill, especially as it relates to energy savings. I would urge, however, that the Secretary also work in concert with the Department of Justice to determine the effects of daylight saving time on the possible reduction of street crime. For a long time now, I have urged that daylight saving time would provide an extra margin of safety against robbery and assaults which occur during the evening rush hour.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that this legislation will result in substantial savings of fuel oil, since it will only reduce demands for electricity and heating by about 3 percent. Nevertheless, it would appear that every little bit is going to make a difference in view of the extortion game now being played out by the Arab oil producers.

Extortion is always an ugly game, but it is moreover a foolish one when played in international politics. At the moment the Arab countries have the upper hand, due in large part to the error of America and Europe in becoming reliant upon foreign producers for energy resources. The winter, however difficult, will pass. But the memory will linger far beyond in the minds of Americans and Europeans of this cold winter. A new push for energy independence and self-reli-

ance will develop. Within a decade new sources of energy will develop leaving the Arab countries with a lot of oil, few customers, and very little good will.

A major initiative into nuclear, solar, tidal, geothermal, and other sources of energy must begin. I strongly urge that the administration take steps now to develop a cooperative energy research and development program with Europe and Japan and other nations who are the victims of this extortion.

As for ourselves, I agree with those who have suggested that perhaps we as a people have been living too high off the hog. We have surrounded ourselves in luxurious gasoline-guzzling automobiles which we drive to work each day alone, polluting the air and congesting the highways. The time for moderation in consumption is long overdue. We need not only smaller more efficient cars, we need less of them.

The time for independence from the automobile is long overdue. There must be a massive infusion of support for mass efficient and responsive transportation systems. I have been urging such an approach for years as have other urban leaders. It is foolish and senseless to continue to burn billions of gallons of scarce fuel in order to support the questionable luxury of being an automobile dependent society while depriving other areas of the economy of needed and scarce resources. The main user of petroleum fuel remains the automobile in an era when it is and has long been technologically feasible to move large numbers of people to and from work comfortably, inexpensively, and efficiently. I would remind my colleagues from agricultural areas who have opposed mass transit funding that every gallon of gas used for urban commuting is denied to farmers for planting and harvesting.

It appears that the only way in which we will be able to free ourselves of reliance on the most wasteful means of transportation in history, is a deep and very real crisis that threatens our economy, health, and safety. Yet it is not too late. We have made a start this year by partially opening up the Highway Trust Fund and by approving the Mass Transportation Act of 1973. Yet these are small victories which took too long to win. There must be a massive acceleration of support for mass transit programs which would incidentally, take up the slack of unemployment caused by cutbacks in the automobile industry.

In addition, there must be serious planning to determine the transportation, industrial, and household energy needs for the next several decades. Most important there must be a willingness to treat seriously what has now become a fearful reality, that we are indeed running out of fuel with which to sustain our lives. Indeed, one observer has noted that if the Earth were a hollow sphere filled with oil and we continued to use it at our present rate we would run out in 200 years. Well, the Earth is not a hollow sphere and as yet we have not cut back. I recall several years ago that I supported legislation which would have significantly revised import quotas on petroleum. Had that legislation passed, we

would today have far greater reserves upon which to draw in this present crisis.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the Congress has taken the initiative over the past several years to seek new sources of energy. There are today at least nine bills in this session of this 93d Congress alone, which are in advanced stages of legislative consideration which originated in the House and Senate and which would deal effectively with the energy problems. The statement by the President that because the Congress did not accept his proposals, at least one of which had been withdrawn by the administration, is therefore unfortunate. The record will bear out that it has been the Congress which has been most concerned and shown the most foresight in conserving energy and planning for the future.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor of H.R. 11324 and a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that studied it, I rise in support of establishing year-round daylight saving time on a 2-year trial basis. This is not simply a daylight saving bill. It is an energy saving bill.

Mr. Chairman, with each passing day, as winter turns his windy wheel in our direction, it becomes abundantly clear that we are going to have an energy problem with us this winter. We are now in the position in Congress of planning this Nation's overall energy conservation strategy. One important step in this plan, a step that can be accomplished with little inconvenience or disruption, is to return to daylight savings time.

The most compelling reasons for support of this measure is that it would bring substantial energy savings. Studies show that year-round daylight savings time would reduce America's fuel consumption by at least 2 percent—many thousands of barrels a day—because it would still be light at 5 p.m. when most businesses and industrial plants are shut down. Year-round daylight saving time was successful in curtailing electricity consumption during both world wars, and reduced consumption now would free significant quantities of oil for other uses.

Not only would this legislation reduce energy use during peak afternoon hours; it would also cut early evening crime and decrease traffic accidents during afternoon rush hours. Great Britain has reduced traffic fatalities 3.2 percent since establishing permanent daylight saving time, and it is generally accepted that drivers are less alert and more often under the influence of alcohol during evening rush hours than in the morning. Why, then, should we compound that problem with an extra hour of darkness?

In addition, the Nation's crime rate can also be lowered by adding an extra hour of sunshine in the early evening. Statistics show a substantially higher crime rate during the first hours of evening darkness than during the last few hours of darkness in the early morning. Moreover, in Maine most working men and women are forced to return home from work in total darkness during the winter months. Why should Maine's schoolchildren wait on dark street cor-

ners at 4:30 in the afternoon for their buses home from school?

Mr. Chairman, this Nation and the people of my State of Maine deserve to be spared as much inconvenience and turmoil as possible in curbing energy consumption. This bill, which would return the country to daylight saving time for a 2-year trial period, is a relatively small, but meaningful means to that end.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation to reinstate daylight savings time on a year-round basis.

My opposition to this bill is twofold. First, a study conducted recently by the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Board of Education has demonstrated that energy consumption will actually be increased by 5 percent if daylight savings time is enforced, and the hours of school openings are maintained at their present schedules.

And if the hours for school openings are moving forward an hour to compensate for daylight savings time, the schoolchildren who ride buses—and there are several thousands of them, thanks to our Federal courts—will be caught right in the middle of rush-hour traffic in the afternoon.

So we have these options: we can send our children to school in the cold and the dark of early morning, with the darkness increasing the possibility of bus accidents and pedestrian crossing accidents, and with the cold requiring a greater expenditure of heating oil than is now required.

Or we can send our children to school an hour later, and let them join their parents in the perils of rush hour traffic, a hazard that all of us here would like to avoid for ourselves, much less our children.

And this leads me to my second point of opposition. All of these unattractive options are consequences of the still-thriving policy of massive forced cross-town busing for racial balance purposes.

The cost of this policy in terms of children's safety and in terms of the shortage of money available for legitimate educational needs has always been a source of great concern for me.

But now, in the midst of an energy emergency, the cost of this policy of forced busing in terms of wasted energy is enormous and astounding and totally without warrant.

In the Winston-Salem-Forsyth County school system alone, court-ordered busing required an increase in gasoline consumption of more than 300,000 gallons a year. Combined with three other school systems in North Carolina now under court busing orders, the total of wasted gasoline soars to more than 1 million gallons a year.

That is only in four school districts in one State. Translated to national terms, the waste of precious petroleum resources is staggering indeed.

At least one school district in this country has found that daylight saving time will not save it any energy, but will instead cost it more. And I became convinced long ago that the continuation of forced busing will result in not only a drain on our children's energy and edu-

cation, not only a drain on our limited educational funds, but a serious and needless drain on our energy supplies as well.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to join me in voting down this measure, and let us then bring up legislation that will stop massive forced busing and plug a gaping hole in our Nation's energy reserve at the same time.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, as a long-time advocate of year-round daylight saving time, I am pleased that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported H.R. 11324 to the full House.

Year-round daylight saving time will save precious energy, it will reduce crime, and it will promote traffic safety.

Most importantly, in view of our present energy emergency, H.R. 11324 represents an important step in the national effort to alleviate the energy shortage. Preliminary figures released by the Rand Corp. indicate that year-round daylight saving time would curtail electrical consumption in America by close to 2 percent or more. The Rand study also estimated that the projected savings of fuel oil and natural gas may be even greater than the electrical savings due to the fact that many utilities generate electricity by burning oil or gas.

There are additional benefits to be derived from year-round daylight saving time. For example, during a 3-year experiment in Great Britain, the additional daylight resulted in an almost 4-percent reduction in traffic fatalities and serious accidents.

Moreover, research studies indicate that America's crime rate can be reduced by the establishment of year-round daylight saving time. Police report that criminals thrive in the early darkness that winter and standard time so conveniently afford.

Mr. Chairman, I urge overwhelming approval of H.R. 11324 by the House.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 11324, the Daylight Saving Time Act of 1973.

This legislation would provide for the introduction of daylight saving time on a nationwide basis in order to effect savings in energy consumption.

It has been estimated by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, whose distinguished chairman, the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS of West Virginia, introduced this legislation, that electricity and heating demands would drop by as much as 3 percent on a national basis if this legislation were enacted.

Such relief would be particularly welcome to the people of the Northeast, who are already beginning to feel the pinch of the Arab oil embargo more severely than the other sections of the population.

New England, in particular, has relied heavily in the past upon imported oil.

Energy savings therefore have assumed the value that victory gardens and war bonds had during the last war.

Daylight savings—or advanced—time was appropriately called "war time" during the period from 1942 to 1945.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt sug-

gested that name in order to impart to all Americans the real gravity that daylight savings and other conservation measures had in terms of the war effort.

I think it is time that a similar notion be imparted to the American people.

It is going to require a spirit similar to the spirit of '76—which brought the starving American Revolutionary Army through its hard, cold winter at Valley Forge—to weather the cutbacks and shortages that this winter holds in store for the Nation.

Perhaps we should rename daylight saving time as Roosevelt did during World War II.

We could call it "energy savings time."

But whatever we call it, we Americans must realize that the energy crisis of which we hear so much is fully upon us.

You have only to sit in my office here or back in Springfield, Mass., for a half an hour or so and sample the letters, telegrams, and phone calls that I receive to appreciate that the scarcity of home heating fuel alone has already created hardships for many individuals and businesses in New England.

This legislation would help ease the plight of these unfortunate victims by conserving millions of barrels of oil that otherwise would be used for heating and lighting in the early darkness of our winter evenings.

It would also point up the seriousness of the national energy problem.

The increased public awareness of this problem could only spur concerned citizens to further, sustained energy savings.

The British experience of year-round daylight saving also prompts the hope that traffic fatality and serious accident rates would drop as a result of the increased daylight during evening commuting hours.

There are also suggestions that the number of street crimes would be reduced if workers could return home during daylight.

Mr. Chairman, there may be those who will suggest that the introduction of year-round daylight saving is hasty or ill-conceived, that it may be proven unnecessary or unfounded in light of subsequent studies.

To those who may advance such arguments, I would point out that H.R. 11324 contemplates termination of year-round advanced time in April of 1975.

At that time, we will have sufficient data on hand to determine whether year-round observance of daylight savings time should be continued.

In the meanwhile, however, we will have taken action in a sector that could well reap substantial energy savings—and with possible additional side benefits.

We owe this effort—however successful it may prove in the long run—to those of our citizens, particularly in certain hard-hit regions such as New England, who are already suffering because we are energy poor.

We owe these people—and all our people—every effort we can devise that will offer a chance of alleviating their distress.

As a Member who becomes daily more aware of the far-reaching, ever-increas-

ing effects of the energy emergency, I urge the swift and full enactment of this legislation.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11324, the Daylight Saving Time Act of 1973. Those of us who have sponsored similar legislation for a number of years are particularly gratified that this bill has finally reached the House floor. Unfortunately, it is an energy shortage of crisis proportions that has given this proposal its current momentum.

I commend the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for responding quickly to this aspect of the emergency program submitted by the President on November 8. I believe the committee acted wisely in reporting a bill which provides for year-round daylight saving time for a 2-year trial period.

We have good reason to expect that year-round DST will help alleviate our energy shortage. White House estimates project a reduction in electricity and heating demands, especially in the northern areas, by as much as 3 percent. A study conducted by Consolidated Edison Co. of New York estimated a saving of 4 million barrels of oil annually. In the highly publicized Rand Corp. study, it was calculated that the net reduction in electrical output during the spring months of daylight saving time has averaged 0.6 percent over the last 7 years and during the colder fall months, 1.77 percent. Since these percentages would probably increase during the shorter daylight periods of January and February, the Rand Corp. predicts a savings of \$600 million per year in electric bills.

A 2-year trial period will give us an excellent opportunity to determine whether these projections are on target, too conservative, or overly optimistic. The experimental period can also test other anticipated benefits of year-round DST, including a reduction in street crime and traffic accidents with more people returning home from work during daylight in the winter months.

The response of my constituency has been overwhelmingly in favor of observing daylight saving time on a year-round basis. Following the President's energy message, hundreds of individuals have written urging swift action on a DST bill. A petition drive, spearheaded by Mrs. Byrna Weir of Rochester, resulted in over 2,000 signatures advocating year-round DST.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the great majority of Americans view H.R. 11324 as an important step toward energy conservation and I hope that both Houses of Congress will move quickly to send this bill to the President.

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, rarely has a legislative proposal been so uncomplicated and yet so potentially productive as is the movement to establish daylight saving on a permanent basis.

I think we were all somewhat wary of the plan as it was first conceived, simply because it was so uncomplicated. These suspicions have proven to be healthy and productive, though, for they have caused us to carefully scrutinize the proposal. Every possible ramification has been ex-

plored, and the conclusions are highly favorable.

There are no critical drawbacks to the bill whatsoever; all the effects of the bill will be on the plus or positive side. In short, there is no reason not to take immediate, favorable action on this bill.

On October 26, I introduced legislation to immediately establish daylight saving time year-round. The same bill was later reintroduced as H.R. 11277 with 10 additional cosponsors. Although there were differences between my proposal and the proposal we are discussing here today, the principles behind both bills are the same and I overwhelmingly endorse today's legislation.

The need for immediate enactment of year-round daylight saving time is clear. The energy crisis is with us now. Immediate action is called for. The shortest day of the year and the day on which electric lights will burn longest, December 21, is fast approaching, and that date should signal to us that if we want to avert a real shortage of energy, the time to do something is today.

The facts are clear. The implementation of daylight saving time on a permanent basis would save us 1 to 2 percent of our energy resources, or 30,000 barrels of oil a day. Such a savings is hardly insignificant. The Nation's implied objective is to reduce demand for energy by at least 10 percent. By enacting this one simple measure, we could be 10 to 20 percent of the way toward this objective.

A second potential area of savings is in crime reduction. Although there has been no definitive proof that crime will be reduced, it certainly could not increase as a result of the implementation of daylight saving time. And commonsense dictates that it will, in fact, be a decided benefit in the fight against crime, by giving workers more daylight time in which to get home, and by improving police efficiency. It certainly deserves a chance.

The possibilities for reducing traffic fatalities and serious accidents by acting favorably on this bill are also great. In fact, they are so great that the weight of this evidence should alone be sufficient to enact the bill. During the evening hours, drivers are generally more tired and oftentimes have consumed large amounts of alcohol. It makes good sense not to compound these problems with unnecessary darkness. During the British experiment with permanent daylight time, traffic fatalities and serious accidents were reduced 3.8 percent.

It is obvious then, that there is everything to gain from enactment of H.R. 11324. But, of course, the overriding rationale for this legislation is the need to save our precious energy resources.

People in this country are anxious to embrace this idea. Even prior to the President's address of November 7, this support was apparent. The Chicago Today, one of the city's large daily newspapers, conducted a poll on the subject; the results were overwhelming; 7,000 responses were received, and support was running about 10 to 1. The overriding reason for their support was the potential energy savings. Other reasons cited were crime reduction and the inconvenience

faced twice a year of having to adjust the clocks.

The Nation's citizens are ready to endorse year-round daylight saving time. This swift and simple measure could be doubly rewarding because it would first of all, create a real and significant energy savings, and second, it would serve as a very visible sign that the National Government is doing really something about the energy emergency, and would further encourage citizens to do their part, which is really the key to the solution of the whole energy conservation effort. Let us get going on the energy crisis. No other measure will be as important or could be as useful as this bill.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Chairman, House approval of the Daylight Saving Time Act will mark an important contribution in the Nation's effort to conserve energy. Exactly how much energy will be saved no one can predict with any degree of precision. But this fact should not obscure the obvious benefits of this legislation.

It is reasonable, I suggest, to accept the considered judgment of the administration in this regard, and administration officials estimate that observance of year-round daylight saving time could reduce electricity and heating demands, especially in northern areas, by as much as 3 percent. And with the shortage of such energy variously estimated to be between 10 and 17 percent, this single step can make a significant difference.

I was especially pleased to note, Mr. Chairman, that in its substitute amendment the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has included a most important provision directing the Federal Communications Commission to permit, wherever possible, daytime standard AM radio broadcast stations which are not otherwise eligible for pre-sunrise operating authority to operate up to 1 hour in advance of local sunrise.

The importance of this provision arises from the fact that many daytime radio stations depend heavily on the early morning market. A substantial part of this market would be lost if such stations were prevented from broadcasting during the winter months, under daylight saving time, until sunrise. The revenue loss from such a prohibition could threaten the ability of many daytime stations to continue operating.

Since the similar bill passed by the other body does not contain this broadcast provision, I would urge those of our colleagues who may serve as conferees in the event of a conference with the Senate on this legislation to insist that this language be included in the conference report.

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the Federal Communications Commission, in carrying out the responsibilities imposed by the broadcast provision, to apply the directive as liberally and inclusively as possible. Except under the most compelling circumstances, local radio stations should be permitted to continue to broadcast during this first hour of their daily schedule.

Mr. Chairman, I hope our colleagues will join in giving this legislation the

overwhelming support it deserves and, thus, assure the country that the Congress is prepared to meet the many challenges of the energy crisis.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 11324, being the bill providing daylight saving time on a year-round basis for a 2-year trial.

I am mindful that the proponents of this bill may have good intentions and may honestly believe that it will be helpful in our present energy crisis. They undoubtedly believe there will be some substantial savings of energy. On the other hand, in consideration of all of the disadvantages and detriments of this plan no one can be positive or certain how much of a savings, if any, in either light, heat or gasoline will result.

On page 8 of the report all of the predicted savings of energy are precluded with the wording

There is only a high probability of a reduction in energy consumption.

As one Member put it during the debate—

This bill is loaded with "mays" and "coulds."

Mr. Chairman, the portion of the report which is the greatest confession of all is contained in the third paragraph of page 8 of the report containing these words:

However, no studies have been carried out and no other information is available which establishes with certainty that an overall reduction in an energy consumption will directly result in the year-round of daylight savings time.

With that kind of a confession contained in the report all of the arguments as to whether there will be a savings in either electricity, gasoline, or heat fuel are purely speculative and conjectural.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with no certainty as to any reduction in consumption of energy to come directly from this year-round daylight saving time, we must remember we at the same time are asking our people to assume some burdens and to bear some hardship unnecessarily.

What are some of these inconveniences, disadvantages, and burdens?

Well, first, the dew will not come off the ground regardless of the clock. That means a disadvantage to our farmers. It means they cannot harvest their crops until the Sun removes the dew.

It means that for our farmers there will be places of business in the towns and small cities which they adjoin that will close their doors according to the clock or local time and even though there may be daylight beyond that hour, our farmers will not be able to get parts to repair their machinery or get other needed items to service or repair their tractors and other implements.

For a long while our farming community has contended—and I think they are right—that they will lose an hour at the beginning of each day and lose an hour at the end of each day.

Mr. Chairman, the farming community is not the only one that this bill will affect adversely. Schoolchildren will be leaving for school prior to sunrise. In the rural areas our children must walk along country roads to reach their school-

buses and are frequently required to wait in the dark for a considerable time until the bus arrives.

It is little wonder to me that our mail has been quite substantial from parents in opposition to this plan. They express a fear that in these dark hours unavoidable accidents may occur. As a matter of fact there have been many traffic accidents to our schoolchildren in the period between Labor Day and the third week in October under the current daylight saving law. Accidents could well increase if we have daylight saving time year-round.

Not only will our farmers be adversely affected and our school children be subject to injury in the dark but in many areas of the country including west-central Missouri just about everyone will be inconvenienced and disadvantaged unnecessarily. For example in the capital city of Kentucky, sunrise will not occur until 8:40 a.m. In Grand Rapids, Mich., sunrise will come at 9:10 a.m. At Boise, Idaho, the Sun will not officially rise until 9:15 a.m.

Mr. Chairman, there are many difficulties associated with daylight saving plan as it now exists from April to October. Because I have recognized these difficulties, every year since the enactment of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 I have introduced legislation to amend the Time Act to provide that daylight saving time begin on Memorial Day and end on Labor Day of each year.

There are not many who could quarrel with daylight saving time during the summer months. In fact, it may then possess more advantages than disadvantages. But before Labor Day and after Memorial Day the scales are tipped against the operation of such a plan and it is for this reason that I have introduced a bill at the beginning of each Congress to repeal a daylight saving plan except from Memorial Day to Labor Day. At the beginning of this Congress I introduced similar legislation.

Who can successfully argue that a plan of this kind will increase the number of hours in a day. There will only be 24 hours no matter how you slice them up. This kind of an idea reminds me of the story of the old Indian trying to lengthen his blanket. You will recall he cut off one end of his blanket and sewed it to the other end to make it longer. With this so-called daylight saving plan what we save on one end we most surely lose on the other. The plan is a gimmick, pure and simple.

If I may recall a contribution made by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) in this debate, we in Congress are trying to be a modern Joshua. It should be recalled that Joshua was a Biblical character who commanded the Sun to stand still, but today, no matter how hard we try the Sun will continue to orbit and the dew will dry up in the fields only on standard time.

Take for example in our congressional district of west-central Missouri, the National Almanac Office of the U.S. Naval Observatory says that during December—depending on the exact day—the sun will rise between 7:18 a.m. and 7:38 a.m. on central standard time, but if year-round daylight saving time is

adopted the sun would rise between 8:18 a.m. and 8:38 a.m. clock time. As I mentioned earlier, this means that our schoolchildren and farmers would have been up about 2½ hours earlier, moving about in the dark.

Well, how is this a saving? The answer to this question should be obvious. If we are working in the dark we will require light. But even if somehow there could be a savings in electricity there will be a loss entailed by the need for heat because during those early hours during the winter months more heat will be required.

No, Mr. Chairman, Congress cannot make of itself a modern Joshua nor can we make our blanket longer like the attempt of the old Indian who cut off one end and sewed it on the other. There are only 24 hours in a day; no matter how much we fool around with the Lord's plan we cannot increase the number of hours. The British tried to stretch their days 2 years ago and give it up as a failure.

With the confession contained in the report that there is no available information with any certainty that there will be an overall reduction in energy consumption directly from year-round daylight saving time and with all the inconveniences and disadvantages that will result, H.R. 11324 should be voted down.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11324, which would provide for year-round daylight saving time on a 2-year trial basis.

On January 8 of this year, I introduced H.R. 1600, providing for year-round daylight saving time, and was thus the first Member of the 93d Congress to do so.

My primary concern in introducing H.R. 1600 was, of course, the conservation of energy. Consolidated Edison, which serves the power needs of the Greater New York area, estimated that it could reduce its winter peak hour electric load by as much as 5 percent, thus considerably reducing the national power drain. The administration, after much hesitancy, has concluded that year-round daylight saving time could have a major effect in reducing power consumption in the United States.

While energy conservation is the prime motive in promoting year-round daylight saving time, a number of other factors enter into consideration. Primarily, year-round daylight saving time should help curtail the rate of auto accidents, especially during the hours of dusk when commuters return from work. Government figures have pegged the traffic fatality rate three times higher at night than during the daylight hours. Additionally, the crime rate, which is substantially higher during the evening hours, could be substantially reduced.

Year-round daylight saving time has received broad urban and suburban support, and it now appears that rural opposition is considerably less than it once was. I urge that H.R. 11324 be given favorable support, so that the President's energy conservation goals can be realized.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, at a time when our proud Nation is beset by the worst energy shortage in our history, all of us must

strive to define and implement any and all measures which will serve to rescue us from this awful predicament.

The Northeastern region of the United States, which I represent, is one of the most hard-hit areas in the whole country. None of us in this area desire to rely solely on temporary, stop-gap measures. We want our immediate needs attended to as well as future ones. It is the failure to institutionalize such long-range thinking into our energy measures that has resulted in the current crisis.

Daylight saving time must be instituted promptly. We already possess ample evidence pointing to the fact that greater oil shortages are in store for us. This will severely affect how our homes are heated and the amount of electricity we can consume. Any possible solution to this is a necessity.

Year-round daylight saving time will address this problem. Since much electricity is used at dusk, daylight saving time during the winter months would be extremely useful. In fact, we have the examples of World Wars I and II which demonstrate the advantages in energy conservation resulting from daylight saving time. In World War II, daylight saving time saved almost 1 percent of our electrical requirements.

Additional benefits to the American people will accrue from daylight saving time. With the average commuter traveling in daylight during the evening, a significant drop in traffic accidents will result. Schoolchildren will have an extra hour of daylight for school and extra-curricular activities. This will make for a much safer school busing situation in that fewer children will be waiting in darkness for their buses.

The advantages of daylight saving time extend to many areas including, as mentioned, energy, safety, and also the fact that, with fewer people on the streets in darkness, a significant reduction in crime could result. The very fact that the observance of daylight saving time in the Northeast could reduce electricity and heating demands by as much as 3 percent provides more than enough justification for it. These additional advantages make its institution absolutely mandatory.

I am most pleased that the House has passed such a measure. I am hopeful that the Senate will do so immediately and bring us closer to the implementation of this most important piece of legislation.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Chairman, in spite of grave misgivings about the wisdom of daylight saving time on its own merit, I have decided that it is necessary to vote for this legislation.

Let there be no mistake about it, we face an energy crisis of enormous proportions. A hair-curling depression is being predicted by many economists unless a solution is found to this dilemma.

Having just returned from 3 days in Israel and 3 days in Egypt, I know firsthand the very real impasse which exists. It is of such grave and far-reaching consequences that were I the President, I would go to the Middle East at once as a priority, urgent matter of business.

It is difficult for me to see how daylight saving time will save any signifi-

cant amount of energy; nevertheless, it seems important today, on this initial piece of legislation, to provide the President with a united approach of solidarity towards enacting his "package" of proposals. He has information which we do not have. He has the counsel of many experts at his disposal. It would seem that we would be justified in relying upon his judgment. This does involve a measure of faith and the President could be wrong. And we may err in voting for this bill or for the other measures to follow. Our intention and our purpose is to withstand the tidal wave which threatens to engulf us and we must do the very best we can as one nation—the Congress united with the Executive.

Fortunately, the legislation provides a method of relief where the need is great. The example provided relates to broadcast hours for radio stations and the adjustment of their hours of operations. This authority is within the Federal sphere and the adjustment is specifically authorized in this bill.

Similarly, an exemption may be granted by State and local authorities by an adjustment of a time schedule affecting the area of need. In my own State of Georgia I would favor such an adjustment for our schoolchildren. The adjustment would be a simple one—a matter of adjusting the hours of operation to fall within daylight hours. That discretion properly belongs to local authorities and is not considered in this bill.

All of us hope for the support and understanding of the American people as we seek to heed the admonition of Longfellow who said:

Go forth and meet the shadowy future without fear and with a manly heart.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I strongly object to this legislation, H.R. 11324, which would allow our Nation to become a guinea pig for the sake of those who prefer daylight saving time. It would demand that the entire country observe year-round daylight saving time for a 2-year period so that the Department of Transportation can spend \$300,000 to see what effects its use has on our Nation.

I would rather have Congress vote to use this money to reduce the public debt, as I would gladly inform DOT what effects this legislation will have on the people of the 13th District of Texas. After hearing of the effects on these citizens, DOT would undoubtedly recommend that we return to standard time year round. Great Britain conducted an experiment of 3 years of daylight saving time, and then voted to return to standard time. Must we subject all Americans to 2 years of time change—that they do not want in many instances—to end up with the same results? The difficulties which we face in this experiment are far greater than our friends across the Atlantic faced: we must contend with the complications that arise because of the vast amount of land in each time zone and the inconveniences this places on the westernmost sections of these zones as compared with the small effect that the differences in a time zone had in Britain.

Daylight saving time is not welcomed

by my people even in the summertime, and I have had numerous pleas to allow at least half of the year to be on standard time. In rural areas many schoolchildren are forced to go as far as 40 miles to school. On December 21, the Sun will not rise in Amarillo, Tex., until a few minutes before 9; these children will be forced to stand out on the highways in my district in the cold, bleak dark morning. I am concerned for the safety of these children. Schools will need additional fuel to heat and light the classroom during this time. In homes where schoolchildren and their parents prepare for their daily activities, the fuel consumption rate will surely increase because of this later sunrise.

The impact of energy savings is hard to rationalize in instances such as this early morning use of heat and lighting. In hearings before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Department of the Interior stated that there has been a polling of electric utility companies by the Federal Power Commission and some felt that there would not be any savings.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association testified that "there is little evidence to suggest that much, if any, energy conservation will be achieved in rural America through year-round daylight saving time." The committee report gave no concrete evidence that there will be any saving of fuel. Although a study was made by the Rand Corp. which estimates that over 1 percent of fuel could be saved, I have yet to talk to anyone who has seen this report, and the study itself was not available to the committee. Evidence such as was presented to the Committee does not give me any reason to vote in favor of a measure for which I have received only negative correspondence.

This legislation is supported by many citizens who merely want more playtime in the evening. I cannot object to making good use of leisure time, especially in some of our sunshine States, however, in my district many farmers and ranchers work on their own property in the mornings and then must work a full day at another job in an attempt to meet their financial needs because of inflation caused by overspending in Congress. I cannot, with good conscience, vote for legislation which will inconvenience many people who are attempting to support their families by long hours of hard work, when I cannot get reassurance that this measure will definitely save energy. I would be a poor representative to those who elected me if I fell for this time change gimmick. Instead of causing hardship to these hardworking Americans, perhaps we should follow the advice of one of my constituents who stated:

If our television networks would go off the air earlier, most Americans would go to bed earlier—as thousands of Americans sit night after night, in overheated rooms watching the idiot box, which consumes countless kilowatts of valuable energy.

Another thoughtful constituent reiterated the old saying:

You can't make a blanket longer by cutting off one end and sewing it to the other.

Not only will schoolchildren be adversely affected by this legislation, but ranchers and farmers will have no choice but to follow standard time in their farming schedule while the rest of the country follows a daylight saving time schedule. As one farmer so aptly put it:

You can legislate daylight saving time till you are blue in the face, but the dew is still going to dry off the field on standard time.

As housewives complain of rising food prices, it should be the concern of all my colleagues to insure that farmers can produce the needed food for America as efficiently as possible. For this, and the reasons mentioned earlier, I urge all Congressmen to vote against this legislation.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time at this moment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and suggest that the Clerk read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11324

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Daylight Saving Time Act of 1973".

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 260a (a)), the standard of time of each zone established by the Act of March 19, 1918 (15 U.S.C. 261-264), as modified by the Act of March 4, 1921 (15 U.S.C. 265), shall be advanced one hour and such time as so advanced shall for the purposes of such Act of March 19, 1918, as so modified, be the standard time of each such zone; except that any State with parts thereof in more than one time zone may by law exempt the entire area of the State lying within one time zone from the provisions of this subsection.

(b) Any law in effect on October 27, 1973, adopted pursuant to section 3(a) (2) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 by a State with parts thereof in more than one time zone, shall be held and considered to remain in effect as the exercise by that State of the exemption permitted by subsection (a) of this section unless that State, by law, provides that such exemption shall not apply during the effective period of this Act.

(c) The provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 shall apply to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the 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 West Virginia?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. In the first place it would steal an hour out of my life, and I have not a single hour to give to gimmickry of this

kind. When one gets to be as old as I am, he will look at his remaining hours and hope that they are dedicated to some kind of a worthy cause, and hope that they are not stolen away from him as is proposed here today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to correct a misstatement made by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN). Incidentally, I am surprised that a Member coming from an agricultural State would take the position that he does on this bill. He stated that this is a 1-year bill. It is more nearly a 2-year bill since it would impose so-called daylight saving time continuously from this December to June 30, 1975.

I urge you to read the report on this bill. It is loaded with "mays," "coulds," "mights." Nowhere is there to be found a positive statement that it is going to save anybody anything.

There has been much talk today about an emergency. When is President Nixon going to come to Congress and ask that it join in a formal declaration of an emergency? He simply tells us there is an emergency and Congress responds with ill-advised legislation such as this.

Not so long ago we put certain restrictions upon a President who embarked this country on a war and specified that within a certain time, and in the absence of a declaration of war, hostilities on the part of this country must end.

If we are going to embark on this emergency business every few months, let us have declared emergencies in which Congress participates.

With respect to schoolchildren, the report on page 17 says:

The problem of later sunrise in winter occasioned by daylight saving time would seem particularly acute for children traveling to school in the morning.

What do you propose to do about it? Compound the darkness that already prevails when they go to school in the winter? Watch how fast darkness comes this evening. If this bill is approved, children will be going to school in the fall and winter for perhaps 2 hours in the mornings, and they will come home at night—some of them—in the darkness.

As I said earlier this afternoon, Congress could not wait after the end of World War II to repeal what was then called "war time." It was one of the first war power acts repealed by Congress. Yet you are going to jump into this thing with no information as to what it will save, no positive information that it will save anything, that it will do anything but upset the lives of a lot of people in this country.

As I said earlier, I have not heard of a single mass meeting ever having been held in West Virginia or anywhere else in behalf of this legislation. Then where is the demand for it? You can play with this gimmickry to your heart's content, and it is not going to get you anywhere insofar as solving this problem.

I wish I had the wherewithal to provide every Member of this House with an old gunny sack or a rag so they could go out and wipe the dew off the soybeans, corn, and hay so the farmers could get out and harvest their crops before the

sun can do its work in the morning. The gentleman from Minnesota knows that farmers cannot harvest crops until the sun does its work by way of eliminating dew, frost, and so on. Go ahead and play with this gimmickry to your heart's content. I want no part of it, and I hope the public will let you know what it thinks about it before this winter is over.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATSUNAGA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATSUNAGA: On page 3, line 7, immediately after the word "zone" insert the following: ", and any State that lies entirely within one time zone and is not contiguous to any other State."

On page 3, line 13, immediately after the word "zones," insert the following: "or adopted pursuant to section 3(a)(1) of such Act by a State that lies entirely within one time zone and is not contiguous to any other State."

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple in nature and one which no reasonable person can oppose. It would have the effect of exempting Hawaii from the provisions of this bill.

This exemption is completely in keeping with the objective of this bill, that is, to conserve our Nation's precious energy resources. To exempt Hawaii would not result in any increased usage of energy. The exemption would, in fact, reduce energy consumption in Hawaii.

A brief look at Hawaii's past experience with daylight savings time, and its present situation, will demonstrate this.

During World War II, when Hawaii was under martial law, the military commander ordered the islands to go on daylight savings time. Both before the war and afterward, Hawaii was on a standard time which was 2½ hours behind Pacific standard. In 1947, to rationalize the system, Hawaii accepted a half-hour of permanent daylight saving time and adjusted Hawaii standard to only 2 hours behind Pacific standard. Since then, standard time has been the unbroken rule in my State. When Congress passed the Uniform Time Act in 1966, Hawaii exempted itself from its application.

And why has Hawaii resisted general daylight saving time? First, because Hawaii is further south and closer to the equator than any other State in the Union, there is much less variation between long and short days as the seasons change. In the Hawaiian city of Hilo, for example, hours of daylight on December 21 are only 2 hours and 23 minutes less than on June 21. By contrast, the difference in Boston is over 6 hours, in Los Angeles more than 4 hours, in Chicago more than 6 hours, and in Miami, the difference is 3 hours, 13 minutes—50 minutes more than the difference in Hilo. There is, then, little or no need for this adjustment in Hawaii.

Second, as I pointed out, Hawaii standard time already implicitly includes a half hour of daylight savings time. Another hour would place great hardship on the people of the Aloha State, without reaping any savings in fuel or energy.

Third, life in Hawaii is already built

on an early-rise, early-to-bed pattern. Most private workers begin by 7:30 or 8 a.m. Most Government workers begin their workdays at 7:45. They complete their days and drive home, even now during daylight hours. At best, the imposition of daylight savings time in Hawaii would merely transfer some energy usage from evening to morning hours, without any energy savings at all.

One final point, Mr. Chairman: Besides the military imposition of daylight time during World War II, Hawaii found itself on daylight time on one other occasion. The territorial legislature passed a statute imposing "fast time" as of April 30, 1933. The effect merely on island family life was devastating. Children lacking sleep became cranky; workers and students had to travel through darkness to job and school. The public outcry was so great that the legislature promptly repealed the time adjustment law, effective May 21, 1933.

I have discussed my amendment with both the majority and the minority of the committee, and I trust that they will accept it.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I understand the purpose of the gentleman from Hawaii. I would not have any objection to the amendment. Most of Hawaii is below the 20th parallel and the lower part of the United States is up around the 30th. Hawaii is a special situation, so I am sure we would have no objection on this side of the aisle and I would accept the amendment so far as I am concerned.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we understand the purpose of the amendment and on this side of the aisle we feel that in this particular, special case we would agree to accept this amendment.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I thank both the gentlemen.

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

Mr. Chairman, today we consider the bill, H.R. 11324, to provide for daylight saving time on a year-round basis for a 2-year trial.

In view of the crisis that we are now facing with regard to our energy supplies, I realize the need for certain measures designed to reduce the consumption of fuel and to conserve energy resources. But I do see the many difficulties that daylight saving time has caused and will cause for many of our rural families. I seriously doubt if energy will be conserved.

I want to state that I continue to support legislation which would amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to provide that daylight saving time shall begin on Memorial Day and end on Labor Day of each year. I am currently sponsoring such a bill and I have done so in previous Congresses.

In many of our Nation's rural areas, daylight saving time has not always

proved to be the beneficial change that its initiators intended it to be, because of the length of daylight saving time, schoolchildren in rural Kentucky are obliged to trudge along dark country roads to school buses and to wait in the dark for their ride to school. It is my understanding that this condition exists in rural areas in many parts of the country.

Many parents have expressed to me the fear that in the dark early hours avoidable accidents may occur, and have occurred. If the period of daylight saving time were amended to include only the 3 summer months, the hazardous conditions faced by these children would be eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt if many of the people in this body realize just what this will mean as to the time sunrise will occur. In Frankfort, Ky., on December 21, sunrise will occur at 8:30 a.m.

At Grand Rapids, Mich., sunrise will occur at 9:10 a.m.

At Boise, Idaho, sunrise will occur at 9:15 a.m.

I submit that we are trying to be modern Joshua's. Of course, he commanded the Sun to stand still but try as we may, the Sun will continue in orbit and the dew will dry as usual on standard time.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAZZOLI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to join in his comments and his statement today. Even though we represent different parts of Kentucky and even though we represent generally different constituencies within the Commonwealth of Kentucky I share his concern about this bill and I commend him for his statements today.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BAKER. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky. I represent the Third Congressional District of Tennessee, which lies in the eastern time zone and we suffer every peril described in his statement. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CARTER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

I regret to say that seriously I doubt if any energy will be saved by this measure.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SEBELIUS. I, too, would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman. I have 57 counties on the western border of Kansas. If we are going to have this double daylight saving time, I wonder if the gentleman remembers what the old Indian thought up when he cut off one end of his blanket and sewed it to the other end to make it longer.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. We have heard various estimates of potential or speculative savings of energy by this daylight sav-

ing year-round. As far as I know, there have been no specific figures provided as to what savings, if any, or in what kinds of energy, lights, or heat. We have heard figures all the way from 1 percent, to 1.5 and 1.7 percent. Obviously, the daylight saving plan is not going to help much in terms of gasoline. People have to get to work somehow. It is not going to help save any gasoline on our school-buses. They are going to have to run. Where will the savings be? They will just drive at a different hour. Maybe it will be in some slight savings in electric power, although I doubt that, but if a person gets up in the dark they will require more heat.

Mr. CARTER. I feel we will all be getting up an hour earlier when it is cold and having to heat things up and energy will not be saved.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CARTER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman has demonstrated some logical thinking. People will have to get up, no matter where they live. They are going to have to use about the same amount of electricity and use even more heat.

Mr. CARTER. Yes, and especially long before daylight.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I am still hoping to get some answers from someone. Perhaps the gentleman knows. I see the gentleman from California over there. He has been fighting for daylight saving plans for a long time; he has been trying to get this year-round for years. But that is not my concern what I am asking the gentleman in the well, will the saving by this plan be 1 percent or is there going to be any saving at all?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am quite familiar with the distinguished gentleman from California. He is a fine man, but he has had a bill in for year-round daylight saving time, long before we had any energy crisis, for years and years. He wants to get out an extra hour to play, and that is the reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were ayes 83, noes 2.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Transportation shall on or before June 30, 1975, submit a report to the Congress on the operation and effects of this Act giving particular attention to its effects on the use of energy in the United States. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall consult with departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government having information or expertise with respect to the operation and effects of this Act, and each such department, agency, and instrumentality shall exercise its power, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the provisions of this section. Such report shall include such recommendations for legislation or other action as the Secretary may determine.

SEC. 4. The authority of the Secretary of Transportation, under the first section of the act of March 19, 1918 (15 U.S.C. 261),

to modify the limits of any time zone is suspended during the effective period of this act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other law or any regulation issued under any such law, the Federal Communications Commission shall, consistent with any existing treaty or other agreement, make such adjustment by general rules to permit daytime standard amplitude modulation broadcast stations which are not eligible for presunrise operating authority to operate not in excess of one hour prior to local sunrise, as may be consistent with the public interest, including the public's interest in receiving interference-free service. Such general rules may include variances with respect to operating power and other technical operating characteristics. Subsequent to the adoption of such general rules, they may be varied with respect to particular stations and areas because of the exigencies in each case.

SEC. 6. This act shall take effect at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the first Sunday which occurs more than thirty days after the date of enactment of this act and shall terminate at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of April 1975.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Page 5, line 4, strike out "thirty" and insert in lieu thereof "fifteen".

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because several Members from my side and several Members from the other side have said they wished that we would bring this down to 15 days so that this bill can be put into effect a little bit earlier.

We are in an energy emergency, and they thought we should get it into effect earlier than 30 days. This makes it 15 days earlier that it will go into effect. We think the communications system of this land being what it is today with radio, TV, and the newspapers, everyone will have an opportunity to know immediately what is required, and the transportation systems will be able to change their schedule in 15 days and it can go into operation.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment, as I understand it, is to change the effective date of this section from 30 days after enactment—that is, the Sunday after 30 days after enactment—to the Sunday 15 days after enactment.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I intend

to support the amendment based on the limited knowledge I have at the moment, but I was wondering whether it is practical from a time standpoint to have the effective date shortened.

Will this allow the train schedules, the bus schedules, the airline schedules, and the television station schedules to be adjusted? Will they be able to do that?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

Other Members, as well as myself, have had similar amendments to offer. I think this amendment makes commonsense.

I only regret that neither the Congress nor the White House took the leadership in doing this some time ago. I thank the gentleman for expediting the matter.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his comments.

He did come to me. He is one of the Members that did have a similar amendment to offer; there were several other Members who also had similar amendments. I felt that in order to expedite it, the chairman of the committee would offer the amendment.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman, what is the attitude of the Department of Transportation as far as the gentleman's amendment is concerned?

Mr. STAGGERS. They feel that they can get along with it all right, and I believe they so testified before our committee.

Mr. GROSS. They apparently do not know "straight up" about what this bill will do so far as saving anything is concerned. Is it not correct that there is a provision for at least \$300,000 to run a study of what this bill will do?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the gentleman that I believe they do have an idea of what it would do.

Mr. GROSS. If they have all the answers, why do they want \$300,000 to conduct a study?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, let me say in answer to the gentleman that we are not including the \$300,000 figure in the bill. That was an estimate, that they would have to spend to make a study of the effectiveness of this bill, that is, how much energy it saves, and considering the crime rate, as to whether it went up or down, and as to the safety on the road, automobile accidents, and so forth.

This study is to be made and submitted to Congress before June 30 of 1975 in order to give us information on the operation and effects of the legislation so that we can decide whether or not to extend or do not extend it. In this way we will have some information we can work with and have something to base legislation on.

Mr. GROSS. So the \$300,000 would be spent by the Department of Transportation to develop a report and to lobby for permanent and perpetual daylight saving time? That is about the answer to that, is it not?

They want the \$300,000 for lobbying purposes; is that not correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. I will say in answer to the gentleman that according to law, we are protected from such lobbying.

Mr. GROSS. That does not inhibit the various agencies and departments of government when they want to ram something down the throats of the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Page 4, strike out line 14 and all that follows down through page 5, line 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other law or any regulation issued under any such law, the Federal Communications Commission shall, consistent with any existing treaty or other agreement, make such adjustment by general rules, or by interim action pending such general rules, to permit daytime standard amplitude modulation broadcast stations to operate not in excess of one hour prior to local sunrise, as may be consistent with the public interest, including the public's interest in receiving interference-free service. Such general rules, or interim action, may include variances with respect to operating power and other technical operating characteristics. Subsequent to the adoption of such general rules, they may be varied with respect to particular stations and areas because of the exigencies in each case.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment which makes changes in the provisions of the reported bill relating to standard AM radio broadcast stations. It would permit the FCC to take interim action before general rules are adopted that would allow the stations to operate 1 hour before sunrise. It would also permit the FCC to take into consideration those stations now not operating with presunrise authorizations or which are not eligible for such authorizations so as to permit them to operate 1 hour before sunrise.

That is the intent of the amendment. The language has been proposed by the Chairman of the FCC, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia that the language he is proposing is much clearer and states the intent of the committee. I hope it will be adopted.

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

The reason I take this time is to try to make some legislative history here, on how this year-around daylight sav-

ings time may affect some of our small sunrise to sunset radio stations.

In the report there is an effort made that some language would be added to provide for those stations who do not have pre-sunrise authority. It was proposed they be permitted to operate 1 hour prior to local sunrise. But nothing is said in the report or in any other information circulated by whip advisories about those stations being given an extra hour before sunrise who now have pre-sunrise authority. The amendment offered by the chairman of the committee today is very different from the language contained on page 4, section 5 of H.R. 11324, and very different from the suggestion in the report in the form of a letter from Dean Burch, Chairman of Federal Communications Commission.

I can only speculate what the amendment offered by Chairman STAGGERS tries to accomplish. I believe we need to have some specifics recited.

Does the chairman of the committee suggest that the amendment he is offering goes beyond those stations which are without pre-sunrise authority and includes those stations which have pre-sunrise authority at the present time. Will these stations be given the additional hour so that they can broadcast information on the weather for farmers and schoolchildren?

I think we should bear in mind we are talking about stations under 500 watts.

Some comment has been made about international treaties. I fail to see how any station in the heart of America or anywhere in the midlands can interfere with Canada or Mexico, particularly a station of between 200 to 500 watts.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee is it his thought that the amendment he proposes goes beyond those stations that do not have pre-sunrise authority and includes those presently with pre-sunrise authority.

Mr. STAGGERS. If the gentleman will yield, yes, and I so stated in my first remarks that that is the intention of the amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. That is the intention of the amendment?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

Mr. RANDALL. One more question, if the gentleman will bear with me.

We hear so much about clear channels and some possible interference with our great, powerful 50,000-watt stations in the East. No one can interfere with these grants. The little stations that operate countywide will be put out of business, and no one seems to care. Will the Federal Communications Commission take these stations into consideration in their so-called process of adjustment. Is that right? I hope we are talking about some kind of an adjustment for these stations with preservice authority, are we not, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the matter of interference be taken into consideration when they allow this 1 additional hour?

Mr. STAGGERS. It certainly should be taken into consideration. That is the intent of the amendment. It so states in the amendment, "including the public's interest in receiving interference-free service."

Mr. RANDALL. In other words, if there is no interference those little stations would be permitted to have their additional hour before sunrise?

Mr. STAGGERS. Assuming that the Federal Communications Commission sees fit to do that, they would give them permission to do that.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, a statement was made earlier that there will be a savings of fuel through this legislation. That statement has been challenged with the charge that there has been no evidence presented here that a savings will be accomplished. Yet the mayor of Los Angeles estimates a savings of up to 500,000 barrels a year. The Public Power Association estimates a savings of from 4 to 8 million barrels of oil. Consolidated Edison of New York estimates a savings of 4 million barrels of oil. But I also want to say this as a former Administrator of the national REA program: One of the first States in the country that found itself in trouble because of peakloads in isolated systems was Iowa, and one of the first States to move in the direction of REA interconnection to spread those peaks was Iowa.

I fail to understand why my associate, the gentleman from Iowa, should zero in on me, and talk about soybeans and the dew on the soybeans. I have lived on the farm virtually all of my life, and I voted against daylight saving before because of that fact. So I know a little bit about the inconvenience of daylight saving time during harvest season, at haying time, and all of that.

But I am also aware of the fact that this Congress is perfectly willing to take a hot potato and put it in the lap of the President, so that Congress is always left free of responsibility and can then criticize him for dealing with it, and can insist that it should have been done in a different way. The sad fact is that whether it be a wage-price freeze, an energy crisis or you name it, when we get a hot potato we lateral it to the President so that he will have to take the blame for whatever happens.

We have a situation now where we need to make a decision. It is not a decision that I like to make. But certainly there is, in my judgment, an opportunity here to spread the peak loads of the power systems of the country through the adoption of this program. And I do not just think that I know—I know that I know, because of the fight we had in the REA agency where I was in charge as Administrator—that one of the toughest decisions and toughest points to sell was trying to get the peak load in isolated REA systems divided. Here is a chance to spread the peak loads in the United States of America, because it has been demonstrated before that it will do exactly that. This is what we must do, or we might find ourselves wiping the dew off the frozen pipes in our homes instead of the soybeans in our fields.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman, but I have no desire to get into any argument with anyone.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the gentleman from Minnesota that I do not intend to get into any argument with the gentleman but I would appreciate it very much if the gentleman would explain for the record and for the benefit of the Members exactly how by moving our day up 1 hour this will cause a more even spreading of the peak loads.

Mr. NELSEN. Because the people who are in the power business have said so. They point out that their peak load is very great at a certain hour, and if the load can be spread, the peaks will be spread, and the system will be able to carry the load in a better manner. I make that point, and I reemphasize it, because I believe it to be accurate.

It is my feeling that this point is highly important. In my judgment, this is one of the real areas where we can be of some help. I regret to have to accept it, but I also am aware of the fact that this is a decision we here in the Congress need to make. We should not delegate to the President of the United States all of the responsibility, but take some ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I am the gentleman from California who was mentioned anonymously a little earlier in the debate as having introduced in bill form this particular idea for year-round daylight saving time some time ago, so long ago perhaps that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. Actually it was only about 8 years ago and I have been at it ever since.

I was delighted to hear the gentleman from Kentucky allege that I introduced it in order to let people have an hour's more fun. I did so, and there is certainly nothing the matter with that. One can have a lot more fun with that extra hour of daylight at the end of the day than early in the day, and we should. Actually, what is time for but to put to man's best and highest use?

All during World War II, I was in the Navy. I was a navigator and I ran a big attack transport. Every day 30 minutes before dawn we rang a general alarm, got up on deck, manned the guns because we were liable to get a German submarine attack about that time, and it was reasoned that if everybody were up and around, we could either fight off the Germans, or if they sank us, we could get off the ship without sinking with it. Since we were constantly moving dawn was coming up daily at different times and upsetting ship's routine. I simply adopted the device of setting our ship's clock according to where we were steaming so we always had dawn at 6 o'clock in the morning. Then we were up and fought the Germans on a regular and civilized schedule and had our breakfast at reasonable hours without sunrise interfering with it. Everything worked well because we used the clock intelligently. We mastered it instead of it mastering us.

This is the same principle that is applicable to all-year d.s.t. now. We are just aiming to put time to the highest and best use and benefit of man by adjusting the clock so things come out better than they do now for us humans.

That was foolishness that we heard a little while ago about the Indian cutting a rug on one end and sewing it on the other end. Whoever told that story obviously does not know the difference between breakfast and dinner. And, there are a lot of other differences than that between the morning and the evening.

When we get up in the morning we are tired and hate to get up in the first place. We turn on the minimum number of lights possible so our wives cannot see how ugly we look. Then we quickly get out of the place and go to work. We do not use much light; we do not use much power. It is in the evening that we use the power. If we can delay by 1 hour the time when the Sun goes down, and when everybody in the evening turns on all the lights and the television and all the rest of the household gadgets, then, of course, we are going to save energy. No doubt about it.

It does not take of necessity anybody's even reading the Rand study that was made on this to know that. But the study documents that we can save 2 percent of the power in this country just by recognizing these plain facts of life. Some of the Members here did not want to read the Rand study probably. Some have never heard of the study, but that is what it shows, an annual saving of hundreds of millions of dollars of electricity use.

This is why we are going to pass this bill. It is not some kind of freakish fantasy. It is to do something for this country when something needs to be done for it. It will allow the energy shortage to be imposed more evenly and with less burden upon the people of this country.

I say this to the Members: That while these 2 years are going on when we have this temporary daylight saving time all year round and the studies are being made and you have tried it, then you are going to like it.

I am also sure that having studied the matter, we will find out that this old business of longitudinal division of time up and down like we have done in the past may not even be the way to do it. Remember that the idea of time zones in this country originated with the railroads. Naturally, anything run by the railroads will go awry, so then they had to pass a law to straighten things out. At that time the Congress knew all about longitude but it did not know much about latitude.

We know the higher latitude we are in, the shorter the day or night, depending on the season. The lower in latitude we are, the more sunshine we get in the summer, the less in winter. Also moving East and West where we have metropolitan load centers, as indicated by the gentleman from Minnesota, if we snake those lines that change time around the load centers, we can put these heavy consumers of electricity an hour off phase in many instances, and thereby pick up an enormous amount of electrical capacity that we do not have to turn on and use because we have intelligently

used time for the benefit of man. We also, because natural daylight can last for an hour longer in the evening, by maneuvering these lines horizontally, as well as vertically, pick up the other numerous advantages of daylight saving time on an all-year basis.

I am sorry an energy crisis had to come about to precipitate action on this bill, but believe me I am delighted to be one of its coauthors and to have it here today and to know it is going to pass and probably be in effect as a Christmas present for all the people.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to identify with the remarks of my colleague, the pioneer from California, who has just addressed the House.

I rise in support of the legislation.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order that I may read a few words from the committee report. I would then like to have the chairman of the committee comment on these four lines if he will. The four lines are:

However, no studies have been carried out and no information is available which establishes with certainty that an overall reduction in energy consumption will directly result from the year-round observance of daylight saving time.

Will the chairman comment on that statement, please?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I will be happy to comment.

We have just discovered that we are in an energy crisis in America. The President in one of his messages has recommended that we pass the daylight saving time bill as one of the methods of reducing the energy shortage.

In making this statement we said it was recommended by the administration and we have had different ones from the administration come and give their testimony to the effect that if we pass this bill we will save 95,000 barrels of fuel each day.

We have had before us the fact that England has had an experiment on this same line for 3 years and we based our action on what they had found out and had done.

Also we have had the testimony of the different power companies and their estimates.

After all this we decided we should do something, and that we should have a study made by the Department of Transportation and we ask them to bring back to us in June of 1975 a report. We made this a temporary bill which runs out in April 1975. We will know by that time, or hope we definitely will know, what this will do for America. There is no other way in which we can have the figures, unless we actually now do something.

The best information we have been given and the best estimate is that when we get this information they will be able to say what has happened during this interval of 14 months.

However, the time to act is now and we cannot put it off for 14 months.

Mr. GOODLING. We had daylight sav-

ing time for a great many years so why did we not have studies made during that time?

Mr. STAGGERS. The gentleman can ask that. Perhaps there are those who should have anticipated this crisis but they did not. However, the time for us to act is now. The President has said in his message to America this is one of the things he would ask Congress to do and we have responded to that as quickly as possible.

Mr. GOODLING. Has the gentleman given any thought to the adverse effect this will have on the millions of school-children?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is in the committee report and we have covered that. Every time we have had a daylight savings bill on the floor and there have been several in the past years, someone has asked these same questions. We have had discussions on the effects of daylight saving time for the children in the District of Columbia and we have discussed that each time we came before the Congress with that type of legislation.

Then they found that it was not as they said it would be; they had one nationally, but it got us in such a chaos in America that something had to be done to bring uniform time. From that they found daylight saving time has not been so bad. When the President asked for this, saying on the best information he had that it would save so much energy, it was time for Congress to do something.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, as many of the Members do, I have grandchildren and I do not particularly like to have them stand on the highways and have the schoolbus pick them up before daylight.

Mr. STAGGERS. Well, if the gentleman will yield, all he has to do is to go to the school board in his district and ask them to change the time.

Mr. GOODLING. Why not ask everybody to do just that?

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

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

Mr. DICKINSON. If I might have the attention of the chairman for one question I wonder if the committee is seriously considering the question of double daylight saving time? If this is so good, we will get a double dip when the summer days come along and add to daylight saving time on top of this.

Mr. STAGGERS. We could not see any advantage to that. It has been tried in different parts of the country, but it does not work too well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODLING was allowed to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.)

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

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

I want to commend him for stating it exactly as it is. There is no proof whatever that there will be any energy saving by this bill. This is stated in the committee report. Again I want to thank the

gentleman for asking this very pertinent question.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for his comments and yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATHIS OF GEORGIA

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATHIS of Georgia: Page 3, line 9, preceding the period insert: and any State lying wholly within one time zone, bordered on the east by a State within the same time zone, and on the west by a State lying within a different time zone.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, what I have is a very simple little amendment that simply exempts the State of Georgia from the provisions of this bill. I know that in the same spirit of friendship and harmony with which the amendment was offered by the gentleman from Hawaii, the chairman of the committee, and the ranking Republican member, they will also agree to support my amendment.

I do not see any point in debating or discussing it, because it does one thing. It exempts Georgia. Therefore, I simply ask support for my amendment.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman.

This goes against the complete purpose of the bill. Certainly, if this amendment passes, no one is going to save anything. We are not going to save energy. I would urge that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MATHIS).

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, personally it makes no difference to me if we get the one dip as the gentleman from West Virginia urges, or the double dip which the gentleman from Alabama urges, because I personally have my life organized on a 24-hour basis.

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

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to correct the record. I am not urging a double dip. I just know that if it is such a good thing that we enact this into public and permanent law, it will not be long before they come back during the summer months and say, "It has done all this, we need a double dip."

It is not that I am urging this. I want to correct the record.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, of course I must agree with the gentleman from Iowa that daylight saving time is just a gimmick as far as I personally am concerned. I can go to work at 7 o'clock, or with the double dip 6 o'clock, and return at 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock instead of 4 o'clock and 5 o'clock, but the thing that does concern me are the millions of young schoolchildren, particularly in rural areas, who will be greatly inconvenienced in the morning.

If this will save as much fuel as the gentleman from California states, per-

haps it is worth that inconvenience, but here I have the report and there is no evidence that there will be such large savings of fuel, but yet the gentleman from California refers to a Rand study where we will have millions upon millions of barrels of fuel per year.

I would like for the gentleman from California to elucidate a little bit more on that Rand study and state why it was not made available to the committee. I am beginning to think that those who maintain that daylight saving time will save fuel are referring to savings during the summer months. There is no doubt that daylight saving time will conserve fuel and power in the summer, but I seriously question whether there will be any savings in the winter.

This is what I cannot see. I arose at 6:30 this morning. I had to have the lights on till 7:30 before I could see to get around the house. Now, I am going to be arising at 5:30 and have my lights on for 2 hours until it becomes 7:30.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say, No. 1, I cannot give the gentleman the answer why—

Mr. ICHORD. The committee could not give us the answer why, either.

Mr. HOSMER. The committee does not have the Rand study, but it does exist and it shows that 2 percent savings can be made with year-round daylight saving time. It translates into savings, in terms of dollars, at least into \$600 million a year spent on fuel.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as the gentleman's morning light bulbs are concerned, I invite him to count his morning light bulbs and evening light bulbs, and if he does not have twice as many in the evening as he does in the morning, he is wasting electricity anyway.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I am sure this House is going to pass the bill, but I wonder if we are doing it on the basis of fact.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it means anything or not, but the British tried it out, year-round daylight saving time, for 3 years from 1968 to 1971, and threw it out.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I just wonder if the gentleman knows that this Rand Corp. study he is talking about, is this the same outfit Dr. Ellsberg works for?

Mr. ICHORD. I believe Dr. Ellsberg did work for them for a while.

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 11324 to provide for the establishment of year-round daylight saving time. It has long been clear to me that such a move would contribute substantially to the overall effort to conserve energy and that immediate passage of

the legislation would be a positive step towards meeting the Nation's energy needs. In addition, passage will emphasize the concern of the House and exhibit the much needed leadership standard for the country.

Year-round daylight saving time would have a number of beneficial effects in addition to the energy saved. The Department of Transportation estimates that d.s.t. would reduce nationwide demand for electricity by as much as 2 percent. In terms of dollars, this decrease in demand could save Americans some \$600 million in electrical bills.

Although it has been argued that daylight saving time would interfere with agricultural production, the Department of Agriculture reports that it will not scientifically effect farmers. Its institution would, in fact, benefit dairy farmers because it would eliminate the semi-annual adjustment when the customary time changes are made.

Public safety in two areas would be improved as a result of longer daylight periods in the evening. Justice Department studies indicate that the frequency of muggings and murders, which occur between the hours of 5 p.m. and nightfall, the normal traveling time of people leaving work, will decrease. In addition, statistics suggest that year-round d.s.t. would decrease the number of motor vehicle fatalities during evening rush hours, a decrease which would offset by a slight increase of accidents during morning rush hours.

When I cosponsored in January the legislation we are considering today, I was convinced of the necessity of passage in order to save energy. Today the need is self-evident. If we, as a nation, are to maintain the quality of life that we have, we must recognize that most of our energy sources have limited supplies and must be conserved. To use energy wisely is now a national goal. Daylight saving is one small step towards reaching that goal. It is time we took that step.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MONTGOMERY, 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. 11324) to provide for daylight saving time on a year-round basis for a 2-year trial period, pursuant to House Resolution 718, 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.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted in the Committee of the Whole? If not, 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. RANDALL. 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 311, nays 88, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 597]

YEAS—311

Abzug	Daniels	Hudnut
Adams	Dominick V.	Hungate
Addabbo	Danielson	Hunt
Anderson,	Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.
Calif.	Delaney	Johnson, Colo.
Andrews, N.C.	Dellums	Jones, Ala.
Annunzio	Dennis	Jones, Tenn.
Archer	Dent	Jordan
Arends	Derwinski	Karth
Armstrong	Devine	Kastenmeier
Aspin	Dickinson	Kemp
Badillo	Dingell	Ketchum
Bafalis	Donohue	King
Barrett	Drinan	Kluczyński
Bauman	Dulski	Koch
Beard	du Pont	Kuykendall
Bell	Eckhardt	Kyros
Bennett	Edwards, Ala.	Latta
Bevill	Edwards, Calif.	Leggett
Biaggi	Eilberg	Lehman
Blasier	Erlenborn	Lent
Bingham	Esch	Litton
Blatnik	Eshleman	Long, La.
Boggs	Fascell	Long, Md.
Boland	Findley	Lott
Bolling	Fish	Lujan
Bowen	Flood	McClory
Brademas	Flowers	McCloskey
Brasco	Ford, Gerald R.	McCollister
Brinkley	Forsythe	McCormack
Brooks	Fraser	McDade
Broomfield	Frelinghuysen	McEwen
Brotzman	Frenzel	McFall
Brown, Calif.	Frey	McKinney
Brown, Mich.	Froehlich	Madden
Brown, Ohio	Fuqua	Madigan
Broyhill, N.C.	Gaydos	Mailliard
Broyhill, Va.	Gialmo	Mallory
Burgener	Gibbons	Mann
Burke, Fla.	Gilman	Maraziti
Burke, Mass.	Goldwater	Martin, N.C.
Burlison, Mo.	Grasso	Mathias, Calif.
Burton	Gray	Matsunaga
Butler	Green, Oreg.	Meeds
Byron	Green, Pa.	Melcher
Carey, N.Y.	Griffiths	Metcalfe
Carney, Ohio	Grover	Mezvinisky
Casey, Tex.	Gude	Michel
Cederberg	Gunter	Millford
Chamberlain	Guyer	Minish
Chappell	Hamilton	Mink
Chisholm	Hanley	Minshall, Ohio
Clancy	Hanna	Mitchell, Md.
Clausen	Hanrahan	Mitchell, N.Y.
Don H.	Harrington	Moakley
Clawson, Del	Harvey	Molohan
Clay	Hastings	Montgomery
Cleveland	Hawkins	Moorhead,
Cochran	Hébert	Calif.
Cohen	Heckler, Mass.	Moorhead, Pa.
Collier	Heinz	Morgan
Collins, Tex.	Helstoski	Mosher
Conable	Hillis	Moss
Conte	Hinshaw	Murphy, Ill.
Corman	Hogan	Murphy, N.Y.
Cotter	Hollifield	Nedzi
Coughlin	Holt	Nelsen
Crane	Holtzman	Nichols
Cronin	Horton	Nix
Culver	Hosmer	Obey
Daniel, Robert	Howard	O'Brien
W., Jr.	Huber	O'Hara

O'Neill	Roybal	Udall
Owens	Ruppe	Ullman
Parris	Ryan	Van Deerlin
Passman	St Germain	Vander Jagt
Patten	Sandman	Vanik
Pepper	Sarasin	Veysey
Pettis	Sarbanes	Vigorito
Peyser	Satterfield	Waldie
Pickle	Schneebell	Walsh
Pike	Schroeder	Ware
Podell	Seiberling	Whalen
Preyer	Shoup	Whitehurst
Price, Ill.	Shuster	Widnall
Pritchard	Sikes	Wiggins
Quile	Sisk	Williams
Quillen	Smith, Iowa	Wilson, Bob
Railsback	Smith, N.Y.	Wilson,
Rangel	Snyder	Charles H.,
Regula	Staggers	Calif.
Reuss	Stanton,	Winn
Rhodes	James V.	Wolf
Riegle	Stark	Wright
Rinaldo	Steelman	Wyatt
Roberts	Steiger, Wis.	Wyder
Robison, N.Y.	Stratton	Wyllie
Rodino	Studds	Wyman
Roe	Sullivan	Yates
Rogers	Symington	Yatron
Roncallo, Wyo.	Talcott	Young, Alaska
Roncallo, N.Y.	Taylor, N.C.	Young, Fla.
Rooney, Pa.	Teague, Calif.	Young, Ill.
Rosenthal	Thompson, N.J.	Zablocki
Rostenkowski	Thomson, Wis.	Zion
Roush	Towell, Nev.	
Rousselot	Treen	

NAYS—88

Abdnor	Hansen, Idaho	Runnels
Baker	Harsha	Ruth
Bergland	Hays	Scherle
Blackburn	Hechler, W. Va.	Sebellius
Bray	Henderson	Shipley
Breaux	Hicks	Shriver
Breckinridge	Hutchinson	Skubitz
Burleson, Tex.	Ichord	Slack
Camp	Jones, N.C.	Spence
Carter	Jones, Okla.	Stanton,
Clark	Kazen	J. William
Conlan	Landgrebe	Steed
Daniel, Dan	McKay	Steiger, Ariz.
Davis, Ga.	McSpadden	Stephens
Davis, S.C.	Mahon	Stubblefield
de la Garza	Martin, Nebr.	Stuckey
Denholm	Mathis, Ga.	Symms
Dorn	Mayne	Taylor, Mo.
Duncan	Mazzoli	Teague, Tex.
Evins, Tenn.	Miller	Thone
Fisher	Mizell	Thornton
Flynt	Myers	Waggonner
Fountain	Natcher	Wampler
Fulton	Perkins	White
Gettys	Poage	Whitten
Gonzalez	Powell, Ohio	Young, S.O.
Goodling	Price, Tex.	Young, Tex.
Gross	Randall	Zwach
Haley	Rarick	
Hammer-	Robinson, Va.	
schmidt	Roy	

NOT VOTING—34

Alexander	Evans, Colo.	Patman
Anderson, Ill.	Foley	Rees
Andrews,	Ford,	Reid
N. Dak.	William D.	Rooney, N.Y.
Ashbrook	Ginn	Rose
Ashley	Gubser	Steele
Buchanan	Hansen, Wash.	Stokes
Burke, Calif.	Jarman	Tieman
Collins, Ill.	Johnson, Pa.	Wilson,
Conyers	Keating	Charles, Tex.
Dellenback	Landrum	Young, Ga.
Diggs	Macdonald	
Downing	Mills, Ark.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas against.

Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Ginn against.

Mr. Foley for, with Mr. Jarman against.

Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Reid with Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Conyers with Mr. Tieman.

Mr. Ashley with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Stokes with Mr. Rees.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Landrum.

Mrs. Collins of Illinois with Mr. Keating.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Young of Georgia with Mr. Rose.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Ashbrook.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for daylight saving time on a year-round basis for a 2-year trial period, and to require the Federal Communications Commission to permit certain daytime broadcast stations to operate before local sunrise."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAGGERS. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

"PRIORITIES FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATION," AN ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMÁS

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

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, on November 19, 1973, I had the privilege of addressing the annual fall convention of the Council for Educational Development and Research here in Washington.

I insert the text of my address on this occasion:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMÁS

I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak at the Annual Fall Convention of the Council for Educational Development and Research.

It is not to flatter you because I believe it to be true that I say that, in my view, you who labor to extend the frontiers of learning about learning are engaged in an enterprise crucial to the future of our society.

As a member for fifteen years of that committee of the House of Representatives with chief responsibility for writing legislation for education, from preschool through graduate school, I speak from experience when I say that we need the best that you, the men and women of the education research and development community, can give us if we as legislators and our nation as a whole are to provide education worthy of a free people in the modern world.

It is because of this conviction that three and a half years ago I responded with such enthusiasm to President Nixon's proposal, in his Message to Congress on educational reform, for the creation of a National Institute of Education as a vehicle for supporting research and development in education.

I want today to talk to you about the NIE and how the National Institute of Education, as one Member of Congress, I see it in relation to the issue of priorities for educational research and development.

As one who has found it easy—and it's getting easier every day!—to restrain his en-

thusiasm for the works of Richard Nixon, I nonetheless applauded the President's call for establishing an institution that would, in his words, "begin the serious, systematic search for new knowledge needed to make educational opportunity truly equal".

And so in March 1970, as leader of a bipartisan group of twenty members of the House of Representatives, I introduced the bill authorizing the National Institute of Education.

The Select Education Subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair, of the House Committee on Education and Labor conducted extensive hearings on the bill, visited centers of educational research in this country and abroad, and commissioned essays by leading authorities on the kinds of problems such an institute might consider.

Our subcommittee went through this intensive process—a kind of protracted graduate seminar—not only to inform ourselves about the role of research in education but also to signify to our colleagues in Congress, to the Administration, to educators and others that we regarded the National Institute of Education as a new development of the highest importance to the future of American education.

And, without my here reviewing the legislative history, we wrote the National Institute of Education into law. Suggested by a Republican President not known for his support of education, approved by bipartisan majorities in a Democratic-controlled Congress, the new venture was on its way.

SOME OF THE TROUBLES OF THE NIE

But as you all know, the NIE has run into some serious troubles in its first year of existence.

That the \$162 million recommended by an anti-education Administration should have been reduced to \$75 million by a Congress that consistently votes more money for education than the President wants is dramatic evidence of these troubles.

Why the cuts?

Here, I suggest, are some reasons.

Many Members of Congress are not really clear about what research in education is and, whatever it is, are not sure that research makes any difference in improving teaching and learning. Investment in research, moreover, especially in the field of human behaviour, characteristically does not produce rapid, concrete dividends.

The lack of short-run payoffs from educational research is all the more grating to Congressmen and Senators faced with an Administration budget that slashes deeply or eliminates Federal funds for ongoing education programs.

Another reason for the NIE's funding difficulties is, in my view, apathy or opposition from professional groups, including teachers, chief state school officers, educational organizations and even researchers like you who, not seeing some immediate benefit to their own interests, responded like some county highway commissioners complaining that there was not enough pork in the barrel for them.

I must say, too—and I believe that Tom Glennan and his associates have been courageously engaged in some self-criticism on this point—that the NIE leadership should have done a much better job of communicating its purposes to Congress as well as to the educational community.

But finally, I would assert that the White House itself must bear a major share of the blame for the failure of Congress to vote more funds for the NIE.

For by delaying for months the selection of the Director and then for many months more the appointment of the National Council on Educational Research, which, as you know, is and was deliberately designed by Congress to be policy-making and not simply advisory in nature, President Nixon left the NIE leadership in a straightjacket.

It was difficult for Dr. Glennan to tell Congress what his programs and policies were to be, given the absence of the Council that had been statutorily mandated to share with the Director, in shaping those programs and policies.

I have elsewhere said that I believe the mentality of Watergate is to be found throughout the Administration of Richard Nixon, and in my view, that mentality cropped up even in the matter of the White House attitude toward the NIE.

For when I say the mentality of Watergate, I mean simply the posture of contempt for the law of the land, in this case, the willful refusal of President Nixon to obey the law which Congress wrote requiring that he appoint a National Council on Educational Research.

That Mr. Nixon should have so undermined the strong bipartisan support in Congress for an initiative for which he could rightfully claim credit is a problem I leave to you researchers in human behavior to explain.

In any event, I want here to reaffirm my own support for the ability and integrity and dedication of Tom Glennan and to say that I know from personal observation he is laboring hard to make the National Institute of Education an institution that will command the confidence of both Congress and the American educational community.

A little later I'll come back to some comments on how I think you can help him achieve that goal, which ought surely to be your goal as well.

PRIORITIES FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

But first, let me talk to you about what seem to me should be some of the priorities for research and development in education today.

I do not of course insist that the priorities of Federal legislators are the only ones, and I recognize that mine are, understandably, colored by my particular perspective and experience.

There are other sources of priorities as well: public policymakers at all levels of government—Federal, State and local; consumers—teachers, administrators, students, parents; and you, the practitioners of research and development.

But here is a list of areas that, as one Member of Congress, I believe should come high on the agenda of effort of the NIE itself and of the institutions it engages to carry out research.

BASIC RESEARCH INTO LEARNING PROCESS

And as I set forth my list, I shall from time to time indicate how some items relate to problems Members of Congress encounter in writing education legislation.

First, we need basic research into the learning process. We should seek to understand the variety of cognitive styles and should try as well, to cite one example, to have physiologists and nutritionists as well as psychologists explore the factors which affect learning ability.

As chief sponsor of the Comprehensive Child Development Bill, which President Nixon vetoed in 1971, I want to know—as my colleagues and I renew our efforts to shape a new early childhood proposal—all I can about how and when children learn and develop, both cognitively and non-cognitively.

What can the researchers tell us on this matter of crucial concern?

EDUCATION OF THE DISADVANTAGED

Second, the NIE should give special attention to the complex national problems of the education of the disadvantaged.

Even now we on the Committee on Education and Labor are considering legislation to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and to say that we have been bogged down in our effort to write Title I would be grossly to understate our dilemma.

How, for example, do you define educational disadvantage?

The present law is premised on the presupposition of a very high correlation between economic deprivation and education underachievement.

That premise is now under attack in the committee and none of us has seen scientific evidence that is completely compelling on any side of this argument.

We need the help of the educational research community here and most of us, frankly, have not been much impressed by what we have seen.

EDUCATIONAL FINANCE

The NIE should study educational finance at every level—from preschool through graduate school. Recent court decisions at both the state and Federal levels should make us all aware that we are headed for major changes in the pattern of support of public elementary and secondary education in the United States, but it is not clear in just what direction we are going.

For example, the NIE can help states and cities look at a variety of alternative means of paying for education.

The sad state of our knowledge here is one of the reasons Congress last year, as part of the Higher Education Act, established a National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, for we were mightily distressed by the failure of the American education community, including its researchers, to pay serious intellectual attention to the economics of higher education.

You will all recall, for example, the several reports of recent years contending that many of our colleges and universities were in deep financial distress. But when our committee attempted to find a definition of "financial distress" or even "financial need", our inquiries fell on stony ground.

For there are no commonly accepted standards of the economics of higher education, and while I appreciate that simply to state the problem is not to solve it, I believe you should realize the dangers for the future financing of higher education in the continued absence of more systematic attention to such problems by the higher education community.

Or are we in Congress to be told that with respect to shaping public policy to support the institutions that symbolize reason in our society, reason does not apply?

Even now those of us who sit on the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education are working hard to fashion by the end of the year a much needed analytical framework within which, hopefully, those who make decisions on financing postsecondary education—Congressmen, state legislators, governors, administrators—can more soundly, more rationally, if you will, decide. It has not been an easy task.

Hopefully, the National Institute of Education will find in our Commission's effort something of value on which to build.

IMPROVING THE EDUCATION OF EDUCATORS

The NIE should also consider ways of improving the education of educators—of enhancing the qualities of those who teach in or administer our schools and universities. In this connection I am concerned that, in the rush of the Nixon Administration to abandon Federal support for training in nearly every area, the NIE not turn its back on the support of training of researchers.

To advance educational practice in terms of both the content of what is taught and the means by which it is taught must also be on the agenda of the NIE.

And I know that these are both areas to which many of you in this room have devoted your own efforts.

STRENGTHENING LINKS OF R. AND D. WITH SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES

I think it essential that the National Institute have as a high priority the creation

of ways of strengthening the links between research and development institutions and schools and universities.

It is vital not only that there be more and better research but also that the fruits of research be disseminated throughout the educational system and not, in the metaphor familiar on Capitol Hill, sit on some dusty shelf.

It was, indeed, because of our awareness of the importance of the dissemination function that the authors of the National Institute of Education stipulated that the principal responsibility for the dissemination of the results of research findings were to be lodged not with the Office of Education but with the National Institute of Education.

To explain why Congress gave control over dissemination to the NIE rather than OE, I quote from the language of our report of our House committee on the bill establishing the National Institute of Education:

"There are two reasons the Institute must collect and disseminate the findings of educational research as well as support such research. First, if they are to be aware of the needs of real students and real teachers and real administrators and real educational settings, researchers involved in developing new knowledge about learning must be involved with such consumers of education.

"Second, the process of research and development in education is not a simple linear one, that is, a process in which basic research is followed by demonstration and validation and then by dissemination of a product. Rather, the process is a dynamic one in which there are constant, continuing interchanges back and forth between and among: (1) basic researchers; (2) those who demonstrate the results; and (3) the consumers, those who apply the results in teaching and learning situations.

"The Institute must, therefore, assume responsibility not only for the development of educational materials and practices but also for their dissemination to students, teachers, administrators and other potential users."

The Senate report on the bill echoes this view of the nature of the relationship between dissemination and research.

OTHER AREAS

There are other areas, too, that deserve the most searching inquiry: continuing and mid-career education, non-formal and extra-institutional ways of learning, and the relationship between the public and non-public sectors of education.

Moreover, should not educational researchers take heed of the implications of last spring's report of the panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee entitled, "Youth: Transition to Adulthood?"

The panel, chaired by James S. Coleman, suggests, among other things, that schools, and the educators who run them, do not adequately prepare young people for adulthood.

The report goes on to suggest that the objectives of schools should be expanded beyond providing students with cognitive skills to include helping young people learn to manage their own affairs, to "develop capabilities as a consumer not only of goods, but more significantly, of the cultural riches of civilization," and, finally, to develop "capabilities for engaging in intense concentrated involvement in an activity."

Will educational researchers see such thinking as a threat or an opportunity?

EVALUATION

I want to single out for special discussion as a high priority matter for the NIE the development of measures for assessing and evaluating the effectiveness of education.

Some of you may recall that several months back, President Nixon, in seeking to justify the sharp reduction or elimination from his budget of Federal funds for a number of domestic programs, said, "We

have conducted detailed studies comparing . . . costs and results. On the basis of that experience, I am convinced the costs of many Federal programs can no longer be justified."

But as many of my colleagues in Congress will agree and as I can testify from personal experience, Administration witnesses at Congressional hearings have been silent when pressed to describe the standards and techniques by which they have judged programs successfully or not.

Administration witnesses have simply been unable to point to the existence of the "detailed studies comparing . . . costs and results" on the basis of which studies they try to justify cutbacks in Federal funds.

For the people in this room know better than do most that we have a long way to go to develop an effective science of the evaluation of human behavior and that a degree of humility would be much more in order than these sweeping—and fundamentally dishonest—pretensions of Administration spokesmen, including the President, whose pleas for budget cutbacks in domestic programs are far more understandable in terms of ideological bias than as a consequence of objective evaluation.

So I am very pleased to see that such groups as the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development are giving particular attention in their current discussions to the problem of the evaluation of education.

And I believe it imperative that the NIE place evaluation high on its list of subjects that require the most careful and thoughtful inquiry and analysis. We need to develop a science of evaluation and we need as well to learn how to evaluate evaluation.

There is one other consideration which, in my judgment, should underlie all the works supported by the NIE, a consideration of particular significance to you.

And it is aptly summarized by Patrick Suppes and Lee Cronbach in their book, *Research for Tomorrow's Schools*:

"Neither the presence nor the absence of Federally supported research is fundamental. What is fundamental is to create a climate that is favorable to first-class intellectual effort and hostile to second rate."

For I am sure we all can share the conviction that first-class standards must be established in all the work supported by the National Institute of Education if it is to be successful in bringing change to American education.

A SUMMARY

Let me sum up what I have tried to say to you and unburden myself of a few admonitions to you for the future.

I have tried to tell you something of the genesis of the National Institute of Education and review the troubles it's had and why they happened.

I have attempted to indicate to you some of the priorities for research and development that I believe should be on the agenda for the National Institute of Education, with particular reference to our concerns here in Congress as we write education legislation.

I have made clear that this list is of my own making but I like to think that it is not too different from what many of you would produce or from what Dr. Glennan and the National Council will deem among the subjects worthy of attention and consideration and investment.

But there are some final comments that I should like to leave with you as well as look down the road to the future of the National Institute of Education.

The first thing I want to say is to urge you, the researchers and developers in education in this country, to give your strong support to the Institute.

That you may not yourselves have benefited from the NIE as much as you hoped is really no excuse for standing by on the other side.

I know that many of you, especially from the regional laboratories and R. and D. centers, feel particularly aggrieved at a pattern of educational R and D policy that seems at best erratic.

Nevertheless, if you as professionals are serious about the importance of research and development in education in this country, you have a responsibility to support the NIE. It's the only one we have and I believe it terribly shortsighted, as I have earlier suggested, that so many who should have a stake in supporting the efforts to improve the quality of education in this country have failed to communicate to their Representatives and Senators their conviction of the importance of this enterprise or still worse, have opposed the effort.

In this connection, I want to reiterate my conviction that Tom Glennan is worthy of your counsel and advice and your support as well as of your constructive criticism.

Second, I hope you will realize that like the rest of the country, many in Congress do not really understand the contribution that first-class research can make to increasing our dividends on our national investment in education and that you, as researchers, have therefore an educational responsibility to help the country and Congress to a better appreciation of the relationship between R and D and our systems of education.

For the skills, the imagination, the efforts of our educational researchers and developers depends, far more than perhaps even you realize, the capacity of American education to produce a free and civilized people.

METHOD OF DETERMINING BIG TEN TEAM FOR ROSE BOWL QUESTIONED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, it is with recognizable bias and a great deal of frustration that I rise today to point out a major injustice committed over the weekend. The purpose of my calling this matter to the attention of the House is not to ask for congressional action—for I believe it is not properly within the prerogative of the Federal Government to oversee such matters. Rather, it is to use this national forum for twofold purpose:

First, to give high praise and honor to the men of the University of Michigan football team who performed so well Saturday in the Michigan-Ohio State game. Although the score ended in a 10 to 10 deadlock, obviously they were the moral victors.

Second, to use this forum to raise the question with those who are responsible, specifically the Big Ten athletic directors, as to the method used to send Ohio State rather than Michigan to the Rose Bowl.

We should at the outset put these matters in perspective. It is most important to pay tribute to the players and coaches of the University of Michigan football team whose efforts thrilled a record crowd of 105,223 and millions more who watched on television. Trailing 10 to 0 at halftime, the Michigan players rose to the occasion and came back against a well-disciplined Ohio State team, leaving no doubt as to who deserved the Rose Bowl berth. That game and the 10-0-1 record of Michigan will remain a vivid memory for all football fans.

So also will the furor generated by the

selection of Ohio State, with a 9-0-1 record, to represent the Big Ten in the Rose Bowl game against Southern California which last year dealt Ohio State a 42 to 17 loss. The tragedy was not in that the University of Michigan was denied representation at the Rose Bowl. The real tragedy was for the athletes who so clearly deserved the honor of playing in the Rose Bowl.

As one who represents the Ann Arbor area and an alumnus of that institution, I must register in this forum my strong protest over the decision of the athletic directors at a time when amateur athletics is increasingly under fire. I have written the athletic directors of each of the Big Ten's schools requesting a full explanation as to the method of selection and to ask whether there could be a more equitable and impartial way of choosing the Rose Bowl team in a situation such as this.

At a time in this country when credibility is widely questioned, fairness in any contest—political or athletic—demands a new accountability and makes the decision of the past weekend even more unfortunate.

THE ENERGY SHORTAGES: ARE WE SEARCHING FOR THE RIGHT ANSWERS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, almost every American is aware that our country is facing a serious energy shortage. The fact is, though, that this problem is not ours alone, for it involves the whole world.

It is not easy to explain in brief how this situation came about, for the complexity of the problem pales into insignificance when compared to the complexity of its resolution. Only one thing is for sure—that the Earth is not running out of potential sources of energy; it is only running out of energy supplies readily available. It will take a major effort and considerable time to develop sufficient resources to meet our future needs. But, the task must begin.

ARAB OIL BOYCOTT WAS PREDICTABLE

In an address before the Greater Buffalo Area Energy Symposium, which I had the honor to sponsor on September 21, I stressed the following point:

To describe the energy supply shortage as a "crisis" is, to me, a less than satisfactory term, for it implies an unstable state of affairs of a short duration which will be solved, for good or for ill, in the not-too-distant future.

What we are really faced with, instead, is a protracted period of chronic and growing deficiencies in the supply of indigenous fuels that will make our nation uncomfortably and dangerously vulnerable to external and political pressures.

And, in an address before this House on October 9, I addressed this problem even more specifically:

The United States must rapidly accelerate its attention to the full development of oil supplies other than those now held, as if for ransom, by some of the Arab nations. This Nation and our allies can no longer rely on the Arabs for oil. To do so is to continue

to subject ourselves to international and economic blackmail by them.

The United States should move immediately to a full inventory of the available fossil fuel supplies, with primary concentration on raw petroleum. Exploration of suspected untapped oil fields should commence. The vast Alaskan North Slope resources must be tapped and moved to areas of use. Technology for oil shale and coal processing must be refined further. I believe we can have both adequate energy and adequate environmental protection at the same time, but we must move forward in these areas now. To do otherwise is to invite continued abuse at the hands of the belligerent Arab nations.

I do not cite these words to stress any quality of clairvoyance on my part; rather, they are cited to show that we, as a Nation, failed to heed the obvious and to remedy the potential crisis before it became a real one. This otherwise potential crisis became a very real emergency within a matter of days and weeks.

ENERGY SHORTAGES INTERTWINED WITH OTHER ISSUES

To recognize a problem is not to solve it. It is the search for resolution—solutions and answers—which must now be the order of the day.

That search will not be an easy one, for the issue is intertwined with such diverse considerations as supply and demand; technology; foreign policy, particularly as that policy relates to the Middle East; environmental protection, esthetics, and land use planning; anti-trust monitoring and enforcement; tax policies; export and import regulation; the balance of trade and the value of the U.S. dollar affected thereby; price controls and commodity price ceilings; the development of regional resources; the quantity and quality of technological progress; and the intricate shadow-boxing not only between the Congress and the administration, but also among competing forces within the administration and competing forces within the Congress.

When examined against this background, one can more fully appreciate the intricacy of resolving the energy shortages and why there are no simple answers to be found.

Before we, as a Nation, propose specific avenues of approach with respect to particular aspects of the present and future energy shortages, it is crucial to first determine the premises on which solutions should be based.

What ought these basic premises be?

ENERGY PROBLEMS ARE SHORT-TERM, INTERMEDIATE, OR LONG-TERM IN NATURE

We can best understand—and deal with—the energy problem when we separate it into time frames within which we have to both devise solutions and implement them. We have some aspects of the energy problem which must be dealt with immediately, like getting through this winter. We have other aspects which must be dealt with over the period of the next 3 to 7 years. And, we have those other aspects which must be dealt with over a more extended time frame. In some instances there is an overlapping of time frames.

THE SHORT-TERM

The most critical problem is getting through the coming winter months. I

trust that my continuing efforts on such vital matters as insuring a continuing flow of Canadian oil to the United States this winter—on which we now have been able to obtain stronger assurances than at any point in the past 60 days—will aid in getting us through this winter fuel crunch. The Canadian Energy Board's recently announced decision to relax their export restrictions should aid greatly in providing adequate No. 2 and No. 6 fuels, particularly for the Northeastern States.

We must reduce gasoline consumption through the use of lighter, more efficient automobiles, car pools, better vehicle operation and maintenance, and those particular auto emission devices and controls which will add to mileage. This must be a continuing, as well as immediate, concern. On the subject of gasoline consumption, let me say a word on proposals for rationing.

Rationing of gasoline ought not to be the long-term preference of any one seeking to preserve the economic freedoms on which our political freedoms rest. The rationing of a scarce natural resource will not make that resource less scarce, in other words, more available. Rationing simply spreads out, on what is perceived by the decisionmakers as a more equitable basis, the unavailability of the resource. Instead of some classes of users being without adequate supplies, all classes of users are made to go without adequate supplies; it's simply that all are supposedly treated more equally. If rationing is the only answer, then a rationing scheme will have to be deployed, but we must be ever mindful—as we were not when we acquiesced in the setting up of a "temporary" wage and price control system—over 2 full years ago—that "nothing is more permanent than a Government's temporary program." The free market system, using the time-proved principles of supply and demand, is a preferable system to arbitrary Government regulation.

Similarly, the imposition of a new Federal or State tax upon retail gasoline is no answer either. It would create undue hardships on low- and middle-income people—owners of small businesses, like fledgling taxi cabs or delivery companies, as well as those private citizens who must commute because of the failure over the past years to provide adequate mass transportation systems—who depend, for their very livelihood on the use of automobiles and other vehicles. I am afraid that such a tax could create serious recession-prone tendencies within the economy, hurting most those who are least capable of surviving such a measure.

We must improve rail and bus systems for short to moderate length interurban transportation—to provide a better balance with auto and air travel. The enhancement of urban mass transportation is crucial, and it is something for which I have pushed strongly for western New York. Similarly, rail and bus transportation between cities must be improved; many are already predicting a rebirth of rail transportation. It is for this energy conservation imperative that I am making efforts with my Buffalo colleague Congressman DULSKI to reinstitute rail transportation to points west of

Buffalo once again—railroads to Chicago and points in between.

We must, during this period of intense domestic fuel shortage stop the exportation from the United States to foreign nations of any crude or refined oil which can be used domestically. I supported legislation, which was subsequently incorporated in the bill, "the Emergency Petroleum Act of 1973," as passed by the House, to cease all exports of crude and refined oil during this period of crisis. I hasten to add that we must be mindful that while such exports did increase in 1973, they still constituted, according to the Office of Oil and Gas, Department of the Interior, of November 9, 1973, only "a quantity of distillates equal approximately to two-tenths of 1 percent of U.S. total demand," and, further, that the bulk of such exports were of such high sulfur fuels which cannot now be used in the United States because of environmental standards.

We must speed the pace of nuclear powerplant construction; this cannot wait, for it takes from 7 to 10 years to get a nuclear powerplant "on the line."

We must implement programs to advance the commercial development of oil shale. Large deposits exist and their locations are known, but there are technological problems to be resolved.

We must resolve conflicts between environmental goals and energy resource development through appropriate government action.

We must use more coal directly for the production of heat and energy.

INTERMEDIATE MEASURES

We must use more coal indirectly, as a source of synthetic oil and gas. The technology exists, but it must be further developed, and it takes several years to get a gasification or liquefaction plant into full production.

We must institute residential and commercial building standards to save energy used for heating, air conditioning, and lighting, and we must build accordingly.

We must develop new ways in which to generate power more efficiently, controlling air pollution and energy consumption at the same time.

THE LONG-TERM RESPONSE

The area of long-term considerations is where understanding basic principles is of the greatest importance.

Over the long range period—the extended time frame—there is little necessity of diminishing the total consumption of energy among developed societies, or of retarding the growth rates of developing societies, if—I repeat, if—energy sources can be developed and harnessed which are, essentially, both unlimited in supply and not productive of environmentally detrimental byproducts.

All supplies of oil—when recovered, refined, and consumed—will run out at some future point—historically, in the not-too-distant future. And, with widely varying points at which they will also run out, so too will natural gas, and coal, and all other fossil fuels or organic substances.

Yet, there is no limit to solar power, as long as the sun gives forth light; the power of falling or flowing water, as long

as rivers flow and tides run; the power of wind, as long as air currents move; and, geothermal steam, as long as the earth's inner crust remains molten.

Our only limitations, at present, are in developing adequate technologies and devices with which to harness such unlimited power sources. And, the ecological consequences of their uses are much less potentially adverse than those of existing fuels and substances.

By reliance on unlimited power sources, the development of a society, which depends on continued or expanded energy uses, could go forward unfettered. No developed society would be compelled to reduce its standard of living, and no developing society would be compelled to abandon a course of action designed to enhance that standard.

Instead of acquiescing to a notion that we must reduce our standard of living by reducing our percentage of the world's energy consumption, we would be better advised to expand the levels of energy available to all the world.

GOVERNMENT ACTION ALONE IS NO ANSWER

The development of solutions to the energy problem lies only partially in Government action.

We too often forget that the invention of the automobile, as an example, was the result of the search for alternatives to the very-visibly polluting horse, particularly in crowded metropolitan areas. Its invention came not from Government initiative or largess. It came, rather, from the genius of men acting simultaneously, in what they perceived to be both the best interest of the community and their own enlightened economic self-interests.

Ford, and Edison, and Steinmetz, and Morse, and Marconi, and Bell, and countless others brought to the world unparalleled contributions to harnessing energy for man's development and progress, and they did it without Government sponsorship.

There is a role for Government, particularly as its efforts might be devoted to an infusion of basic research and applied demonstration, but the role of Government ought never to be taken as a substitute for—a replacement for—the efforts of a diverse and intelligent people, as reflected through the private and volunteer sectors of the economy. Nor should its activities draw the talents of those within the private and volunteer sectors—those who are capable of helping to therein resolve parts of the immediate and long-range problems—away from those sectors and into solely Government endeavors.

ACTION MUST BE DIRECTED AT THE CAUSES OF THE PROBLEM

The degree of Government action which is to be undertaken should be directed at the causes of the shortages and not simply at the obvious results thereof.

Government policies are too often directed at the results—not the causes—of the problems those policies are intended to resolve. Through an application of such misdirected policies, Government tends to diminish the people's abilities to resolve problems through reliance on problem-solving institutions other than Government and through

problem-solving devices other than statutes and regulations. The Government—no matter how well-intentioned and no matter how well-learned its officers—can never duplicate the diversity of independent—and voluntarily collective—human action indigenous to a free society. If there is one thing which history teaches us, it is that Government is incapable of dealing adequately with complex and interrelated problems, for Government directives always have unforeseen secondary and tertiary side effects, and Government remedial action is, at best, too slow, and, at worst, never coming. Immediately answers to immediate problems, without adequate regard for long-range consequences, too often characterizes Government action.

We must never forget that Government brought about no small share of the energy crisis which some proponents now say only that same Government can resolve. Theory? Philosophy of Government? No. Rather, fact.

Artificial pricing schemes, particularly in the area of natural gas, distorted the market allocations between supply and demand, creating inadequately available supplies to meet real demands; government regulation created that artificial pricing scheme.

The removal or lessening of tax incentives to mineral exploration reduced significantly the search for new sources of oil within the United States and on the Continental Shelf.

The congressionally-fostered delay in the construction of the trans-Alaskan pipeline set back the delivery of hundreds of thousands of barrels of crude oil per day by several years.

Nuclear plans are not now "on the line" because of Government policies.

Offshore oil exploration has not gone forward at its natural pace, again because of Government policy.

The examples are virtually unlimited, but, in summary, they add up to the conclusion that Government allocation cannot make a scarce resource more plentiful, and that Government policies would be better directed at developing additional sources, not simply allocating inadequate resources.

The Washington Post editorialized this notion as follows:

The time of adjustment is going to be difficult and exasperating.

We may be forced to irritations like gasoline rationing before the new sources of oil begin to flow.

But Adam Smith's economics is now our likeliest policy to end the shortages over the next several years.

Independence is worth 15 cents a gallon.

MUST LESSEN DEPENDENCY ON FOREIGN SOURCES

Lastly, the development of energy sources—by searching for a new type of energy, or by developing further a now underutilized type, or by increasing the quantity of an already heavily used type—should be within the conscious framework of reducing dependency on foreign supplies.

This is no proposal that we abandon our foreign commitments or that we return to a "fortress America" notion of economic self-sufficiency, for that would

reject both the realities of our time and the premises of our commitments with foreign nations on matters of mutual concern, but it is a proposal that we develop such internal resource capabilities as not to be ever again—as we are now—caught with wholly inadequate supplies with which to meet existing demands.

Mr. Speaker, if we operate from these premises, we can develop a sound and effective energy policy. If we ignore them, we are doomed to repeat the errors of the past—not the least of which has been an intensification, not diminution, of this energy problem.

POWER STRUGGLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the latest issue of Orlando-Land magazine published in my congressional district contains a thoughtful article by Mr. Sammy Roen entitled "Power Struggle."

In the article, Mr. Roen reinterviews individuals with whom he discussed the problem of finding energy sources 1 year ago. The contrasts, predictions and similarities to the problems presented a year later make fascinating reading.

The article follows:

POWER STRUGGLE

(By Sam Roen)

Just a year ago, Curt Stanton told us Orlando Utilities' new generator would take care of the system's needs through 1980. Since then, much has changed in the energy picture nationally.

What effect will the energy crisis have on Orlando-land now?

For a timely analysis, we went back to the key people in the electric and national gas business whom we interviewed last year.

First, Curt Stanton, general manager and executive vice president of Orlando Utilities Commission.

"Curt, I want you to tell me what the situation is—the aspects of critical shortages of fuel and the resultant power shortage. What do we have to look forward to?"

"At present we're not facing any critical power shortages, provided our equipment continues to function as it has so far. We have approached some rather high peaks compared to our capability. However, our new generator has just gone into operation at the Indian River plant. It adds 325,000 kilowatts to our previous 425,000, which brings us up to a capability of around 750,000."

"This new generator . . . what kind is it? I think we talked about it before."

"This is a fossil fuel generator which, of course, brings us into the fuel supply situation. Now just a few more comments on the power. We certainly feel that now this is in operation we have a very comfortable margin, both in serving our customers and helping in other areas of the state. We are able to contribute more to help possible problems in other areas where other companies may not be quite ready to increase their facilities and may be having a faster load growth than they can supply comfortably. As far as fuel is concerned we are still relying quite a bit on gas but it is becoming less and less available. We are having to look more to the use of fuel oil which is a bunker "C" or a residual type fuel oil to burn in our boilers. Our boilers can take or burn either gas or fuel oil. They cannot burn coal."

"Curt, what about this Jay Field (in the

Florida Panhandle) which is providing so much gas?"

"Well, as far as the Jay Field is concerned, our contracts are with Florida Gas Transmission . . . Florida Gas Company and insofar as they are able to participate in that Jay Field production then we would benefit from the point of additional gas."

SPILL LAW

"I was under the impression that the Jay Field was going to supply a tremendous amount of gas."

"It may very well as time passes. But frankly I'm not that familiar with the geological situation in respect to the potential gas production. But it is my impression, Sam, as it is yours that there will be a lot of gas available. That doesn't necessarily mean much as far as using it for boiler fuel to generate electricity, which is our use. Because most of the regulatory agencies are leaning toward denying that use, to free gas for use in domestic areas like heating homes and making it available to more people."

"I seriously doubt in the years to come that we could expect too much benefit from Jay even though it went into tremendous production. The commission has fortunately got a contract which we signed a year ago that takes us through April '75, which will supply our fuel needs. We have got an immediate problem with that contract because of Florida's very stringent spill law. We don't object to the general intent of the law which is, of course, obvious protection."

"Unfortunately there are two aspects of that law which hit the whole state of Florida very hard. The first is there is no limit of liability on the part of the ship owners or operators, and the other part is that the state need not show cause. Usually people are exempt from complicity in a negligent or liable action if they can prove that it was an act of God or something over which they obviously had no control. There are no such safeguards in the law as it is presently written. Even the federal law has a limit I think of \$15,000,000 and does include protection against acts of God and so forth."

"There have been hearings by the appropriate legislative committees of the state, listening to information regarding what is happening. It is my understanding that the preponderance of evidence indicates that we are having quite a problem obtaining fuel by ship into ports because of the stringent aspects of this law. It is hoped that the legislature will do something. Other than that, to get back to your original question, Sam, we are getting along and so far I don't see any real problem, and hopefully these other things will come about in such a way that we won't have."

COSTS GOING UP

"What do you anticipate as far as the price of electricity of the future?"

"Right now the biggest thing that is affecting our production cost is fuel and we are protected in that respect in that we have a fuel adjustment charge which is applied and refigured every month so this part protects us; certainly the charges are continuing to go up because fuel is going up. Now I think in time we'll have to do something to cover increased labor. Labor is continuing to go up. So far because of the growth patterns around here by production increases we have been able to keep our unit production cost in line but this can't go on continuously, and I'm sure that we are looking at increased costs of electricity as well as for anything else."

"I've been told the day of inexpensive power is behind us."

"Definitely. This is true because there are other things coming into the picture. For instance government regulations and laws concerning air pollution and thermal pollution; these things will obviously result in higher costs. For instance oil, if you get where you have to burn a 1% or less than 1% sulphur

oil to keep down the discharge of sulphur dioxides and nitrous oxides into the atmosphere. In our case we'll have to pay for that low sulphur oil at least 30% more than we're paying for a normal (1½ or 2% sulphur) oil. We will have to meet these guidelines within the next few years so all of this just has to raise the charge for electricity. Although, Sam, I think people's bills are going to continue to go up even if the charge per unit remained the same because people are still using more electricity."

"We all do . . . it's so luxurious."

"This is the way we've been trained through the years, and to effect a real slowdown that's going to be felt any time in the new future I think would be extremely difficult."

"I don't know anyone who wants to do without their air conditioning and other conveniences once they have been accustomed to them."

"No. No one does."

POWER ORGANIZATION

"I understand that you have been elected chairman of the Florida Electrical Power Group, the organization of the power companies of Florida. How does this new organization plan to function?"

"We represent at least 99% of the power generating and distributing facilities in the state. We have hired a manager, who will report in December. He has been with the Department of Water and Power in Los Angeles and has a tremendous wealth of experience. He will manage the affairs of the association and will coordinate our activities. We are planning to have our headquarters in the Tampa area."

"I'm so happy that we have this organization; it is going to be a tremendous help to our industry and to the state. You've probably read about the site law that the state has passed, which means that certain criteria have to be met over a considerable period of time before a site can be approved for a power plant to be built. We hope that our organization, through its committees and subcommittees, can be very helpful to the state in formulating these guidelines and eliminating a lot of the time loss that we might have without the knowledge and experience that is at our disposal through our organization. Our environmental committee and our operating committee are working with the proper state agencies, we have formulated a legislative committee which we hope will be helpful in that respect and also iron out some of the problems that may arise within our own organization."

"Curt, the focus is so much on offshore drilling as a fuel supply. What do you offer for the future from this source?"

"Again, we've been involved. At a federal hearing of the Department of Interior, the subject involved was the lease of certain offshore areas for oil and/or gas exploration. We actively supported the sale of these leases; our Florida organization FCG made a statement and took a stand because Florida is obviously dependent on oil and gas primarily. In order that we continue to supply our customers and so the people of Florida would continue to be supplied electricity at reasonable rates, we've just got to support whatever is necessary to see that these things are done. One of the reasons for shortages, as reported by people knowledgeable in this field, is that over the last 10 or 12 years the exploratory activities for oil and gas have been very minimal. I think we've got to do this; however, it must be done with proper supervision so that there is the least possible damage to any ecological or environmental factors. And I think this can be handled."

"What's our situation today on the nucs?"

"As far as nuc power is concerned, speaking for Orlando, I question that Orlando, at least for far beyond what we could see, would be in a position to finance by itself a nuclear

plant. However, this does not mean that there isn't a possibility that we can take advantage of nuclear produced power. We are, hopefully, going to be in a position where we could, after proper investigation and study, jointly own one of these plants with one or more other utilities."

ASTRONOMICAL INCREASE

For the second time James Gleason, Vice President of the Florida Power Corporation, graciously talked to me about the energy crisis. One year had passed between interviews.

"What has been happening in the energy situation as you see it, Mr. Gleason, since we last talked?"

"About what we predicted. The cost of fuel has gone up almost astronomically."

"Will you specify the fuel?"

"Oil; we're an oil-burning organization. Most of our oil is bought from foreign sources, and they do control the cost of it . . . and it has just moved out."

"When you say foreign sources . . . ?"

"Mideast."

"You say prices have gone up astronomically; can you give me specific figures?"

"Yes I can. Our fuel cost alone has increased 83% since Jan. 1 of this year."

"Fantastic. Have you been able to pass that on to the consumer?"

"No, we haven't. We do have a fuel cost clause in our rate base; however there's a six month's delay built into it. So we have a delay between actual cost and implementation of a pass-on, a portion of it. It doesn't allow us to pass on the full amount."

"Is your company in the process of asking the Florida Utilities Commission for an increase?"

"Not at the moment. We are studying carefully, making preparations to go to the commission for an increase which we will do when we have the necessary information available."

"Are there indications that the price of your fuel oil is going to go up beyond this 83%?"

"Oh, yes, we expect it to continue to increase. There's more to it than that. The Florida oil spill law shows promise of creating additional expense to any oil-using organization, particularly a utility."

"Will you elaborate on that?"

"It's the most stringent, the most rigid oil spill law anywhere in the United States. It exceeds the federal requirements and it is so extreme that it actually tends to discourage oil suppliers from bringing fuel into the state of Florida for fear that they might have a spill and the cost would be so great that they simply couldn't afford it."

"When you talk about spills, how would that occur in your normal business relationships with the oil companies; where would the spill occur?"

"We have an unloading facility in Tampa Bay. An oil tanker bringing fuel to that facility could run aground or have an accident and cause an oil spill . . . this is the problem that the tankers have."

"So that's the deterrent for the oil companies doing business with the companies in Florida."

"That's right and I think that the legislature will probably be inclined to look into the possibility of mitigating this oil spill law to some extent."

MANPOWER PROBLEMS

"What other problems do you have?"

"The problems of manpower. We have a number of vacancies that stay with us almost all the time. We're not able to get as many people as we would like to have with the necessary qualifications, knowledge and training that we require. This is almost true in an area of rapid growth such as this particular area, the Orlando area."

"With this problem of personnel and your problem of fuel . . ."

"I might add another problem. That is material and equipment supplies. The manufacturers all over the country are behind in filling orders. They've got the same problems that we have of rough materials to work with the manpower, and we have some difficulty with poles, ordinary utility equipment . . . getting enough at the right time. This creates additional shortages as in the building-construction business. They have problems with concrete and materials of various kinds. We have the same general problems with our materials."

"An increase in rates is not going to solve all of those problems?"

"An increase in rates will not solve many of those problems. It's a condition that I think we will continue to live with for the foreseeable future. A period of shortages, of high cost and of limited manpower."

"Is it overdevelopment . . . too fast technologically in this nation . . . putting a tremendous strain on the uses of energy?"

"No, I don't think so; were it not for the widespread use of energy that we have, we couldn't be anywhere near where we are nor could we meet our social as well as our economic requirements."

"Are we developing too slowly?"

"I'd hesitate to say that, but we are moving too slowly from a governmental standpoint to be able to meet the requirements of technology, because of inability to adapt to changing conditions."

"Is the big problem the environmental controls?"

"I'd hesitate to label environmental as being the big problem. The idea of controls, and I guess the extreme caution with which government and industry move into new areas causes problems. These problems can best be illustrated, I suppose, by the idea of what would happen if we tend to set up extreme conditions and possibly overreact to new developments . . . and the unknown."

NUCLEAR POWER COMING

"When we talked last year we dwelled a little on the nuclear power plants that you had been building and then had halted. What is the status of that today?"

"We have a large nuclear facility that is moving along quite well at the present time. And it should be in service if we have no further or unanticipated delays, late in 1974 or early 1975."

"Where is this one located?"

"This is Crystal River. Crystal River complex on the Gulf Coast."

"It has been cleared to be completed?"

"It has been cleared to go to completion. There are some final permits that will be required before it becomes commercially operative."

"Do you anticipate any problems in that department?"

"Hopefully, no."

"Do you have any other nuclear plants under construction or in the planning stage or design?"

"We feel as a company that nuclear generation is the system of the future. We think, and most of the electric utility industry agrees, that nuclear generation is the only feasible way to supply the energy that this country requires. We are planning additional nuclear generation, but remember, it takes 10 years from decision to operation. So that if we decide in 1973 to build a large nuclear installation, it's anticipated that it will be 1982 at least before this could become a functioning part of our system."

"Are those decisions made as yet?"

"They are being very carefully considered. Now don't misunderstand me. We have alternative ways of providing the necessary generation. There will not be an acute lack of capacity whether or not we get the nuclear

tion Agency and other forces in the U.S. and as a result there has been a decline in coal production for energy uses. You know we've had pollution problems that have been tied directly to coal. We have not been able to scrub out the pollutants from the stack gases. We don't have the sophisticated equipment in quantity that has been developed, the technology that has been developed, at this time.

"But that's another area where I think our research effort should be cranked up and we should commit the research dollars . . . and the administration has said that they are willing to commit substantial dollars in order to do those things today that will pay off in the future. Let me point out one other thing while we're on the subject. When I was in the Soviet Union representing the Science and Astronautics Committee, we visited an MHD plant just outside of Moscow."

MORE EFFICIENCY

"What is an MHD?"

"That is a magnetohydrodynamic facility which takes coal and through the gasification process converts it directly to energy. This process is attractive to us in this country because of the factor that you mentioned, that we have substantial supplies and reserves of coal whereas we're running out of gas and oil. But beyond that the process is also attractive because it releases very little in the way of pollutants into the atmosphere. And also it is a very efficient process in the conversion of coal to energy, or coal to electricity. So that if you compare the conversion process of the other fossil fuels, gas and oil, the highest efficiency that you can achieve there is roughly 40%, whereas in the MHD process, the Soviets have been achieving from 50 to 55% efficiency."

"That's part of the reason why there are less pollutants that are released. As you can see, we came away with the feeling that the Congress should look into this potential energy process, and we should commit some money to further research here. The Soviets would like for us to do that. They are obviously ahead of us in this technology, but they would be willing to share their technology with us with the thought of working out some of the barbs that are still present. They have an on the line plant just outside of Moscow that's delivering 25,000 kilowatts to the Moscow grid today. They are expending that MHD facility; in 1975 it will be producing over a million kilowatts a day. So that is an area of energy research that we think would bear supporting in the U.S."

"The opinions that I have picked up indicate that this source of energy could be economically feasible."

"Right, and I can tell you that this is one of the conclusions that has been reached by the House of Representatives Energy subcommittee."

OCEANIC POWER

"Another exotic source of power that the industry is discussing is oceanic. Have you or has your committee been involved in this in any way?"

"I'm not intimately familiar with it, but I think that you are referring to ocean current power. The Gulf currents off the coast of Florida have been suggested by those who testified before our subcommittee as a place where additional experimentation might be useful. One reason is that those are warm currents. The Gulf Stream brings warm waters in contact with colder waters so in addition to the thrust of the current itself, you have the interaction of warm and cold waters, which adds to the potential energy supply. These are factors where there's a lot of technology yet to come. I think that Florida is in an excellent position wherein we can exploit some of the potential research sources not only in ocean current energy

but also in thermal energy and solar energy."

"What can you tell me about the solar energy? How far have we moved?"

"We're in position now with the research that has been done to know that solar energy provides a constant source; it provides a clean source of energy, but it's not economically feasible. We've got to jump over that particular barrier. At the University of Florida they have created a solar heated, air conditioned house, and by and large this is the extent of the research. They have not been able to harness solar energy to the extent that it would go beyond that rather minimal requirement to take care of all of the electrical facilities, for example, in a normal American home. You have to have broad expanses to take in the rays of the sunlight and then to bring them into concentration at one point or another."

U.S. DOLLAR INCREASING IN VALUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Finance, I must watch closely the value of the dollar and the progress toward monetary reform. I would like to report that the U.S. dollar has strengthened considerably in the foreign exchange markets. Since the dollar hit its low mark in the summer, it has improved almost continuously, and as of the end of last week the dollar was nearly at the same levels as in March of this year when the float began after the devaluation of the dollar.

The dollar, in other words, has reached a new 8-month high against most major currencies. And foreign exchange dealers feel that the dollar will continue to improve.

The strengthening of the dollar was one topic discussed this past weekend at a meeting in France, attended by Secretary of the Treasury George P. Shultz. This meeting of the Big Five—West Germany, Japan, France, Great Britain, and the United States—was the second in a series of private meetings to discuss monetary reform outside of the auspices of the Committee of Twenty. The Washington Post, in the following article summarizes well the issues involved in this meeting:

BIG FIVE TALK RATE STABILITY

(By Hobart Rowen)

The world's Big Five financial powers concluded a secret weekend caucus in the French Loire Valley yesterday which may be the forerunner of a return to more stable exchange rates.

Recent strengthening of the dollar has created the question of how to manage the exchange markets. Or, to put it another way, the big powers are seeking ways to keep the dollar from getting stronger than the level set by the devaluation last February—a level that most officials think is the right one.

At the same time, the third secret meeting in a row of the self-nominated Big Five has caused bitterness among other powers, causing a further chill in Common Market relations.

Treasury Secretary George P. Shultz, meeting with reporters immediately after returning from France, said that the major powers

had agreed at the end of September in Nairobi to meet again in late November "to review the bidding" on monetary reform issues.

He acknowledged that a primary subject for discussion was the increasing strength of the dollar, and whether governments should intervene to stop its rise at the levels set at the time of the February devaluation of the dollar.

"We agreed," Shultz said with a smile, "that the markets have finally caught up with the opinions of the finance ministers," inasmuch as exchange rates (except for the Japanese yen) are close to the relationships set in February, as adjusted by the revaluation of the German mark and Dutch guilder.

Shultz stopped short of saying that there had been an agreement reached under which the dollar would not be allowed to float above the February rate. But he said that "we would consider it healthy to have a reflow of dollars from countries holding them."

A reflow would occur, for example, if the West German government sold dollars out of its own hoard to keep the dollar from moving up past the level of 2.67 marks to the dollar, the old official rate.

Shultz pointed out that "from the standpoint of long-term monetary reform, the problem of the dollar overhang can be dealt with at least in part by having a reflow." In effect, the dollar overhang would automatically be reduced by this process, the exact reverse of the dollar support operations which helped to build the overhang in the first place.

"We have thought for a long while that something like the second (dollar) devaluation level was desirable," Shultz said. "Now, we don't want to get back to pegging rates. At the same time, we think a reflow is called for now."

The U.S. official indicated that the "relaxed informal" session at a French chateau covered the gamut of international monetary issues, including gold, the future structure of the International Monetary Fund and convertibility. There was a hint, also, that a deputy to IMF Managing Director H. Johannes Witteveen might have been selected whose name might soon be announced by Witteveen.

Shultz vigorously defended the private and exclusive nature of the talks, and said others would be held in due course. "At Nairobi," he revealed, "quite a few (of the other countries) said that 'you fellows who represent the big countries ought to get together and organize your thinking, but don't let it get highly publicized.'"

Besides, Shultz said, lots of other countries, including the Common Market group, have caucuses, "and I don't see anything wrong with it."

He reported that the question of energy came up "as it bore on monetary reform." Various views were offered on how the Arab oil boycott would affect the economies of Europe, but he said there was no talk of a worldwide recession.

But he conceded that "there is a lot of uncertainty about what the result will be on prices and output, and that's a problem for any monetary system to handle."

Shultz's private office, where he met reporters, was only dimly lit in acknowledgment of the need to conserve energy.

The origin of the Big Five secret meetings lies in U.S. and German dissatisfaction with the unwieldy nature of the IMF and its reform group called the Committee of Twenty.

Shultz invited his German, French, British and Japanese counterparts to a Camp David meeting last July, prior to a C-20 meeting.

They met again at Nairobi, with the late Japanese Finance Minister Kiichi Aichi as

a dinner host, where they agreed to put off final decisions on reform until July 31, 1974.

French Finance Minister Valéry Giscard d'Estaing confirmed at the conclusion of the Loire Valley session what Shultz told reporters here about the origin of the meetings. The reaction from some of those left out was bitter.

An Italian foreign ministry statement, for example, said that the secret meeting involving three EEC countries "can only cause concern among those who are attached to the normal working" of the Common Market. The Canadian, Australian and other governments who have representation through the C-20 are equally annoyed.

Giscard d'Estaing and West German Finance Minister Helmut Schmidt indicated that no firm decisions were made by the group. Giscard d'Estaing, in a statement to the press, said that the ministers had talked about monetary reform, inflation and problems relating to the energy crisis.

Monetary experts here suggested that while the energy crisis might have influenced the sudden scheduling of the meeting, the basic cause was the need to discuss the problems caused by the rapid recovery of the dollar.

A related issue is the sticky question of gold: the Common Market countries have at least one position on which they are unified, and that is they want a stronger, rather than a de-emphasized role for gold.

The dollar problem is the bigger one at the moment. Yesterday, the dollar was at its highest levels in the West German foreign exchange market since before the revaluation of the mark in June. At one time, the dollar hit 2.6608 marks, before settling back fractionally to 2.6585 marks.

During the Nairobi meeting, West German central bank governor Othmar Emminger revealed that his country would intervene by selling from its enormous holdings of dollars whenever the dollar appreciated to the 2.67 mark level. At that time, it was considerably below, at 2.42 marks.

Since then, the dollar has climbed steadily, aided by a U.S. balance of payments shift from deficit to surplus—and, more recently, by the energy crisis, which is expected to hit the United States less severely than Japan and Europe, which are more dependent on Arab oil.

The confluence of these circumstances apparently produced the hastily arranged Big Five session, secret until word leaked out on Saturday. Money market experts here suggested that a basic decision might be whether market intervention should be arranged when the dollar is at the top end of the allowable range around a central point (which would be the normal way) or whether intervention should come at an earlier point.

From the standpoint of American policy, says one expert, "There is something to be said for holding the dollar at the lower end of the range." That would give the dollar a stronger competitive edge and help to build up the trade surpluses already in view. But there may be resistance from other countries to maintaining what would be regarded as an undervalued level for the dollar.

CONGRATULATIONS AND BEST WISHES TO CONGRESSWOMAN YVONNE BRATHWAITE BURKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ROY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, while I am sure that I am not the only Member of Congress who has ever delivered a baby, I believe I must have the record—in that I

delivered over 5,500 babies prior to my service in Congress.

As an obstetrician, I believe it appropriate that I extend to our colleague, Congresswoman YVONNE BRATHWAITE BURKE, congratulations and best wishes on the birth of her daughter.

Autumn Roxann Burke was born at 3:55 p.m. on Friday, November 23 at Queen of Angels Hospital in Los Angeles. She weighed 7 pounds and 9 ounces.

As we all know, Congresswoman BURKE is the first Member of Congress ever to give birth while serving in the Congress. I know that all my colleagues in the House join with me in wishing the Burkes much happiness.

TRIBUTE TO LATE R. S. FREEMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity today to pay tribute to Mr. R. S. Freeman, late of Yorkville, Tenn., and to include an article from the Jackson, Tenn., Sun.

Mr. Freeman was field representative and longtime friend of our colleague, Congressman Ed JONES. Mr. Freeman worked with Mr. JONES for many years. The two men began their association in 1945 with the West Tennessee Artificial Breeding Association and continued working together when Ed JONES was elected to Congress in 1969.

The friendship and working rapport between Congressman JONES and Mr. Freeman was a thing to be admired, and I know that all of you join with me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to the members of Mr. Freeman's family and, of course, to our colleague, Ed JONES.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE R. S. FREEMAN

YORKVILLE.—R. S. Freeman, director of field services for Congressman Ed Jones, died Sunday morning of an apparent heart attack.

Mr. Freeman, 50, became ill early Sunday morning at his home in Yorkville and was taken to Gibson County General Hospital in Trenton where he was pronounced dead at 7 a.m.

Funeral services will be this afternoon at 3 o'clock at the Karnes Funeral Home chapel in Dyer with Tom Holland, minister of the Church of Christ, and the Rev. James Combs officiating. Burial will be in Oakwood Cemetery in Dyer.

A native of Gibson County, he was the son of Robert Freeman of Dyer and the late Ima Freeman. He was married to the former Dean Brownloe of Rutherford.

He was educated in the public schools of Gibson County and enlisted in the Navy in 1941 at the outbreak of World War II. He served in the Pacific Theatre and returned to his native Gibson County in late 1945.

Mr. Freeman's first job after completing his military service was with Congressman Jones, who at that time was introducing artificial breeding to upgrade dairy herds in this area. He subsequently became manager of the West Tennessee Artificial Breeding Association, leaving that position in 1969 when Jones was elected to Congress in the old 8th District.

"I told him I wanted him to stay with me because I trusted him so much," Congressman Jones said of his long time association with Mr. Freeman.

Jones, who flew home from Washington Sunday after learning of the death of his staff member, was at the funeral home Sunday afternoon with other members of the congressional staff and Mr. Freeman's family.

"I have lost one of the best friends I ever had," the congressman said. "He and I could just communicate."

Congressman Jones said Mr. Freeman "had a great ability to analyze people" and was devoted to his work as director of field services for the 7th District representative. "He just never would quit," Jones added.

The congressman had urged Mr. Freeman to take a vacation after he had spent so much time tending to arrangements for the "Ed Jones Day" dinner in Jackson on Sept. 8, but after a weekend fishing trip with his family at Kentucky Lake he was back on the job helping cut through federal red tape for the congressman's constituents.

Sunday morning when Mr. Freeman became ill and planned to go to a Memphis hospital later in the day, he went to the congressman's Yorkville office at 4:15 a.m. to leave some instructions for the secretary.

Mr. Freeman was an active member of Thompson-Jones Post 9635, Veterans of Foreign Wars in Dyer, belonged to the American Legion Post in Dyersburg, Yorkville Masonic Lodge 115, the Moose Club of Dyersburg and the Ruritan Club. He was a member of the Church of Christ in Dyer.

In addition to his widow and father, he is survived by two daughters, Mrs. Sheila Tullos of Memphis and Miss Denise Freeman, a senior at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, and a sister, Mrs. Joyce Lewis of Trenton.

Pallbearers will be Ray Lancaster, Bob Cashdollar, Joe Hill, Dennis Vaughn, Galey Fesmire and Jim Crow.

FINANCIAL MALNUTRITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years this administration has attempted to establish a new method of "working" the legislative process. When there is legislation which the executive branch does not support, and the sentiment in the Congress is such that this legislation could not be defeated or later vetoed because the veto would be overridden, then the administration would kill the law or portions of it by simply not funding it.

FINANCIAL MALNUTRITION

This practice, impoundment, reached fruition last year in the confusion over interpretation of the continuing resolution for Labor-HEW appropriations, and, as a result, dozens of constituent groups have been forced to go to court to obtain the funds which the continuing resolution entitled them to.

The results of these court actions, thus far, tell the story rather well—29 favorable decisions for the constituents of health, education, and welfare programs, dealing with impounded funds totaling more than \$1 billion.

Although the administration originally announced its intention to appeal these court decisions, we are now seeing an attempt to retroactively halt the right of constituent groups to use the courts to redress arbitrary impoundment of funds. The so-called Laird package, a proposed

amendment to the fiscal year 1974 Labor-HEW appropriations bill, would negate all suits pertaining to fiscal year 1973 monies if the constituent group accepted any fiscal year 1974 funds.

Mr. Speaker, I think this approach is unconstitutional. In my view, the amendment would deny constituent groups or individuals their due-process rights to access to the courts. Moreover, it raises serious constitutional questions of undue encroachment by the legislative branch on the judicial branch in violation of the constitutional principle of separation of powers.

Additionally, such an amendment, if passed into law would give weight to the premise that the executive branch can ignore the intent of the Congress and laws passed by the Congress, thus legitimizing financial malnutrition as a legislative tool to be used by the executive branch to defeat the intent of Congress.

I am, therefore, asking that the House conferees now considering the Labor-HEW appropriations conference report reject this unprecedented attempt to weaken the power of the Congress. It is a plain and simple attempt to legitimize this administration's position that they are not obligated to carry out the laws of the land as well as serving to intimidate constituent groups while barring their access to the courts.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following remarks prepared by Dr. John T. Grupenhoff for delivery before the State University of New York's Washington Seminar program. Dr. Grupenhoff, a former Deputy Assistant Secretary of HEW for Health Legislation, is the coauthor of the recently published book, "Impoundment of Health Funds by the Nixon Administration, an Analysis and Case Study: Colleges of Podiatric Medicine v. Ash and Weinberger."

The remarks follow:

COMMENTS BY JOHN GRUPENHOFF, PRESIDENT, SCIENCE & HEALTH PUBLICATIONS, INC.

The Administration has proposed an amendment to the pending HEW-Labor appropriations bill for fiscal year 1974. It would nullify the 29 favorable judgments totaling over \$1 billion already won by health, education and welfare groups in their anti-impoundment suits, would cancel all other anti-impoundment suits now pending, and would permit the Administration to cut up to 5% from each line item of the appropriation (to a total of \$400 million for the total bill) after it is passed into law.

Let us deal first with the language on the nullification of the court actions. It provides that if any federal funds are accepted by any program from fiscal year 1974 appropriations, such acceptance would discharge any claim for any fiscal 1973 impounded funds already freed for that program by the courts.

It is clear that a program which needed its promised federal funds so desperately last year that it was forced to sue the government would also need them in fiscal year 1974. The dilemma a program would face is simple: On the one hand, if it wishes to survive fiscal year 1974, it will have to forget about fiscal year 1973 impounded monies, even if it won them back in the courts. On the other hand, if the situation is desperate enough, the loss of the fiscal year 1973 monies alone would guarantee the program's failure. If it takes the former

option, the Nixon impoundment strategy for fiscal year 1973 worked; and if the latter option is followed, the Nixon Administration, desirous of destroying or lessening the program, will have succeeded. Heads the program loses, tails the program loses. And the Administration, even if its actions were declared illegal by the courts, would win.

It is also clear that the amendment is probably unconstitutional, on three grounds: separation of powers, due process of law, and the right of petition. In a recent memo to Senator Magnuson on the amendment, by Mr. Jerome Wagshal, (who was the attorney of record in the case of *The Community Mental Health Centers v. Weinberger*, decided in favor of the plaintiffs on August 3, 1973) and several other lawyers all of whom participated in impoundment cases, the case against the amendment on the grounds of probable unconstitutionality was spelled out in considerable detail. A reading of this memo would be valuable to your understanding of this issue.

Because of the limited time given me for the presentation, I will comment only briefly on these issues.

Separation of Powers.—The amendment raises questions of undue encroachment by the Congress on the federal judiciary. The amendment would bar access to the courts, and the recipients of federal funds who seek court action are thus economically coerced from doing so. The courts have repeatedly ruled that each of the three branches of government must be able to act without control or coercive influence by any other. Additionally, the courts themselves have ruled that impoundment issues are justiciable, and not alone political.

Due Process of Law.—The amendment would require the plaintiffs to give up funds to which the courts have already ruled they are legally and constitutionally entitled, in order to gain fiscal year 1974 operating funds, which would seem to amount to a form of extortion. The Supreme Court has stated, "Retraactivity, even when permissible, is not favored, except on the clearest mandate". The court has also recognized that the provisions of the Fifth amendment prevent the deprivation of property or the right to it once legislative actions vest that property or the right to it in a person. (Of course, the courts have ruled in the impoundment cases that such a right to appropriated funds does exist.)

Right to Petition.—The Wagshal memo brings up another issue of constitutionality, which has not, so far as I can recall, been raised elsewhere, the right to petition. The argument is that the "right of access to the courts" has been held to be "one aspect of the constitutional right to petition." (*California Motor Transport v. Trucking Unlimited*, 404 U.S. 508, 510-1972.) Further, a law which has no other purpose than, "to chill the assertion of constitutional rights by penalizing those who choose to exercise them is patently unconstitutional", *Shapiro v. Thompson*, 394 U.S. 618, 631 (1969).

Certainly, these are very strong arguments, and from my point of view would be viewed favorably by the courts.

Why has the Administration proposed the amendment? Its action follows from the severe reversals it has received in the courts on the impoundment issue. Of the 33 cases heard in Federal district courts (almost 60 have been filed), 29 have been decided in favor of the plaintiffs. Two others have been dismissed without consideration on the merits of the case, one because the judge stated he lacked jurisdiction, and the other because the judge ruled the plaintiff lacked standing. The remaining two cases were heard on the merits. In one, the impoundment of some OEO funds in Chicago was ruled legal in a district court there; but shortly afterwards in a strikingly similar

case on OEO in the D.C. courts, such an action was ruled illegal—it may be that the difference in decisions will be ruled upon in an appeal. In only one case, then, did the government win a clear-cut victory. That case involved an impoundment of housing funds by the Secretary of HUD, and the court ruled that the applicable law permitted the Secretary discretion in funding, and thus permitted impoundment. The Administration, at each loss, threatened appeal, but in fact has appealed only a few cases and has already released impounded funds in many of the others.

It is unlikely that the Supreme Court will rule quickly on the impoundment issue, as it recently declined to hear a Georgia impoundment case on original jurisdiction despite the fact that both the plaintiffs and the government attorneys requested a hearing. It is possible that a suit may be heard in the spring term, but until then, there are several months in which many of the nearly 30 unheard cases will be decided.

Additionally, there are many groups now deciding to move to sue, encouraged by the success of others. This movement is being reinforced by the rapidly growing body of legal literature and commentary and by the widespread reporting of decided suits by the newsletters and newspapers of the affected groups. Ad hoc attorneys meetings on impoundment abound, law schools are developing courses, and even the official organization of the State attorneys general is publishing newsletters on the subject. Clearly, a massive anti-impoundment movement is developing.

It should be noted, additionally, that the language used in the courts' decisions has given little comfort to the Administration. The legal arguments that the Executive possesses the power to impound on the grounds of the constitutional power of the President, historical precedent, delegated powers, and necessity to manage the national economy, all have been turned aside. Even the argument that the impoundment issue involves a legislative-executive struggle in which the judiciary has no role has carried little weight. For example, Judge Gesell of the D.C. Federal District Court stated in a recent case, that when the Congress directs that money be spent by the President, and he declines to permit the spending, "the resulting conflict is not political", and it is necessary "for the courts to interpret the law and resolve the conflict".

In a recent case (*Colleges of Podiatric Medicine v. Ash & Weinberger*) the judicial language was more blunt. The government attorneys asserted that Congress no longer effectively holds the power of the purse, because of its inability to establish national priorities and fund programs properly to meet them. The government attorneys, in the verbal argument, asserted that, "Congress is in a position where it is influenced by different interest group pressures and it would not want to be in a position of preferring one interest group over another, so it seems the Congress has left the authority to the President and the Executive Branch to determine which programs demand priorities over others".

This inference that the Administration is not affected by interest group pressures in determining national priorities, and therefore it can set priorities better, and thus should have the power to impound, carried little weight with Judge George Hart of the D.C. Federal District Court, who is known as a strict constructionist and a conservative. He put the issue simply, on October 26: "Well, of course, there is no question about the fact that the power to appropriate direct expenditure monies rests solely in the Congress. Now, Congress can, if they wish, give the President certain discretion in the mat-

ter, or they can direct that the money be spent and if they direct it, then whether it is foolish or isn't foolish, it has got to be done, if it is available . . ."

"It does seem to me in these matters relating to health that Congress decided that they were definitely not going to give the discretion or would not give the discretion to the Executive Department to determine what should or should not be spent, but were directing that it actually be spent."

"Now, whether that makes sense or not does not make any difference. It is the prerogative of Congress to spend money foolishly if it wants to, and the remedy is, I suppose, in the electorate."

Faced with these reverses, the Administration has now decided upon an alternative method of attempting to hold its impoundment program intact and has proposed its amendment. Consider the proposal's effect on the courts, the affected groups, and the Congress.

The courts have ruled consistently that the conflict may properly be settled on judicial grounds. The Administration amendment effectively would remove the courts from any further consideration of fiscal 1973 impoundment matters, leaving those impoundments purely a political matter, and thus the enforcement of appropriation law a political matter.

The affected groups will become even more disaffected from the Administration than they have been by the impoundments alone. Those who have decided to sue have not done so easily—among the health groups especially there is uneasiness. They are historically conservative regarding legal action; they were concerned with their suits' impact upon administration program heads with whom they dealt daily and who themselves disliked impoundments and their effects upon the programs; and they were most concerned about "reprisals" from the Administration leaders if they did sue. Anyone who followed closely the discussions of the groups and associations who finally resolved to sue could see this pervading fear of "reprisals", a fear that was unspecific and therefore more ominous.

Additionally, most of these groups have believed that their suits would not only be seen favorably by the Congress, because the Congress authorized and funded them, but that they were supporting, by the suits, the Congress' efforts in the domestic field.

Finally, this Administration action will further catalyze these groups: over the last several years they have become increasingly politically aware and active, and it is certain that the latest action will only increase that militancy. Already many of these groups are girding themselves for still another battle, this time to sue on the grounds of unconstitutionality because of the separation of powers and due process, as well as the right to petition. U.S. district court judges, already weary of impoundment suits, will have to ready themselves for more. It is likely that the entire years of 1973-74 will be known as the years of "appropriations by litigation".

What about the Congress? It is now being asked to make legal an Administration program that the courts have ruled illegal and unconstitutional, and to do so with an amendment that at the least may be unconstitutional, but certainly in any case violates the spirit of legal fair play. The Congress is also being asked to pre-empt the support of its present ally, the judiciary, in the appropriations law enforcement question. If it would acquiesce to the Administration, it would deprive itself of part of a major strength it now has, the power of the purse, which would be doubly unfortunate at this time, when it is struggling so hard to regain a parity with the Executive on questions of national and international affairs.

The Administration knows that it is in very deep trouble on the impoundment issue,

and is asking the Congress, whose intentions it has consistently disregarded on authorized programs and appropriations, to pull it out of the pit it has dug for itself. There is simply no other way out for it than to try to get the Congress to nullify the court action.

The President no longer can veto an appropriations bill, then impound funds provided in a continuing resolution which the Congress would pass in order to temporarily keep the government running. He cannot, because the courts have indicated by their rulings, that the continuing resolutions have the same force and effect as the appropriations law they temporarily replace. If he vetoes an appropriations bill, the Congress will respond with a continuing resolution, and it is becoming sophisticated in the use of this newly important instrument of appropriation, so much so that it is getting to be very much like an appropriation bill itself. And if the President vetoes the resolution, he stops the applicable part of the government. Thus, before the courts ruled on the continuing resolutions, he could veto appropriations and demand that the Congress keep the government running by a continuing resolution, then impound. Now the shoe is on the other foot—the President is confronted with the task of keeping the government running, because he cannot impound continuing resolution moneys.

Thus, the Administration's only way out is to block judicial rulings on impoundments. The Congress, consequently, is in a very strong position, a position it can lose only if it accedes to the Administration's request. It would be foolish to do so.

Finally, congressional acceptance of the second part of the amendment, which would provide the Administration with the opportunity to cut up to five percent of any appropriated line item (up to \$400 million for the entire bill) would only weaken Congress' hand still further, unnecessarily.

This proposal, styled a compromise by the Administration, would permit expenditures under this bill to fall \$37 million below the continuing resolution now in force (which provides for program expenditures at the House or Senate passed appropriation bill level, whichever is lower).

Why should the Congress move to accept it? As a matter of political power, it need not. If it chooses not to accept it, and does pass the bill, and should the President veto, he puts himself in the box just described above.

To sum up: The federal courts, interpreting the separation of powers and the power of the purse issues in Congress' favor, have gone a long way to helping to re-establish parity between the legislative and executive branches. This newly re-established parity can only be lost by the Congress if it desires to lose it.

Also, however, if the Congress really desires to hold on to the power of the purse, it must do more than say it wants to keep it. It must now restructure itself to establish a solid and workable budgetary program, which will require a high degree of institutional self-discipline.

AMERICAN—BEING NEIGHBORLY IS A TWO-WAY STREET

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CHAPPELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, it took the Canadian Broadcasting Corp. to bring into focus what many Americans have been saying a long time—that we rush to give aid to every country in the world when they have trouble but always

are left to pull through our own crises alone. It is good to see that our efforts are appreciated by some.

The following is a copy of the CBC statement as printed in the Sarasota Herald:

STATEMENT

The United States' dollar took another pounding on German, French and British exchanges this morning, hitting the lowest point ever known in West Germany.

It has declined there by 41 per cent since 1971 and this Canadian thinks it is time to speak up for the Americans as the most generous and possibly the least appreciated people in all the earth.

As long as 60 years ago, when I first started to read newspapers, I read of floods on the Yellow River and the Yangtze. Who rushed in with men and money to help? The Americans did.

They have helped control floods on the Nile, the Amazon, the Ganges and the Niger.

This year the rich bottomland of the Mississippi was under water and no foreign land sent a dollar to help.

Germany, Japan, and to a lesser extent Britain and Italy, were lifted out of the debris of war by the Americans who poured in billions of dollars and forgave other billions in debts.

None of those countries is today paying even the interest on its remaining debts to the United States.

When the franc was in danger of collapsing in 1956, it was the American who propped it up and their reward was to be insulted and swindled on the streets of Paris.

I was there. I saw it.

When distant cities are hit by earthquake it is the United States that hurries in to help—Managua, Nicaragua, is one of the most recent examples.

So far this year, 59 American communities have been flattened by tornadoes. No-body has helped.

The Marshall Plan and the Truman policy pumped billions upon billions of dollars into discouraged countries. Now newspapers in those countries are writing about the decadent warmongering Americans.

I'd like to see just one of those countries that is gloating over the erosion of the United States dollar build its own airplane.

Come on, let's hear it!

Does any other country in the world have a plane to equal the Boeing Jumbo Jet, the Lockheed Tristar or the Douglas 10?

If so, why don't they fly them? Why do all international lines except Russia fly American planes?

Why does no other land on earth even consider putting a man or woman on the moon?

You talk about Japanese technocracy and you get radios. You talk about German technocracy and you get automobiles.

You talk about American technocracy and you find men on the moon, not once but several times and safely home again.

You talk about scandals and the Americans put theirs right in the store window for everybody to look at.

Even their draft dodgers are not pursued and hounded. They are here on our Canadian streets, most of them (unless they are breaking Canadian laws) are getting American dollars from Ma and Pa at home to spend here in Canada.

When the Americans get out of this bind—as they will—who could blame them if they said: "To Hell with the rest of the world."

"Let someone else buy the Israel bonds. Let someone else build or repair foreign dams or design foreign buildings that won't shake apart in earthquakes."

When the railways of France, Germany and India were breaking down through age, it was the Americans who rebuilt them. When

the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central went broke, nobody loaned them an old caboose. Both are still broke.

I can name you 5,000 times when the Americans raced to the help of other people in trouble.

Can you name me even one time when someone else raced to the Americans in trouble?

I don't think there was outside help even during the San Francisco earthquake.

Our neighbors have faced it alone and I'm one Canadian who is damned tired of hearing them kicked around. They will come out of this thing with their flag high. And when they do, they are entitled to thumb their nose at the lands that are gloating over their present troubles.

I hope Canada is not one of these.

I do not want America to thumb its nose at anyone, but I do want us to look long and hard at our assistance programs. Many of our own resources are dwindling and we need to be concentrating on conserving what we have and searching for new sources. While we want to remain neighborly with the other countries of the world, we are no longer in a position to act as benefactor for all the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to read that others believe America will come out of this crisis with our flag held high.

THE TRUTH ABOUT USDA'S PROPOSED ACROSS-COUNTY-LINES COLOCATION OF FIELD OFFICES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, in order that Members of the House are not misled by the Department of Agriculture's recent press release about providing one-stop service to farmers at its country offices, I have obtained a copy of the conclusions to the Department's work paper behind that proposed centralized location of offices which I believe should go in the RECORD.

The press release, quoting Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz, assures us:

We do not anticipate this program will force separation of any personnel. Dislocations will be minimal.

But their background paper raises my doubts and will raise the dander of farmers when they find that "colocation," or grouping of offices together in one building, may bring extra driving and inconvenience.

The conclusions section of the USDA colocation study which I have obtained indicates that 3,300 to 5,000 employees will be terminated and that 8,250 to 13,750 people will require compensation for movement of their households at an average cost of \$1,600 to \$1,800 each.

The background study indicates that 8,800 facilities will be involved, 800 will be eliminated, and that the current number of locations of USDA field offices will be reduced from 4,500 to 2,200. It also describes the colocations as "across county lines colocation."

There is an estimated one-time cost of the so-called intercounty colocation of offices in the \$14 to \$25 million range,

but one of the Department's conclusions is that—

At worst, the Department will break even financially while streamlining its field structure. At best it will realize substantial savings in personnel positions and expenditures.

The county ASC committees, Soil Conservation Service offices, Farmers Home Administration, and Federal Crop Insurance are primary targets for colocation.

There is an interesting timetable which indicates that key Members of Congress and the Office of Management and Budget were to be notified of the planned colocation by October 12, or no later than distribution of Secretary's memo.

As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I had no notice of the plan before the paeans of praise for this one-stop service for farmers started pouring out in press release form recently with the assurance that "we do not anticipate this program will force separation of any personnel. Dislocations will be minimal."

I think I can understand now, coming from a State where they already have farmers traveling over 100 miles to some county offices, why I have not been advised about this across county lines colocation effort.

It seems to me appropriate that the Agriculture Committees hold hearings on what is planned, so we will all at least get some idea how much more gasoline is going to be burned getting to the 2,200 offices, out of 4,500, to be retained. Obviously, if 2 million farmers have to travel an extra hundred miles back and forth several times a year to county USDA offices, it will not contribute to energy conservation.

Of course, I can think of a few other reasons why some features of the colocation idea are of dubious merit. The idea of one-stop service for farmers is very laudable, but not if that stop involves a round trip of 200 miles to an understaffed set of offices. But the backrounders themselves, you will find, have listed a few problems, including:

- Disruption of county committee;
- Some clients disadvantaged;
- Institutional objections;
- High one-time cost;
- Disruption of work flow;
- Space limitations;
- Management structure needed;
- Employee grievances, morale, resistance to change, and need for retraining.

The study indicates that Georgia and Florida are to be the guinea pigs for this new across-county-lines consolidation of offices.

It seems to me that this is another instance where Members of Congress might serve as the best original guinea pigs. Why not try it out—in all its honest detail—on the elected representatives of the people?

That step might just save the Government a few million dollars with very little one-time cost. Some of us country boys might be able to give Mr. Butz' management experts a pointer or two.

I include in the RECORD, first, the release of the Department of Agriculture announcing the attractive new one-stop

services for farmers, and second, a section of "Conclusions" from the USDA Field Colocation Study by the Office of Information Systems, dated October 12, 1973, which outlines a few of the more realistic details:

SECRETARY BUTZ ANNOUNCES NATIONAL PROGRAM BEGUN TO PROVIDE FARMERS ONE-STOP SERVICE

WASHINGTON, D.C., November 21.—A nationwide program is being initiated to modernize the U.S. Department of Agriculture's outdated field office system by establishing local U.S. Agricultural Service Centers to provide farmers, ranchers, and rural citizens up-to-date "one-stop service," Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz announced today.

In an effort to provide maximum service at single locations, USDA is initiating development of local U.S. Agricultural Service Centers to update the Department's existing 15,000 field offices which now function in many different organizational structures, the Secretary explained. A Steering Committee chaired by Under Secretary J. Phil Campbell has been established to direct the new program and the Office of Field Operations has been established under direction of Edward H. Hansen to carry out its objectives, he said.

The program will involve approximately 7,800 offices at the local or county level in similar geographic areas operated by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS), Farmers Home Administration (FHA), the Soil Conservation Service (SCS), and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC), Secretary Butz explained. Administrative committees in each state composed of the State Directors of the four agencies will develop plans which will vary according to geography, transportation network, farm population, workload and other factors.

"We do not anticipate this program will force separation of any personnel. Dislocations will be minimal," he emphasized.

Secretary Butz said establishment of Service Centers will "carry out the mandate of Congress spelled out in the Rural Development Act of 1972" which calls for location of all units of the Department concerned with rural development in single field offices and "the interchange of personnel and facilities in each such office to the extent necessary or desirable to achieve the most efficient utilization of such personnel and facilities and provide the most effective assistance in the development of rural areas . . ."

The Secretary said the Service Center program will also carry forward a USDA effort begun 11 years ago which achieved some colocation in 54 percent of counties with USDA offices. However, he said the degree achieved lacks uniformity and does not achieve maximum efficiency. He added that USDA has learned through its experience so far that the effort is a worthwhile one.

"It's time we brought our field delivery system forward into the 1970's with concentration of services in single field offices at the county level wherever possible, the elimination of marginally effective offices, and groupings where more efficient services to farmers and rural residents can be achieved," the Secretary said.

"We've asked farmers to use new farm programs and go all-out in food production next year, so we in government have a concurrent responsibility to go all-out to give farmers the most efficient and streamlined service in the field that's possible," the Secretary said.

"This is impossible with our present field structure. Most of it has grown up independently of other agencies since the 1930's and there's little of the coordination we should have. As a result, most farmers have to run all over town to do business with us. In this modern age, that's inexcusable."

The Secretary pointed out that with farms growing larger in size and farther apart, farmers are planting and harvesting more acres and need more time to concentrate on selling in the marketplace. "They have less time to spend running from one place to another because of an outdated USDA office system," the Secretary explained.

In addition, the Secretary emphasized the need to reduce confusion among rural citizens who seek assistance from USDA in housing, community facilities, water and sewer, and industrialization programs. A streamlined county-level office structure should enable rural citizens to get comprehensive and more specialized assistance at one location at the local level.

Secretary Butz said the Department is already reorienting its administrative capability in Washington to provide farmers and ranchers a more effective field delivery system. Establishment of new offices will permit USDA at the local level to provide more technical assistance, more information and other services not now feasible with a widely-dispersed, multiple-agency field office system, he added. Upgraded communications capability, computer terminals, and modern business equipment are planned for each office.

He said the Service Center program will: Permit a fuller range of services to farmers, ranchers, and rural residents at each local office;

Reduce client travel in many cases by eliminating multiple office visits;

Integrate mutually supportive programs; Allow a fuller range of technical expertise at a county-level site rather than state or regional;

Enhance the effectiveness of field employees through broader knowledge of USDA programs;

Reduce duplicated overhead costs;

And centralize equipment use.

ESTIMATED IMPLICATIONS BY END OF EACH FISCAL YEAR

	Fiscal year—				Total
	1974	1975	1976	1977	
Offices moved (percent).....	15	50	35	0	2,700
Low.....	405	1,350	945	0	3,609
Expected.....	540	1,800	1,260	0	4,500
High.....	675	2,250	1,575	0	5,000
Personnel reduced (percent).....	0	25	50	25	3,300
Low.....	0	825	1,650	825	4,100
Expected.....	0	1,025	2,050	1,025	5,000
High.....	0	1,250	2,500	1,250	5,000

CONCLUSION

Even with substantial variation from estimated figures, co-location makes sense. At worst, the department will break-even financially while streamlining its field structure. At best it will realize substantial savings in personnel positions and expenditures.

Implications—overall

Total facilities involved.....	8,800
Facilities to be eliminated.....	—800
Facilities remaining.....	8,000
Current number of locations.....	4,500
Locations to be eliminated.....	2,300
Locations remaining.....	2,200
Estimated personnel reduction.....	4,125
Estimated one-time cost.....	14-25 million
Estimated annual savings.....	30-50 million

AND IMPROVED ONE-STOP SERVICE

Benefits

Service effectiveness:
Permit fuller range of services—reduce client travel time in many cases; integrate mutually supportive programs; permit fuller range of technical expertise available at one site (generalist vs. specialist); enhances effectiveness of each employee through

USDA FIELD COLOCATION STUDY

OFFICE OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS,
October 12, 1973.

CONCLUSIONS

Co-location across county lines will:
Accrue significant savings through economies of scale and reduction of personnel by facilitating functional integration.

IMPLICATIONS: ESTIMATED ONE-TIME COST

	Low	Expected	High
Number of offices to be moved.....	2,700	3,600	4,500
Average cost per office move.....	×\$125	×\$150	×\$175
Cost of moving offices.....	\$337,500	\$540,000	\$787,500
Number of people requiring compensation for movement of household.....	8,250	11,000	13,750
Average cost per household moved.....	×\$1,600	×\$1,700	×\$1,800
Cost of relocations.....	+\$13,200,000	+\$18,700,000	+\$24,750,000
Estimated total one-time cost.....	\$13,537,500	\$19,240,000	\$25,537,500
Range of one-time cost, \$14 to \$25,000,000.			

IMPLICATIONS: ESTIMATED ANNUAL SAVINGS

	Low	Expected	High
Number of offices merged with offices of same agency.....	600	800	1,000
Average cost of operating an office.....	×\$1,750	×\$2,000	×\$2,250
Annual operational savings.....	1,050,000	1,600,000	2,250,000
Number of people in offices to be consolidated.....	33,000	33,000	33,000
Percent personnel reduction possible.....	×.10	×.125	×.15
Number of fewer people required.....	3,300	4,125	4,950
Average annual salary plus benefits.....	×\$9,500	×\$10,000	×\$10,500
Annual personnel savings.....	+\$31,350,000	+\$41,250,000	+\$51,975,000
Number of offices moving to rented space.....	1,000	1,500	2,000
Average additional rent.....	×\$1,750	×\$2,500	×\$2,250
Annual additional rent cost.....	—1,750,000	—3,000,000	—4,500,000
Estimated total annual savings.....	30,600,000	39,850,000	49,725,000
Range of annual savings, \$30 to \$50,000,000.			

CUMULATIVE COSTS AND SAVINGS

[Millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—				
	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Cost:					
Low.....	2	9	14	14	14
Expected.....	3	13	19	19	19
High.....	4	17	25	25	25
Savings:					
Low.....	0	4	19	45	75
Expected.....	0	5	25	60	100
High.....	0	6	31	75	125

broader knowledge of USDA programs; centralizes information flow; centralizes equipment use; computer terminals; wats line; and files integration.

Economy:

Reduce personnel costs—share clerical and support personnel; reduce administrative costs.

Management efficiency:

Functional integration potential—reduction of program/service overlap; centralization at the local level.

Problems

Political:

Disruption of county committee—some clients disadvantaged and institutional objections.

Functional:

High one-time cost—disruption of work flow; space limitations; and management structure needed.

Employee:

Grievances; morale; resistance to change; need retraining.

Recommendations

Co-location be undertaken and directed toward: co-location across county lines and functional integration.

Provide for improved clientele service by facilitating functional integration by facilitating a wider range of technical expertise.

Provide potential for increased administrative efficiencies.

(NOTE.—The following cost and savings estimates are conservative.)

	Number of offices	Personnel
Primary candidates for colocation:		
Most county-level offices of—		
ASCS, FHA, FCIC, SCS.....	8,212	27,500
Additional candidates for colocation:		
Some local offices of—AMS, FNS, APHS, OGC.....	611	5,200
ASCS (management) OIG.....	8,823	32,700

* Implementation start on a pilot basis: two States—Florida and Georgia.

Implementation plan and date completed by

1. Present plan to Under Sec. & Sec.—revise as necessary & obtain approval, October 5, 1973.

2. Inform Asst. Sec. & key agency & staff office heads, October 5, 1973.

3. Select project director, October 5, 1973.

4. Finalize action plan (including public information strategy) with Under Sec. & Sec., October 12, 1973.

5. Establish departmental steering committee, October 12, 1973.

6. Identify task force members: program agency representatives (5-6); staff office

representatives (5-6); and communications representative (1), October 12, 1973.

7. Prepare & distribute Sec. memo, October 12, 1973.

8. Notify key members of Congress & OMB as appropriate, but no later than distribution of Sec. Memo, October 12, 1973.

9. Notify GSA & others as appropriate (including State administrative committees, October 19, 1973).

10. Prepare presentation package, October 19, 1973.

11. Develop co-location plan for pilot State: State Admin. Committee (SAC) to meet with Sec. to initiate project, October 19, 1973.

SAC & task force formulate guidelines and work plans, gather workload data, November 2, 1973.

Preliminary action plan completed, November 12, 1973.

Action plan finalized & issued, December 10, 1973.

12. Begin pilot co-location, December 17, 1973.

13. Finalize national action plan, March 18, 1974.

14. Expand to national basis using model developed from pilot effort.

Key issues to be resolved by pilot effort

1. Test the accuracy of assumptions and estimates.

2. Determine adequacy of scope: impact on non-PFT personnel and impact on State and regional and district offices.

3. Determine appropriate administrative system: degree of integrating field office management; problems associated with single office director concept, and mechanisms to coordinate field activities from Washington. Identify complications in acquiring adequate office space and terminating lease agreements.

5. Determine best way to involve State administrative committees.

6. Determine nature and degree of local support and/or opposition and best ways to use the former or counteract the latter.

7. Develop detailed guidelines and procedures for national implementation.

Summary

An aggressive multicounty colocation effort would: result in the moving of 2,700-4,000 offices; facilitate the reduction of 3,300-5,000 personnel; entail estimated one-time costs of \$14-25 million, and permit estimated annual savings of \$30-50 million.

And would yield the benefits of: enhancing one-stop service; facilitating improvements in administrative efficiency, and facilitating functional integration.

SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill on the subject of the special prosecutor for Watergate matters. This subject has occupied the interest of both Houses of Congress. The primary purpose of the legislation introduced in both Houses thus far has been to seek to obtain an independent special prosecutor with adequate authority to pursue all relevant and pertinent evidence with respect to wrongdoing, including alleged evidence that the President may or may not have participated in such wrongdoing.

The difficulty with the legislation introduced so far has been with respect to drafting a constitutional bill on this subject. Most of the legislation has pro-

ceeded toward giving either the courts the authority and the duty to select a special prosecutor, or putting that authority in the Congress, or giving the Senate the right to advise and consent with respect to the selection of a special prosecutor.

Another related matter is trying to provide that the independent prosecutor appointed not only has the authority adequate to do the job, but also that he will be secure in his tenure. That he will not be discharged if it looks like he is making some headway or is in disagreement with the President.

I believe it is important that we consider these matters, in view of the background and in view of the need to instill confidence in the American public with respect to this investigation. My bill meets all the constitutional and substantive requirements.

First, it recognizes that the selection should be by the executive branch of the Government. That either a judicial or legislative selection would be unconstitutional. The next thing the bill does, after giving the duty to select the special prosecutor to the Attorney General, is to secure to the special prosecutor the rights and the authority which are contained in the regulations published by the Attorney General on this subject.

Next, my bill provides that the special prosecutor cannot be discharged except for certain causes: death, physical disability or mental disability, gross impropriety, and for similar acts. My bill also provides that if it is determined that the special prosecutor should be discharged, the House of Representatives and the Senate must be given 30 days' notice, and the discharge will not be effective if within that 30-day period Congress would disapprove of such action.

The appointment of Leon Jaworski as special prosecutor, is a fact that has already been consummated, and under my bill the Attorney General would have the right to reaffirm that selection.

I believe Mr. Jaworski has the confidence of the majority of the American people. He will then have the authority under the regulations promulgated by the Attorney General. He will have the same staff that Mr. Cox did. Further, he will have tenure that will be secure, so that he cannot be discharged unless and until this Congress would see fit to approve his discharge. I request my colleagues to examine the merits of this bill and their support.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I voted against the conference report on the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration (to accompany H.R. 7446). The reasons for this are simple.

First, the legislation is not going to commemorate the American Revolution.

What apparently is going to be celebrated is a decentralized hodgepodge of local historical events with little or no chronological or geographical relationship. They may be related to the American Revolution in no way. The history and geography of 1776 are being ignored. Custer's Last Stand. The California Gold Rush. The Alamo. Such events as these, while important nationally, have nothing to do with gaining our freedom from England, although they may be appropriate for States and municipalities to celebrate. They occurred years later, however, and have little to do with the revolution that occurred almost 200 years ago and which is meant to be the focal point of our national observations.

Second, there is inadequate leadership on the Federal level. Funding is totally inadequate. People in the States and cities are crying for help and guidance.

Third, there is no program now or planned which will adequately acquaint the people with what is being planned. Americans from all over the country will be visiting other parts of our Nation for the first time. Foreign travelers by the millions, from Europe, South America, and the Orient will visit our country. No program exists which will properly let these people know the "what, where, when, why and how" of the celebration.

As far as I can see, if an effective celebration of our 200th birthday is to be held it will have to be done by the States. Virtually no help can be counted on from the Federal Government in Washington.

And finally, if things continue as they are, our country will be commemorating its tricentennial before the Bicentennial Commission gets through with even the necessary preliminary planning for what it is going to do.

I WOULD SURE LIKE TO HEAR

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the Delaware County, Ohio, Republican newsletter "Partyline" published a very interesting and enlightening article by Betty Horn, president of the Women's Club.

Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, as well as the people across America, should be interested in these views which do not surface often in the liberal segment of the media.

The article follows:

I WOULD SURE LIKE TO HEAR

(By Betty Horn, president, Delaware County Republican Women's Club)

I'd sure like to hear . . . President Nixon make a speech without 2 or 3 interpreters or analysts, as they call themselves, explaining what he really meant. Aren't the American people smart enough to understand what the President has to say without the TV newsmen trying to interpret for them? I'd sure like to hear . . . more reliable reporting and less instant analysis of the news. Why is it unheard of to listen to facts, so we can evaluate them ourselves? Would our conclusions differ with those presently analyzing the news? I'd sure like to hear . . . President Nixon announce plans to do one thing

that the news media doesn't jump on immediately—stating how Congress and the Senate won't go along with it.

I'd sure like to hear . . . More about the accomplishments of the Nixon Administration such as the end of the war in Vietnam, the return of the POW's, the end of the draft, the reduction of unemployment, fiscal responsibility, the peace-making endeavor now in progress with the Arab-Israeli war, and all the other accomplishments so soon forgotten.

I'd sure like to hear . . . all our Congressmen and Senators stand behind our President and quit contributing to the mass hysteria created by the electronic media. I'd sure like to hear . . . that Americans are presumed innocent until proven guilty, that our President should receive as much consideration in this matter as any other American.

In President Nixon's first Inaugural Address he said, "We cannot learn from one another until we stop shouting at one another—until we speak quietly enough so that our words can be heard as well as our voices." That was good advice on January 20, 1969. It seems even better advice today—better for everybody concerned.

TO FUND A CRASH PETROLEUM EXPLORATION PROGRAM

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to fund a crash exploration program for Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 in Alaska. The \$200 million survey would be under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, which administers U.S. petroleum reserves for national defense.

There is no question about our Nation's need for a dependable petroleum supply in the future. The current energy crunch makes it imperative that we explore all continental reserves to ward off disaster in the years ahead.

Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 was set aside in 1923 and remains only lightly explored on Alaska's North Slope. It covers 37,000 square miles, nearly the same as the State of Indiana. A \$50 million survey of reserves during and after World War II confirmed suspicions of vast underground petroleum but no definitive work has been done since.

The reason for neglecting this potentially vast reserve was transportation. But now Congress has authorized construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline and brought the North Slope closer to production.

My bill appropriates funds for study only. Pet 4 cannot serve the national defense and improve the energy situation until we at least know what is there.

COMMON CAUSE, HAYS STILL LOCKED IN DISPUTE

(Mr. JAMES V. STANTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks an article from the Plain Dealer, Sunday, November 25, 1973, by Robert J. Havel of the Washington Plain Dealer bureau.

Although the article is critical of Con-

gressman HAYS in some instances, I consider it to be an objective article and I think it would make educational reading for every Member of Congress.

The article follows:

COMMON CAUSE, HAYS STILL LOCKED IN DISPUTE

(By Robert J. Havel)

WASHINGTON.—The simmering feud between Common Cause and those who concoct campaign legislation in the House has been shunted to a back burner because of the pot-pourri of political potboilers that continue to whet the public appetite.

But the dispute between the "people's lobby" and principally, Rep. Wayne L. Hays, W-18, Flushing, is indeed still bubbling. It probably will not come to a full boil until next year.

Common Cause will not hesitate to tell you—and rightfully so—that it was instrumental in pushing through the Senate tough campaign reform legislation that it hopes will lead to some form of public financing of political campaigns. Hays, head of the House Administration Committee, is in no hurry to press for similar action.

There will be no such bill out of the House this year, Hays says, and darkly warns that he intends to bring Common Cause under the financial reporting requirements of any bill that emerges.

At issue is whether Common Cause, three years old and 280,000 members strong, is a political organization and therefore subject to reporting requirements of campaign law rather than the less stringent demands of the lobbying law.

One nationally syndicated columnist pointed out that Commons Cause headquarters throbs with more political activity than either the Democratic or Republican national committee. This would seem to equate Common Cause with political organizations.

Another writer labeled Common Cause a political organization interested in opening up the American political system.

An organization that issues reports on fund-raising organizations has none on Common Cause because, it states, it does not undertake to report about organizations operating primarily in the political field.

Federal law defines a political committee as any group that raises money and spends it to influence a federal election.

"We're a lobby and not a political organization," insists John W. Gardner, chairman of Common Cause. "We don't get involved in political races on the basis of personalities. We get involved in issues. We do not give or take political money. We're scrupulous about not endorsing or opposing a candidate and raising or giving political contributions."

Hays expresses mock surprise that Gardner should insist on such a narrow definition of "political committee." He says Common Cause spends "substantial amounts of money mainly to promote press releases against those who don't bow to their wishes."

"I think this is a political effort and so does everybody else," he continues. "They don't endorse, but they hammer people. This has the same effect of being involved in a campaign."

"It's illogical that an organization that demands total and full disclosure is unwilling to submit to the same canons it would impose on others. If Common Cause has nothing to hide, it has nothing to fear."

Gardner insists he has nothing to hide or fear. It is standard procedure for Hays to "threaten anyone who disagrees with him," Gardner adds.

"Common Cause should make complete disclosure and it does now," he says. "We file the most complete report of any lobbyist. We file a full report to the Internal Revenue Service. We have a yearly audit. We report to members on how we spend their money. We keep a record of all contributions of over

\$100 and make it available to anyone who wants to look at it.

"But we're willing to do it in other forms. We'd post it in the town square if that's what they ordered us to do."

Bringing Common Cause under a political-reporting law would do it no harm, Gardner says, because Common Cause already observes limitations on contributions. It would cut off corporate and union gifts, he says, "but what we get from either source you could put in your eye." Such gifts are illegal to political committees.

About 97% of Common Cause money—it raised more than \$4.1 million in the first three quarters of this year—comes from the \$15 annual dues each member pays and from gifts of less than \$100, Gardner says.

In its lobbying reports for the year Common Cause accounts for spending about 20%—\$680,000—of the \$4.1 million it has received. The \$680,000 went for public relations and advertising, wages and salaries, printing and mailing, office expenses, telephone and travel.

Where does the rest go?

"The biggest single expenditure is for membership recruitment," Gardner acknowledges. "Building a membership base is absolutely crucial," Gardner, incidentally, receives no salary.

In its 1972 Form 990, which organizations exempt from income tax are required to file with IRS, Common Cause listed expenditures of \$1.6 million for postage and mailing, printing and publications, computer processing, consultant fees and mailing lists and advertising. Reported receipts totaled \$3.4 million. This is considered a good rate of return by fund raisers.

In a recent report, Common Cause listed among the successes it helped win "an end to U.S. military action in Indochina, congressional committee decisions made out in the open, the highway trust fund busted..."

"So far they have not been effective on campaign reform," the liberal says. "Common Cause no less than anybody else can carry these things off by itself."

A conservative critic, who also chooses to remain anonymous, bristles at Common Cause's claim of nonpartisanship.

Of the 44 listed on Common Cause's 1972 governing board, he says, 26 are "hard Democrats," several of them substantial contributors to Democratic presidential candidates. At best, he says, the board has only three Republicans, including Gardner, and one "probable" Republican. Among Republicans, Gardner's GOP credentials are suspect.

Gardner emphatically denied Hays' charge that Common Cause spends millions "exclusively at the direction of two or three people."

"Decisions are made by the board of directors," he says. "If our members don't like those decisions they can vote against us by not renewing their memberships. That is important."

He points out that anybody can run for the board by getting a petition signed by 20 persons and that a referendum establishes priority issues. The response to the referendum, however, is fractional.

"We never go below the fourth-ranking priority," Gardner says. "The board meets and turns priorities into battles. It's fairly essential that the board agree fully on an issue. You can't operate effectively with a divided board."

But the board has never turned down a staff-initiated position, and there is no doubt in most minds that John Gardner is Common Cause.

While many other groups operating in the political arena barely wallow along through Watergate, Common Cause continues to grow and flourish almost strictly because of Watergate, according to Gardner. It got perhaps

its biggest boost when it won the case to force President Nixon's re-election committee to disclose its contributors before April 7, 1972. It was a triumph for which Common Cause can take full credit.

Prior to Watergate, Common Cause's membership showed signs of slippage.

Operatives in allied fields attribute Common Cause's initial successes to a tidy sum of seed money and to the fact that a "citizens' lobby" was an attractive idea. But they see a tailing off of its appeal.

"No problems are created by belonging to Common Cause," one said. "It appeals to the moderate center and that's the biggest group to appeal to."

"But the good-government-type organizations usually go sterile."

Common Cause is working to evade this eventuality. It is building a grassroots field organization that it hopes to have operating in all 435 congressional districts this year.

"By next fall," says Jack Conway, president of Common Cause, "we're going to be in every single congressional district and in every Senate race on our reform issues, and we'll be felt."

That, says Wayne Hays, is politics.

THE IMPEACHMENT PROCESS

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the letters pouring into my office supporting the impeachment process continue unabated. As of now, the count is approximately 5,400. Those in support of impeachment proceedings outweigh those in opposition by 5,400 to 160. The mail supporting the initiation of impeachment proceedings began after that infamous Saturday of October 20 when the President indicated that he would not obey the order of the U.S. District Court Judge John J. Sirica. That action caused more than 100 of our colleagues, myself included, to sponsor resolutions initiating the Judiciary Committee's impeachment proceedings. The House has authorized \$1 million for the committee's use in retaining an investigatory staff and doing all that is necessary to expeditiously report to the House of Representatives whether or not the President has committed impeachable acts.

Almost every day since the Watergate investigations started, the President's credibility has been impeached by actions on his part and those of his associates. The public has become weary of the continuing flow of revelations and administration excuses that seem to become more preposterous as time goes on. The country's tolerance is worn and there is an understandable desire that this matter be resolved with dispatch. At the same time, most Americans appreciate the importance of not allowing the passions of the hour to corrode two gems of our Constitution: civil rights and civil liberties. We must acknowledge that the President, too, has civil rights and liberties that deserve equal protection.

While I believe that a careful investigation must be made of the allegations brought against the President, to say that I have no opinion on this matter would be neither truthful nor credible. I do believe that there is strong reason to believe that the President has engaged

in actions which can be described as obstruction of justice. At this time I anticipate awaiting the report of the Judiciary Committee before making a final determination on impeachment. After reviewing the evidence that the committee uncovers and the case it advances, I will not hesitate to cast my vote for impeachment if I believe that a prima facie case has been established against the President warranting his being tried by the Senate—even were the Judiciary Committee to make a lesser recommendation.

The latest episode involving the President's taped conversation with H. R. Haldeman and its erasure by an alleged error committed by the President's secretary, Rose Mary Woods, strains one's credulity, to say the least, and further destroys the President's credibility.

The impeachment of a President for having committed "high crimes and misdemeanors" is a step which should not be taken lightly but is one that must not be shunned if warranted. I will fulfill my sworn obligation to uphold and defend the Constitution.

SOVIET OPPRESSION

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, many of those who have lent their support to the cause of Russian Jews and intellectuals were recently given some cause for optimism at what appeared to be a lull in Soviet repressive tactics. If that optimism were ever justified, it is no longer. Dissidents are clearly in the midst of a grievous escalation of political harassment and court proceedings. Christopher Wren writes in today's New York Times that dissident Soviet mathematician Yuri A. Shikanovich has gone to trial after 14 months of incommunicado detention. He was not permitted to attend his trial on grounds of insanity and was committed indefinitely to a mental hospital. His lawyer has never been allowed to meet him. The Shikanovich case is matched by others equally serious that have emerged in recent weeks. Consider the following actions against Soviet Jews:

First. On November 13, Pieta Pinkasov, a carpenter, was sentenced to 5 years in a labor camp. The charge was that Pinkasov had performed some illegal freelance work. He and his family had previously obtained visas to Israel. They were set to leave when Pinkasov was arrested.

Second. On November 19, the trial of 26-year-old Aleksandr Feldman began in Kiev. The charge is "malicious hooliganism." Feldman has been trying for 2 years to emigrate.

Third. On October 25, Leonid Zabelishensky, an unemployed electrical engineer who taught at the Ural Polytechnic Institute, was arrested and charged with "parasitism." The investigation by Soviet authorities continues even though Zabelishensky is currently taking care of their sick son and his wife works and earns a substantial income. The Zabelishenskys had applied for exit visas in 1971.

These cases give a brief indication of what is presently occurring on a massive scale. I could cite numerous additional instances of intellectuals and Jews brought under investigation, put on trial, or forcibly confined—all during the past month. Every new wave of repression further consumes my faith in the efficacy of diplomatic appeals by the American leadership and public appeals by concerned American citizens. These efforts seem to induce more change in the appearance of Soviet policy than in its conduct. It is time for the Congress to realize that the Soviet Union will never allow its Jews and intellectuals to live in peace unless it becomes materially costly to do otherwise. I must again speak to the moral sensibilities of my colleagues to ask them to deny the President discretion to grant most favored nation status to the Soviet Union unless it guarantees freedom of emigration. The unceasing message from the victims of Russian persecution is that Jackson-Mills-Vanik is their only hope. If that hope is extinguished, we must bear the responsibility.

OPERATION DISNEY WORLD

(Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the American public has been subjected to a steady barrage of startling disclosures, revelations, and discoveries regarding the conduct of the President and his closest associates and staff. After much prodding by the press, members of his own party and occurrences which he could not overlook, the President, on October 26, launched "Operation Candor."

A well-researched and objective analysis of those first offerings was carried in Washington Post editorials entitled "Operation Disney World."

The text of these three editorials follows:

OPERATION DISNEY WORLD (I)

Working our way laboriously through the transcript of President Nixon's extraordinary performance last Saturday night before the Associated Press Managing Editors at Disney World, it struck us with increasing force that on a number of specific points the President is not exactly clearing up the record on Watergate and related matters. Rather, he seems determined to add to the public's confusion at almost every turn. The President would have us believe, of course, that with Operation Candor (as the White House has called it) he is at long last setting out to sweep away public misapprehensions—that he is helping us to get to the bottom of the Watergate affair, once and for all. Yet, picking and choosing almost at random, one finds disturbing distortions of the record and misrepresentations of the facts. By way of a beginning effort to set the record straight, we would deal today with the President's misuse of two of his predecessors in office—Thomas Jefferson and Lyndon Johnson—in attempting to defend actions of his own.

Mr. Nixon's persistent use of the "Jefferson rule," as he called it in his Saturday night appearance, is startling. This is the second time in a month that the President has distorted the facts regarding the issuance of a subpoena to President Jefferson by way of justifying his own performance in the matter of the Watergate tapes. In his

press conference on October 26, Mr. Nixon said that the court had subpoenaed a letter which President Jefferson had written and Mr. Jefferson had refused to comply, but rather had compromised by producing for the court a summary of the contents of the letter. Saturday night, he went further. He began his answer to a question having to do with executive privilege with the astonishing assertion that, "I, of course, voluntarily waived privilege with regard to turning over the tapes." This is a curious way to describe his ultimate decision to obey an order of the Federal District Court—an order which he first appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals. Having lost the appeal he then tried to compromise the issue with the famous Stennis proposal which cost him the resignation of his Attorney General and his Deputy Attorney General in the course of his efforts to fire the Watergate Special Prosecutor who had originally requested the tapes. Having rewritten this recent history, the President went on to elaborate on the "Jefferson Rule" and to rewrite some more. He repeated his version of the Jefferson case which he had given us in October and went on to say that John Marshall, sitting as Chief Justice, had ruled in favor of the Jefferson "compromise."

In just about every important aspect, it simply didn't happen that way. To begin with the letter was not written by President Jefferson. It was written to him. What is more, Mr. Jefferson agreed to testify in the case under oath (although he wanted to do so in Washington, rather than journey to the court in Richmond). And he sent the entire letter—not a mere summary—to the U.S. Attorney who in turn offered it to the court and authorized the court to use those portions "which had relation to the cause." Chief Justice Marshall, moreover, never ruled in his capacity as Chief Justice on any such compromise; he ruled as a trial judge in a lower court. So much for the misuses of Mr. Jefferson.

Now for President Johnson and Mr. Nixon's taxes. The first thing to be said is that the President was offered a specific opportunity to deny published reports that on a total income of \$400,000 for the years 1970 and 1971 that he paid only \$1,670 in income taxes. He did not deny it, but rather admitted that he had paid "nominal" taxes for those years. He then said that the fact that his taxes were nominal was not a result of "a cattle ranch or interest or all of these gimmicks . . ." Perhaps so. But it would be somewhat surprising if Mr. Nixon did not deduct interest from his gross income for those years. The figures the White House has put out concerning the transactions by which he acquired his Key Biscayne and San Clemente homes indicate that he paid substantial sums in interest in those years, and it is hard to figure out any other way he could have arrived at such a "nominal" obligation.

His own explanation for that "nominal" obligation was that President Johnson told him shortly after he became President in January, 1969, that he ought to donate his vice presidential papers and take a deduction for them. There are two things puzzling about the idea that Mr. Nixon was merely taking his cue from his predecessor. One is the inference conveyed by Mr. Nixon that all this was new to him; in fact, he had made such a donation of some of his official papers in 1968, prior to taking office as President. The second, and far more important thing that is puzzling about Mr. Nixon's story is his suggestion that Mr. Johnson had established the precedent and that both men followed the same general policy in their handling of the tax aspects of their official papers. Prior to 1969, they apparently did just that. But in 1969, Mr. Johnson made a careful decision not to do what President Nixon did, for very precise reasons having to do with propriety.

The facts of this matter are that in 1969 Congress was debating a significant change in

the Internal Revenue Code which might have precluded anyone from taking such a deduction from this sort of gift of papers or documents. Both Mr. Johnson and Mr. Nixon expressed their opposition to this change in the tax rules but until late in the year it was unclear which way Congress would resolve the issue—or when any change would become effective. Under the circumstances, Mr. Johnson decided that it would be unseemly for a former President to attempt to make such a gift in an effort to beat a congressional deadline and so he did not do so—reportedly at a cost of millions of dollars to his heirs. Mr. Nixon, by contrast, made a gift that year of papers valued at more than \$500,000 and took what he claimed to be the appropriate deduction.

So much for the inference that Mr. Nixon was only following President Johnson's lead. Beyond that, there is an even larger question—not specifically raised by the editors and consequently ignored by Mr. Nixon on Saturday night—as to whether what he did in 1969 with respect to his gift of papers and claimed tax deduction was in accordance with the requirements of law—quite apart from its propriety in the context of the congressional debate and the likelihood of an imminent change in the rules. Speaking of his predecessor, Mr. Nixon said that Mr. Johnson "had done exactly what the law required." What remains to be seen, as we have noted repeatedly in this space, is whether Mr. Nixon, in this particular instance, can make that same claim for himself.

We do not mean to say that the President does not have a cogent defense of his tax deductions, or of his policy toward the release of his tapes—or of any of a number of other charges and allegations that have been raised in connection with his performance in the broad category of matters which come under the broad misnomer of Watergate. We would simply argue (and we will be returning to the argument in this space) that the President is unlikely to clear the air and resolve public confusion in any conclusive way by the sort of muddying of history and misrepresentation of facts which characterized so much of his appearance before the managing editors on Saturday night in Disney World.

OPERATION DISNEY WORLD (II)

(NOTE.—If it had gone to the Supreme Court—and I know many of my friends argued, "Why not carry it to the Supreme Court and let them decide it?"—that would first, have had a confrontation with the Supreme Court, between the Supreme Court and the President. And second, it would have established very possibly a precedent, a precedent breaking down constitutionality that would plague future Presidencies, not just this President.)

Thus Mr. Nixon, in his Saturday night question-and-answer session with the Associated Press Managing Editors, elaborated on his reasons for failing to carry his fight to protect the secrecy of the White House tapes subpoenaed by Archibald Cox to the Supreme Court. We cite at some length his remarks on the subject because they strike us as characteristic of the quality of the President's defense as a whole. It is marked by a perpetual shifting of argument, a series of astounding assumptions and a facility for distorting the facts of the case.

Consider only the quotation we have cited. Mr. Nixon, who on October 20th was declaring he was "confident" he would have won an appeal to the Supreme Court but didn't think it would be wise to leave the question open for the time it would take the Supreme Court to rule, now suggests that the prospect of losing was a strong factor in his decision not to appeal. So far as astounding assumptions are concerned, we invite your attention to the President's assumption that a Supreme Court ruling against him would have been

of dubious constitutionality (surely the thing works the other way round). And finally, on the facts of the matter, does anyone have any doubt that the reason the President abandoned his plan to seek a Supreme Court test was that he considered he had a better chance of preserving the secrecy of the tapes by cooking up his so-called "compromise" or that he ultimately only agreed to release them to Judge Sirica as a consequence of the uproar brought on by his mishandling of Mr. Cox and the issue as a whole?

Yesterday in this space we addressed ourselves to Mr. Nixon's discussion of his taxes and to his misuse of two of his predecessors in the course of justifying his actions. Today we will deal briefly with the President's arguments concerning the Watergate case itself.

Mr. Nixon's observations on the Watergate case, of course, revolved around the twin issues of Mr. Cox and the forbidden tapes. It is at least curious that the President who had a great deal to do with delaying Mr. Cox's investigation had the temerity to complain about that delay. Thus Mr. Nixon who earnestly discussed the reasons it had taken him so long to discover that two of the tapes did not exist and who, at least by indirection, acknowledged that he himself had been in a protracted and time-consuming legal battle with the Special Prosecutor concerning the White House documents that would be made available to the prosecution, in the same breath observed that the Special Prosecutor had taken much too long to get his cases into court. What does Mr. Nixon think Archibald Cox was doing for much of that time—if not battling the White House in order to acquire the material he regarded as necessary to bring those cases in an orderly and effective way, material which Mr. Nixon sought to deny him?

When Mr. Nixon observed that Assistant Attorney General Henry Petersen, who was replaced on the Watergate case by Mr. Cox, claimed to have had the case 90 percent completed when it was put in Mr. Cox's hands, he again misled his audience. That is because, in the first place, Henry Petersen was referring exclusively to the case concerning the burglary of Democratic headquarters on June 17, 1972, and the subsequent cover-up, and in the second place, because Mr. Petersen's claim referred to a period before it had been revealed that any White House tapes even existed—a revelation that inevitably produced attempts on the part of the Special Prosecutor to gain access to this potentially crucial new evidence.

Nor does the President's explanation of his delay in informing the court of the non-existence of two of the subpoenaed tapes overwhelmingly persuade. If Mr. Nixon is so clear in his mind that he made the June 20, 1972, phone call to John Mitchell on a White House telephone that was not part of his recording system—he even recalls that he was on his way in to dinner when he placed the call—how could it have taken him from late September to late October to ascertain this fact? How is it for that matter, that he wasn't aware there was no such tape back in July when Mr. Cox subpoenaed a tape of the call? If Mr. Nixon is now only deducing from the absence of a tape that he must have made the call on the phone in question, he is merely offering us a theory, not an assertion of fact—and if, on the contrary he is offering a clear recollection of fact, there is hardly any explanation for the many months it took him to remember or disclose it.

The case for the President's delay in discovering the nonexistence of a tape of his crucial April 15 conversation with John Dean is not much more persuasive. The President is known to have spent many hours on June 4th listening to tapes of conversations he'd had with Mr. Dean; the April 15 conversation was among their most important talks; and Mr. Cox subpoenaed this tape also in mid-July. Mr. Nixon, however asks us to accept his ar-

gument that he did not discover that there was no tape until late September and that he had less sense of urgency about finding it than he had about the others because only Mr. Cox—and not the Ervin Committee—had asked for it. Since the President did not intend to produce tapes for the Ervin Committee in any event, and since the Ervin Committee (unlike Mr. Cox) lost its case in court to gain access to them, it is hard to see how the Ervin Committee requests could have figured so prominently in Mr. Nixon's actions at the time.

So much for Mr. Nixon's capacity to twist beyond recognition the already complex matter of the tapes. And so much for his desire once and for all to clarify these matters with candor. Because the President has attached such great importance to this latest "once and for all" effort to set the record straight, we think it equally important to examine his words and the facts to which he alludes with great care. Therefore, we intend to return to the subject of Operation Candor. There is yet much to discuss.

OPERATION DISNEY WORLD (III)

After President Nixon's meetings with the Republican governors in Memphis on Monday, Gov. Tom McCall of Oregon said Mr. Nixon "was very believable today—more believable than I've ever seen him before." White House deputy press secretary Gerald L. Warren, for his part, said Mr. Nixon hadn't told the governors anything he hadn't said before. There is only one way to reconcile these two comments and that is to assume that the governors are either so credulous or so hungry for reassurance that they can be inordinately cheered by a little special attention and a superficial plausibility—what White House aides used to call "stroking." For if Mr. Nixon's private sessions with the Republicans have been anything like his public performance before the Associated Press Managing Editors at Disney World last Saturday, he has been serving up generous portions of half-truths, ellipses and outright distortions as substitutes for facts.

We have already discussed his penchant for rewriting the record of past Presidents and his confusing, not to say misleading, reconstruction of his role with respect to the Watergate investigation and the missing tapes. There is another pattern in his performance that takes the form of directing attention away from his own conduct and toward his opposition as some sort of justification or excuse for what he may have done. Scapegoating is, of course, a very human trait; but even children usually learn quite early that "everybody does it" and "he hit me first" seldom stand up as viable defenses—even when the finger-pointing has some validity.

Mr. Nixon compounds the weakness in this tactic by twisting the facts. Discussing the financing of the 1972 campaign, he said:

"Neither party was without fault . . . They raised \$36 million and some of that, like some of ours, came from corporate sources and was illegal because the law had been changed, and apparently people didn't know it."

Now the fact is that no corporations have admitted or been charged with making illegal gifts to the McGovern campaign, while six have so far been convicted of making large unlawful donations to Mr. Nixon's reelection drive. Furthermore, the law barring such corporate gifts is hardly new; it was enacted in 1907.

There was a similar twist to Mr. Nixon's version of the milk deal—a story he was all too eager to advance. As he told it, the administration's sudden reversal on milk price supports in March 1971 came about not because of large contributions from the dairy lobby, but because "Congress put a gun to our head." Members of Congress comprising

about one-fourth of each house, mostly Democrats and including Senator McGovern, were urging an increase to 85 or 90 per cent of parity. According to Mr. Nixon, the furor got so intense his "legislative leaders" said "there is no way" to avoid passage of a bill and the override of a veto.

There are two things that are unpersuasive about this. First, Democratic pressures don't explain some crucial concurrent events: the dairy lobby's contribution of \$10,000 to the Republicans on March 22, 1971; a presidential meeting with spokesmen for three big dairy co-ops on March 23; another industry contribution of \$25,000 on March 24; and the price support increase on March 25. Nor do Democratic pressures explain either the White House staff memo, alluding to a dairy industry commitment of \$1 million or more, or any number of other curious facts about the size and the timing of the milk lobby's largesse. Moreover, if Senator McGovern and his colleagues did push Mr. Nixon to change his mind, that would be another historic first. Given the President's penchant for vetoes and extraordinary success in making them stick, this would have been the only time we can think of that the administration was cowed by a group of Democrats not numerous enough even to pass a bill—much less to override a veto.

Then there was the "everybody-does-it" approach to the sensitive matter of presidential taping of conversations. In the course of his tortuous remarks about the missing tapes, Mr. Nixon said in passing that the taping equipment used in President Johnson's term "was incidentally much better equipment . . . and I am not saying that critically." Well, so far as we can determine, the equipment President Johnson actually had was in no way comparable to the extensive, indiscriminate automatic voice-actuated system—"little Sony" or not—which President Nixon installed. Close associates of President Johnson can recall only recorders attached to two telephone consoles, one in the Oval Office and one in the presidential bedroom. Each box reportedly had two cylinders with a total recording time of 30 minutes, and the mechanism had to be activated each time by a toggle switch—and by the President's conscious decision that a particular conversation was sensitive enough to be worth recording on tape.

According to his former aides, Mr. Johnson used this equipment, with its limited capabilities, primarily to obtain an exact record of conversations with the military and with foreign diplomats. If Mr. Nixon knows of any other bugging or telephone tapping operations of his predecessor—anything remotely like the all-embracing, voice-activated mechanisms Mr. Nixon himself employed—the facts should be disclosed. If not, the innuendo—"critical" or otherwise—should stop.

There were still more misleading comments, such as Mr. Nixon's description of his telephone conversation with John N. Mitchell on June 20, 1972. As Mr. Nixon tells it now, Mr. Mitchell "expressed chagrin to me that the organization over which he had control could have gotten out of hand in this way." However, on that same day, Mr. Mitchell was expressing no such chagrin publicly. On the contrary, in a formal public statement he was saying, "This committee did not authorize and does not condone the alleged actions of the five men apprehended Saturday morning . . . The Committee for the Re-election of the President is not legally, morally or ethically accountable for actions taken without its knowledge and beyond the scope of its control."

In one sense, it hardly matters to what extent this constitutes a conscious, deliberate effort to distract and deceive, and to what extent Mr. Nixon has really come to believe that the record he's supposedly setting straight is the truth. Either way, such rhe-

torical evasions and distortions place an intolerable burden on the public and the government at a time of severe national stress. In short, when you take the trouble to examine with some care the contents of "Operation Candor," you discover that candor is precisely what is lacking in this latest effort by the President to present us, "once and for all," with the facts which could begin the long, slow process of restoring public confidence in Mr. Nixon's conduct of government.

MILLER INTRODUCES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO CURB ABSENTEEISM

(Mr. MILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, absenteeism is a thorn in the side of Congress that often impedes its effectiveness. While it may not have received the attention it deserves, it is nevertheless an obvious problem that must be confronted by all of us, especially as an election year draws near.

Like any organization, the Congress functions best when there is a high level of membership participation in its activities. The Nation is best served when legislation is considered and voted upon by the entire Congress, not just a simple majority. Congressional absenteeism has often impeded the scheduling of legislative business and has eroded public confidence in the legislative branch's ability and commitment to help lead the Nation.

Since 1953, the Congressional Quarterly has conducted a voting participation study of all Members of Congress. During this period, on the average, voting participation has been between 79 and 90 percent. This year has been a relatively good year. Through August, attendance to recorded votes stood at 89 percent. While this level is not as high as I think it should be, it will nevertheless drop appreciably next year. Traditionally, it has been much harder to roundup quorums and bring bills to a vote in election years.

In most private businesses, a 5 percent absenteeism rate is considered high. Yet the 11 percent rate in Congress this year is the best record since 1959. On many votes that are taken, there is substantially less than 89 percent of the Members voting. In 1972, 330 rollcall votes were taken in the House because no quorum was present. This amounted to 10,140 minutes of lost time.

There have been occasions when poor attendance has delayed floor business or caused adjournment.

On September 5, 1972, when Congress returned after a recess, there were 79 empty seats in the Senate Chamber. The Senators who were present had to wait around an hour before enough Members showed up to conduct business.

When the House met on October 14, 1972, 251 Members were mustered for the first rollcall. Six record votes occurred throughout the day and evening with a maximum of 269 Members voting at any one time. Unable to establish a quorum, the House adjourned late that evening.

Committee absenteeism is perhaps even a greater problem getting things done

around here. Often hearings are poorly attended and markups are delayed or drawn out for lack of quorums.

As we all well know, the congressional workload has increased dramatically in recent years and each day new demands are made upon our time. We could get more done in less time and do a better job in our work if more people would stay in town while we are in session.

The place to start in reasserting congressional responsibilities in this Government is by doing the job we are elected and paid to do. And you can not do that if you are off globetrotting or campaigning. When Congress is in session, the job is here. There could be no better way of promoting public confidence in our abilities and commitment to move America forward than a high level of congressional attendance and voting participation. The Constitution guarantees every State and district representation in the Congress. Each Member of Congress, therefore, has a duty to be the voice of the people and maintain a high level of voting participation.

Other jobholders in this country are hired with the understanding that they will perform certain duties, they will be punctual, and they will report for work regularly. When an employee is chronically absent without extenuating circumstances, he is discharged. The same should hold true for Congress. If a Member can not meet minimum attendance standards, he also should be dismissed. Last year, in fact, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD bluntly told his colleagues that if they were employed by private industry they would be fired.

I have introduced today a constitutional amendment with 10 cosponsors to curb congressional absenteeism by requiring the Congress to expel any Member who was not present and voting on at least 60 percent of the rollcall votes taken in a session. While any percentage figure would be somewhat arbitrary, 60 percent is generally recognized a minimum passing standard and, therefore, more than reasonable for the purposes of curbing absenteeism.

The only exception that would be made for a Member's absence is his hospitalization due to illness or accident. The Congress would be empowered to enforce the article through appropriate legislation.

I hope this amendment will serve as a vehicle for useful constructive debate on how we promote better attendance practices in the Congress.

REVIEW OF VICE-PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, all of us are getting mail from our constituents asking for a thorough, though prompt, review of the nomination of our colleague, Vice President-designate GERALD R. FORD. I support such a review because of the importance of the precedent being set here.

Conceivably, that review may disclose material that will change Congress and

my own favorable views of the character and solid honesty of JERRY FORD—but I think not.

He has worked conscientiously. He has shown an open, "listening" quality of leadership even when his position required partisanship. We know the thorough study he gives to the issues, his honesty and his candor—and we know that these qualities are important to the Nation.

His ideology may be to the right or to the left of some of us, but it is very close to the views expressed by the President and approved overwhelmingly in the past Presidential election, and that is what counts if we are to keep faith with the people.

Washington Post columnist David S. Broder has written of our colleague—

His conscientious preparation, his evident cooperativeness and his candor are making his confirmation hearings an occasion in which the country can not only learn something of the character of its new Vice President but re-learn the value of one of its oldest traditions—the tradition of civility.

When he says, as he did that "my platform, gentlemen, is always to support truth and intelligent compromise," you know that is the authentic Ford credo—and not a line some public relations adviser furnished.

THE NUCLEAR DEFENSE PROGRAM AND ENERGY SUPPLIES

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, an article in the November 21 Washington Post, I am afraid gives the wrong impression concerning the use of electricity for nuclear weapons program. I am referring to the statement in this article about possibly diverting electricity from the nuclear weapons program to the civilian economy.

First, the enriched uranium being produced in the Government's uranium enrichment plants which is referred to in the article, is not for the nuclear weapons program, but for the nuclear power program. Each kilowatt hour of electricity used for enriching uranium is multiplied manifold when the uranium is used to generate electricity in nuclear powerplants. In other words, the uranium enrichment operation provides one of our most important solutions to the energy problem.

Of course, if we had a serious short-term problem with the supply of electricity, a short-term interruption of the uranium enriching operation may be justified. In fact, last year during a particular shortage of electrical energy on the east coast, the diffusion plants were cut back to meet the short-term energy problem. It should be remembered though that we should do everything reasonable to keep up our production and, in fact, increase the production of enriched uranium for our civilian power program, because nuclear power is essential to meeting our energy needs.

Secondly, the inference in the article that the nuclear weapons program results in any aggravation of our energy problem is incorrect for another reason. Due to the vision of the Joint Commit-

tee on Atomic Energy and the Congress in the early 1960's, one of the newest plutonium production reactors for the nuclear weapons program, the NPR reactor at Hanford, was built with electrical generators to utilize the waste heat generated by the reactor. This reactor is now generating nearly 1,000 megawatts of electricity for the energy-short west coast. In other words, the new weapons program is a net generator and not a user of electrical energy.

The above-mentioned article appearing in the Washington Post of November 21, 1973, follows:

U.S. PRESSES RATION-FREE ENERGY HUNT (By Thomas O'Toole)

The federal government pressed its search yesterday for ways of easing the energy crisis without resorting to rationing. A nationwide ban on Sunday driving and moving into the civilian economy the massive amounts of electricity used to make uranium for nuclear weapons were among the considerations.

These steps are being urgently studied by the White House in addition to a whole raft of other possibilities, such as a ban on weekend gasoline sales, closing national parks to automobiles, shutting down shopping centers on Sundays and prohibiting the sale of fuels for private power boats and aircraft.

"We want to consider every possible option we have before we make a move on rationing," one energy source close to the White House said. "We still consider rationing our last resort."

More and more energy experts, however, called for an immediate start to gasoline rationing, at least partly on the ground that it will take six months to impress the public with the seriousness of the shortage.

"We need to ration gasoline now," said Rawleigh Warner, chairman of the Mobile Oil Corp. and outgoing chairman of the American Petroleum Institute, "not only to save fuel but to get the message across so the public fully understands it next spring."

Another reason to ration gasoline now, said S. David Freeman, director of the Ford Foundation's Energy Project, is to allow refineries to turn their full attention this winter to the production of heating oil.

"More than 25 per cent of the petroleum we use goes right to the automobile," Freeman said. "It's one of the end uses we can really save on."

The White House, emphasizing alternatives to rationing, studied proposals for a ban on Sunday driving and gasoline sales that a Cabinet Task Force on Energy is believed to have sent to President Nixon for his consideration.

"What we're doing is to look at more rigorous conservation measures instead of rationing," one White House aide said. "We're preparing for rationing in case it comes, but we want to look hard at every alternative we have to rationing."

One alternative is the study begun this week by the Federal Power Commission to see if large amounts of electricity can be diverted from the production of enriched uranium to the huge electric companies of the Middle West and Northeast. As much as 3 per cent of the electricity consumed in the United States is used to enrich uranium, so that even a fraction of that would save electric companies a massive amount of the oil they now burn to make power.

Twice before, the U.S. allowed shipment of its uranium-making electricity to the Midwest and Northeast, both times in the summer of 1970 when a heat wave and power plant breakdowns threatened blackouts in Illinois, Michigan and New York.

The U.S. now produces 3.8 million kilowatts of power to enrich uranium for weapons and for electric companies. The uranium is produced at three plants, one in Oak

Ridge, Tenn., a second at Portsmouth, Ohio, and a third at Paducah, Ky. The first time it did so the Atomic Energy Commission diverted 650,000 kilowatts to private electric companies, the second time 250,000 kilowatts.

If the AEC were to agree to a diversion of power this time, it would have to slow down drastically its production of uranium for power plants, which it is now stockpiling in anticipation of the huge needs for uranium in the next 10 years. The stockpile is to meet the needs of the U.S., Japan and all of Western Europe. The United States has signed export contracts with the Japanese and Europeans.

Meanwhile, the American Automobile Association said that while gasoline supplies are holding up well Thanksgiving travelers may find many service stations closed.

"The thing that should be emphasized is that there will be no major inconvenience for holiday travel," Kay Aldous of the AAA said yesterday, "although over the holiday it is likely that a number of stations will be operating on schedules similar to what they've been doing on Sunday since Labor Day."

The Air Transport Association warned that the Thanksgiving weekend may produce "one of the biggest crunches in airline history." It said airlines expect to carry four million passengers this Thanksgiving, but the fuel squeeze means it has to do so on 500 fewer flights than last year.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. METCALFE, for Wednesday, November 28, 1973, on account of official business.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for November 26 and 27, on account of illness.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, for Wednesday, November 28, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, for 1 hour, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TOWELL of Nevada) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ESCH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. RONCALLO of New York, for 30 minutes, December 5.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas, for 3 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Miss JORDAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FULTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEHMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VANIK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROGERS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAPPELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MELCHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to review and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TOWELL of Nevada) and to revise and extend their remarks:)

Mr. KEMP in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in five instances.

Mr. CARTER in three instances.

Mr. SARASIN in two instances.

Mr. SYMMS.

Mr. HARVEY.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. FRENZEL in three instances.

Mr. BAUMAN in two instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. TREEN.

Mr. HUDNUT.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. LENT in five instances.

Mr. ROUSSELOT in two instances.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mrs. HOLT.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri.

Mr. HUBER.

Mr. SHOUP.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Miss JORDAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia in six instances.

Mr. LEHMAN in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. ASPIN in 10 instances.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. BRASCO.

Mr. CORMAN in two instances.

Mr. RYAN.

Mr. LEGGETT.

Mr. DRINAN in five instances.

Mrs. CHISHOLM.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. FRASER in five instances.

Mr. REES.

Mr. FASCELL in five instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. HANNA in six instances.

Mr. DELLUMS in six instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.

Mrs. BURKE of California in 10 instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania in 10 instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS.

Mr. GUNTER.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mr. PATTEN in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1106. An act to amend the Federal Reports Act to avoid undue delays in the col-

lection of information by Government agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on November 26, 1973, present to the President, for his approval bills of the House of the following title.

H.R. 1353. For the relief of Toy Louie Lin Heong;

H.R. 1356. For the relief of Ann E. Shepherd;

H.R. 1367. For the relief of Bertha Alicia Sierra;

H.R. 1463. For the relief of Emilia Majowicz;

H.R. 1696. For the relief of Sun Hwa Koo Kim;

H.R. 1955. For the relief of Rosa Ines D'Elia;

H.R. 2513. For the relief of Jose Carlos Recalde Martorella;

H.R. 2628. For the relief of Anka Kosanovic;

H.R. 3207. For the relief of Mrs. Enid R. Pope;

H.R. 3754. For the relief of Mrs. Bruna Turni, Graziella Turni, and Antonello Turni;

H.R. 6334. To provide for the uniform application of the position classification and general schedule pay rate provisions of title 5, United States Code, to certain employees of the Selective Service System;

H.R. 6828. For the relief of Edith E. Carrera;

H.R. 6829. For the relief of Mr. Jose Antonio Trias;

H.R. 9474. To amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the monthly rates of disability and death pensions and dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9575. To provide for the enlistment and commissioning of women in the Coast Guard Reserve, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10840. To amend the act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for members of the police force of the Library of Congress; and

H.R. 10937. To extend the life of the June 5, 1972, grand jury of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Miss JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 28, 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:

1579. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the size of the Executive Protective Service; to the Committee on Public Works.

1580. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting an amendment to the approved prospectus for the Federal Office Building proposed for construction at Mount Vernon, Ill., pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

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. MORGAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 1443 (Rept. No. 93-664). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 718. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11324. A bill to provide for daylight saving time on a year-round basis for a 2-year trial period (Rept. No. 93-665). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 719. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11010. A bill to assure opportunities for employment and training to unemployed and underemployed persons.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 1817. A bill to provide for the striking of national medals to honor the late J. Edgar Hoover (Rept. No. 93-666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 11575. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

H.R. 11576. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 11577. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Energy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. COTTER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FULTON, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SISK, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.R. 11578. A bill to direct the President to halt all exports of gasoline, distillate fuel oil, propane gas, and residual fuel until he determines that no shortage of such fuels exists in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.R. 11579. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of disability compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 11580. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that licenses for the operation of broadcasting stations may be issued and renewed for terms of 4 years and to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for the renewal of such licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 11581. A bill to amend section 133 of title 28, United States Code, to increase by two the number of district judges for the eastern district of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENHOLM:

H.R. 11582. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act in order to exempt motor vehicles purchased by persons residing in certain rural areas from certain emission control requirements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 11583. A bill to amend the Age Dis-

crimination in Employment Act of 1967 to remove the 65-year age limitation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11584. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to repeal the recently added provision for the establishment of Professional Standards Review Organizations to review services covered under the medicare and medicaid programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ESCH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, and Mr. BADILLO):

H.R. 11585. A bill to limit the medicare inpatient hospital deductible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENZEL (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RINALDO, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. BIESTER, and Mr. KEMP):

H.R. 11586. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for more effective regulation of elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 11587. A bill to improve and extend the Public Health and National Health Service corps scholarship training program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 11588. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11589. A bill to provide emergency security assistance authorizations for Israel and Cambodia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUBER:

H.R. 11590. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer insulating his residence for the years 1973, 1974, and 1975 during the period of maximum fuel shortages, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of work and materials to insulate such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDNUT:

H.R. 11591. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for programs for the diagnosis and treatment of hemophilia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KETCHUM:

H.R. 11592. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to change the requirements for extension of deadlines for compliance with implementation plans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 11593. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on the amounts paid for communication services shall not apply to the amount of the State and local taxes paid for such services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself and Mr. RUPPE):

H.R. 11594. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to conduct programs of exploration for oil and gas on Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 11595. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 11596. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a broader and more equitable tax base; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 11597. A bill to provide for Federal regulation of foreign banks and other foreign persons establishing, acquiring, operating, or controlling banking subsidiaries in the United States (including its possessions), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SISK (by request):

H.R. 11598. A bill to establish an improved program for the benefit of producers and consumers of extra long staple cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 11599. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from imposing certain seatbelt standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 11600. A bill to provide standards of fair personal information practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11601. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to prohibit the disclosure of an individual's social security number or related records for any purpose without his consent unless specifically required by law, and to provide that (unless so required) no individual may be compelled to disclose or furnish his social security number for any purpose not directly related to the operation of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SYMMS (for himself, Mr. CAMP,

Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. FISHER, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. GROSS, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. CRANE, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. RUTH, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. GOODLING):

H.R. 11602. A bill to repeal the Occupational Safety and Health Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11603. A bill to create an Upper Mississippi River Recreational Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Illinois:

H.R. 11604. A bill to establish an independent Special Prosecutor and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself and Mr. BRAY) (by request):

H.J. Res. 832. Joint resolution authorizing increased production of petroleum from the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve for national defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER (for himself, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ZWACH,

Mr. BUTLER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. THONE, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. TREEN, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. FROELICH, and Mr. KETCHUM):

H.J. Res. 833. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the attendance of Senators and Representatives at sessions of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH:

H. Con. Res. 383. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the missing in action in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H. Con. Res. 384. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect

to climate manipulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH:

H. Res. 720. Resolution concerning protection of human rights in Chile, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DRINAN:
H.R. 11605. A bill for the relief of Mina Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:
H.R. 11606. A bill for the relief of Ida Kunstmann, Waldemar F. Kunstmann, and Anneliese E. Kunstmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri:
H.R. 11607. A bill for the relief of Tri-State Motor Transit Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:
H.R. 11608. A bill for the relief of Robert

H. Glazier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

365. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Committee, Coral Gables, Fla., relative to fuel for the operation of the Coral Gables municipal transit system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE—Tuesday, November 27, 1973

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who called men of old to the service of the Nation and hast not ceased to call, call us to a life higher than we have ever known or lived. In days which cry aloud for leaders, make us faithful, wise, and good. Reach down into the depths of our being to refine and renew our souls, strengthening us in every endeavor, empowering us in all that pertains to that righteousness which exalts a nation. Across the tolling hours, be the companion of our souls to strengthen our weakness and steady our anxieties, to calm our restless spirits and control our fevered tempers, granting us courage for cowardice, and faith for cynicism. Amid all that is transient and temporal keep us loyal to the transcendent and eternal, testing all our actions by our conscience, and by the words and spirit of One who is Lord and Master, in whose name we pray. 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., November 27, 1973.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 26, 1973, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. 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 OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the acting Republican leader desire recognition?

Mr. TAFT. No, I do not desire recognition at this time, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), was to be recognized for 15 minutes at this time.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be given control of the time allotted to the distinguished majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time be charged against the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUBLESTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I request permission to be absent from the Senate from November 30 until December 9 for the purpose of visiting Iran on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond 10:30 a.m., with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Office of Oil and Gas" for the fiscal year 1974 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations. Referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the U.S. Secret Service of the Department of the Treasury for "Salaries and Expenses," for fiscal year 1974, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation. Referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION ON NEGOTIATED CONTRACTS

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on certain negotiated contracts for the period January 1, 1973, through June 30, 1973 (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences.

STOCKPILE REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report to the Congress on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period January 1 to June 30, 1973 (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

MONTHLY LIST OF GAO REPORTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of reports of the General Accounting Office of the previous month (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Government Operations.