

ADJOURNMENT TO 10:30 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate. I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:24 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 5, 1974, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 4, 1974:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the Presi-

dent under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. William V. McBride, xxx-xx-xx FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Louis L. Wilson, Jr., xxx-xx-xx FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. John W. Pauly, xxxx FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Bryce Poe, II, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named (Navy enlisted scientific education program) graduates for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Barbee, Forest L.
Hayes, Daniel P.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 4, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John F. Warren, National Church of God, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O mighty God, be the auditor of all the business transactions of this House. Keep each Member honest to the nth degree. Help each servant maintain the sensitivity necessary to serve. Give each heart vigor that willingly accomplishes the task. Give each Member energy to keep busy doing the work of the people. Give each one grace to call on You for a refreshing supply of life.

All-seeing and all-knowing God, You see through the coverup we make for our failings and sins. Give us the moral courage to stand or fall on our own accomplishments.

Help us to rely upon the righteousness which is to be had in Christ. 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 PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 28, 1974:

H.R. 5621. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the presentation of a flag of the United States for deceased members of the Ready Reserve and for deceased members of the Reserve who die after completing 20 years of service, but before becoming entitled to retired pay.

On May 31, 1974:

H.R. 12670. An act to amend section 301 of title 37, United States Code, relating to incentive pay, to attract and retain volunteers for aviation crew member duties, and for other purposes.

On June 1, 1974:

H.R. 6541. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain mineral interests of the United States to the owner or owners of record of certain lands in the State of South Carolina;

H.R. 6542. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain mineral interests of the United States to the owner or owners of record of certain lands in the State of South Carolina;

H.R. 7087. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain land in Missouri to Grace F. Sisler, the record owner of the surface thereof;

H.R. 10284. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain rights in the State of Florida;

H.R. 10942. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918 (40 Stat. 755), as amended, to extend and adapt its provisions to the Convention between the United States and the Government of Japan for the protection of migratory birds and birds in danger of extinction and their environment, concluded at the city of Tokyo, March 4, 1973; and

H.R. 12920. An act to authorize appropriations to carry out the Peace Corps Act, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S.J. Res. 206. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy one citizen of the Kingdom of Laos.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

COL. JOHN SHERMAN

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

MURRAY SWARTZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6411) for the relief of Murray Swartz.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

ESTELLE M. FASS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 362) to refer the bill (H.R. 7209) for the relief of Estelle M. Fass to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

RITA SWANN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1342) for the relief of Rita Swann.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

LEONARD ALFRED BROWNRIGG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2629) for the relief of Leonard Alfred Brownrigg.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

FAUSTINO MURGIA-MELENDEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7535) for the relief of Faustino Murgia-Melendez.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

ROMEO LANCIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4172) for the relief of Romeo Lancin.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SELL RESERVED PHOSPHATE INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10626) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in certain lands in Florida to John Carter and Martha B. Carter.

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

H.R. 10626

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and di-

rected to convey, sell, and quitclaim to John Carter and Martha B. Carter of Lake Wales, Florida, all phosphate interests now owned by the United States in and to the herein-after described lands located in Polk County, Florida: The northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section thirty-three in township thirty south of range twenty-seven east of the the Tallahassee meridian Florida, containing thirty-nine acres and ninety-hundredths of an acre.

Sec. 2 In the event that the Secretary of the Interior determines that the lands described in the first section are not prospectively valuable for phosphate, he shall convey the reserved phosphate interests to John Carter and Martha B. Carter upon the payment of a sum of \$200 to reimburse the United States for the administrative costs of the conveyance; otherwise, the phosphate interests shall be sold to John Carter and Martha B. Carter upon the payment of a sum equal to \$200 plus the fair market value of the phosphate interests as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary. No conveyance shall be made unless such payment is made within one year after the Secretary notifies John Carter and Martha B. Carter of the total amount to be paid.

Sec. 3. Proceeds from the sale made hereunder shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 3 through 19, strike out the present text and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 2. The Secretary shall require the deposit of a sum of money which he deems sufficient to cover estimated administrative costs of this Act. If a conveyance is not made pursuant to this Act, and the administrative costs exceed the deposit, the Secretary shall bill the applicant for the outstanding amount, but if the amount of the deposit exceeds the actual administrative costs, the Secretary shall refund the excess.

Sec. 3. No conveyance shall be made unless application for conveyance is filed with the Secretary within six months of the date of approval of this Act and unless within the time specified by him payment is made to the Secretary of (1) administrative costs of the conveyance and (2) the fair market value of the interests to be conveyed. The amount of the payment required shall be the difference between the amount deposited and the full amount required to be paid under this section. If the amount deposited exceeds the full amount required to be paid, the applicant shall be given a credit or refund for the excess.

Sec. 4. The term "administrative costs" as used in this Act includes, but is not limited to, all costs of (1) conducting an exploratory program to determine the character of the phosphate deposits in the land, (2) evaluating the data obtained under the exploratory program to determine the fair market value of the mineral rights to be conveyed, and (3) preparing and issuing the instrument of conveyance.

Sec. 5. Moneys paid to the Secretary for administrative costs shall be paid to the agency which rendered the service, and deposited to the appropriation then current. Moneys paid for the minerals or mineral interests conveyed shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

GABRIEL EDGAR BUCHOWIECKI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3190) for the relief of Gabriel Edgar Buchowiecki.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

LEONOR LOPEZ

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 280) for the relief of Leonor Lopez.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

ESTATE OF PETER BOSCAS, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2637) for the relief of the estate of Peter Boscas, deceased.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

MARCOS ROJOS RODRIGUEZ

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 724) for the relief of Marcos Rojas Rodriguez.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 724

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marcos Rojas Rodriguez of San Antonio, Texas, the sum of \$15,000, in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Marcos Rojas Rodriguez against the United States for compensation for permanent personal injuries suffered by him as the result of the accidental explosion of a Mark I bomb fuse (Barlow type) which was found by Marcos Rojas Rodriguez, on May 28, 1925, in a potato field north of and adjacent to Kelly Field, Texas: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this bill in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of service rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this bill shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6: Strike "\$15,000" and insert "\$10,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

WELCOME TO PASTOR JOHN F. WARREN

(Mrs. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to welcome Pastor John F. Warren, the senior minister of the National Church of God in Washington, who opened our session today with his thoughtful prayer.

Mr. Warren is a constituent of mine, living in Hillcrest Heights, and has served as missionary pastor in the Bahama Islands. In his 4 years of service to the National Church of God, he and his wonderful family have earned the great respect and the deep affection of his congregation and his community.

Mr. Warren is currently a member of the State board of counselors for the Church of God, and is also an active member of the State Evangelism Commission. It is a great pleasure to have Pastor Warren and his family with us today.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 15074, CAMPAIGN FINANCING BILL

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 15074, the campaign financing bill.

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

There was no objection.

JUDGE JIM LAWLESS MURDERED BY LETTER BOMB

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a friend of mine, Judge Jim Lawless of the Superior Court of Benton and Franklin Counties of Washington State was murdered in his office by a letter bomb.

The tragedy of the loss of this kind man, and his wisdom, counsel, and justice to the thousands of people he served is overshadowed by the enormity of this crime and the cowardice of his murderer.

Our society is not sick today, but there are apparently some sick individuals who think that such crimes as murder by letter bomb can somehow be justified. I say they cannot under any circumstance.

Public servants such as Jim Lawless absolutely must be protected from acts of violence if our country is to survive.

The death of Judge Jim Lawless is our loss, partially because the murder of public officials constitutes the destruction of our freedoms. It is democracy's loss. Such crimes must stop.

I mourn the death of my friend and extend my deepest sympathy to his family, but I mourn also for a society in which such crimes occur.

CREATIVE JOURNALISM

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about "creative journalism" CBS's Dan Rather tried to outdo himself in his WTOP "First Line Report," Wednesday, May 29. In speaking of Dr. Kissinger's Middle East negotiations, he rather gratuitously offered:

But Kissinger's assignment was to help the President fight off impeachment by reaching a disengagement agreement with Israel and Syria and Kissinger it now appears will be finally bringing back the good news.

If anyone has doubted the charges of slanted, biased newscasting this is a prime example. What evidence does Mr. Rather, or anyone else, have that the President's assignment to Dr. Kissinger to put out the flames of the most explosive situation in the world was actually "to help the President fight off impeachment."

COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reiterate my support for the Bolling-Martin committee reorganization proposal in a very particular sense. As my colleagues will recall, one controversial feature of that plan is the transfer of jurisdiction over campaign finance from the House Administration Committee to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

I must observe that despite what I understand to be the best efforts of the chairman, Mr. Hays, the members of that committee have signalled very clearly that they do not wish to retain election reform jurisdiction, that they are not really interested in this vital subject and would be pleased to see the responsibility transferred to others.

On six different occasions during the last 2 weeks the majority of the committee has voted—by absence of a quorum—to relinquish jurisdiction.

On May 22, 15 Members showed up but the meeting was canceled within one-half hour because attendance had dropped to 10—4 short of a quorum.

On the next day a scheduled markup was canceled—again for lack of a quorum.

On May 29, only 10 of the committee's 26 members appeared so the markup was once more postponed.

The next day, May 30, attendance was down to nine and again no business could be conducted.

On Monday of this week, June 3, 11 Members appeared for an afternoon markup session—three short of a quorum.

And now I have been informed that the committee did not even assemble this morning because a telephone check indicated that the chairman would be forced to preside over a nearly empty committee room. In addition, I have been

informed that the meeting rescheduled for the afternoon has just been cancelled.

Mr. Speaker, in light of this performance is it any wonder that the committee has covered only 8 pages of the 30-page bill, despite more than a dozen meetings since March 26?

Given the unprecedented crisis of confidence in the country today, and the overwhelming public support for campaign reform, there is only one word for the sorry record I have just recited—scandalous.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, campaign finance reform is the single most positive response that Congress can make to the Watergate scandal. However, the House Administration Committee, which is presently considering campaign finance legislation, has been unable to make or keep a quorum to conduct business for six straight meetings.

On May 22, 15 out of 26 committee members were present, but the meeting had to be cancelled after only about half an hour because 7 of those members present left. On May 29, only 10 members were present, on May 30, only 9, and on June 3, only 11. Meetings on May 23 and June 4 were cancelled beforehand because an insufficient number of members said they would attend.

The present situation is intolerable. The election bill is of top priority, but we cannot make a quorum.

Members have chosen to go to other legislative business. For example, six members of the committee are also on the Education and Labor Committee which is presently involved in the important ESEA and pension reform conference. Five members are on the Banking and Currency Committee which is presently considering the housing and community development bill. Three members are on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which is acting on the biomedical research, health manpower, health planning and development, and clean water bills. Three members are part of the Judiciary Committee's impeachment investigation.

The committee's failure to muster a quorum six times is a powerful argument for the single committee proposal of the Bolling committee report—the bipartisan effort to reform the committee structure that was so ignominiously scuttled in the secrecy of the Democratic caucus.

The chairman of the committee, who has often in the past been criticized for dilatory tactics, has not been to blame. He has diligently scheduled meetings whenever it appeared that the committee might be able to get a quorum. The leadership of the House must find a way to break the impasse. We cannot let ourselves be shackled by the lack of a quorum. There must be a solution, and we have to find it. And the solution cannot cut short deliberation or debate.

Mr. Speaker, public confidence in Congress has reached an all-time low. We

must do everything possible to assure that election reform legislation is given expeditious but complete consideration. The public will not ask how difficult our problems were. It will only ask whether we produced good well-considered legislation.

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION OF COASTAL RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting the first annual report on the management and conservation of our coastal resources, as required by the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972. This report covers fiscal year 1973, a year of study and organization preparatory to the financial implementation of the act in fiscal year 1974.

In the spirit of the New Federalism, this program constitutes a partnership between the States and the Federal Government. It will seek to solve what some have described as the dilemma of conservation versus development in the ecologically fragile coastal zone area of our country. Together with the Congress we recognize this dilemma, but neither branch of Government believes conservation and development are mutually exclusive. We must permit neither development nor conservation to become completely dominant. By systematically weighing the benefits and the costs of proposed actions, we can provide for both conservation and progress.

Together with the land use legislation now pending in the Congress, the Coastal Zone Act would provide our Nation with complete geographic coverage for this important State-Federal planning partnership. We look to land use and coastal zone plans to assist us in preserving our natural heritage and in permitting orderly development of our resources for the common good. This is especially important in the coastal areas where most of our population is concentrated, where many of our recreational and employment opportunities are centered, and where many forces compete for our resources.

Significant groundwork has been laid in planning for implementation of the Coastal Zone Act. As a result, I believe we are able to look forward to rapid progress as the Federal Government begins this important task in partnership with State governments.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 4, 1974.

ANNUAL REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF RADIATION CONTROL FOR HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1968—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93-316)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President

of the United States; which was read and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1973 annual report on the administration of the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-602), as prepared by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 4, 1974.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3 (b) of rule XXVII, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

After all motions to suspend the rules have been entertained and debated, and after those motions to be determined by "nonrecord" votes have been disposed of, the Chair will then put the question on each motion on which the further proceedings were postponed.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 263]

Anderson, Calif.	Fraser	Rooney, N.Y.
Badillo	Gray	Rousselot
Bell	Gubser	Roybal
Blester	Gude	Runnels
Bingham	Hanna	Ryan
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Stanton, James V.
Bowen	Hawkins	Stark
Brasco	Hébert	Stubblefield
Brown, Calif.	Hinshaw	Talcott
Burke, Calif.	Hollifield	Teague
Burke, Fla.	Howard	Thompson, N.J.
Burton	Huber	Udall
Carey, N.Y.	Hutchinson	Van Deerlin
Chisholm	Jarman	Vander Jagt
Clausen, Don H.	Jones, Tenn.	Waldie
Cochran	Kyros	Ware
Conyers	Landgrebe	Whalen
Coughlin	McCloskey	Widnall
Culver	McKinney	Wiggins
Daniels, Dominick V.	McSpadden	Wilson, Bob
Danielson	Macdonald	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Dellums	Martin, Nebr.	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Dickinson	Mazzoli	Wyllie
Diggs	Meeds	Young, Tex.
Dorn	Metcalfe	Zwach
Drinan	Murphy, N.Y.	
Foley	Pike	
Ford	Podell	
	Price, Tex.	
	Rees	
	Reid	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 349 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) to authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 40

Whereas access to information and ideas is indispensable to the development of human potential, the advancement of civilization, and the continuance of enlightened self-government; and

Whereas the preservation and the dissemination of information and ideas are the primary purpose and function of libraries and information centers; and

Whereas the growth and augmentation of the Nation's libraries and information centers are essential if all Americans are to have reasonable access to adequate services of libraries and information centers; and

Whereas new achievements in technology offer a potential for enabling libraries and information centers to serve the public more fully, expeditiously, and economically; and

Whereas maximum realization of the potential inherent in the use of advanced technology by libraries and information centers requires cooperation through planning for, and coordination of, the services of libraries and information centers; and

Whereas the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is developing plans for meeting national needs for library and information services and for coordinating activities to meet those needs; and

Whereas productive recommendations for expanding access to libraries and information services will require public understanding and support as well as that of public and private libraries and information centers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the President of the United States is authorized to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1977.

(b) (1) The purpose of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Conference") shall be to develop recommendations for the further improvement of the Nation's libraries and information centers and their use by the public, in accordance with the policies set forth in the preamble to this joint resolution.

(2) The Conference shall be composed of, and bring together—

(A) representatives of local, statewide, regional, and national institutions, agencies, organizations, and associations which provide library and information services to the public;

(B) representatives of educational institutions, agencies, organizations, and associations (including professional and scholarly associations for the advancement of education and research);

(C) persons with special knowledge of, and special competence in, technology as it may be used for the improvement of library and information services; and

(D) representatives of Federal, State, and local governments, professional and lay people, and other members of the general public.

(c) (1) The Conference shall be planned and conducted under the direction of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(2) In administering this joint resolution, the Commission shall—

(A) when appropriate, request the cooperation and assistance of other Federal

departments and agencies in order to carry out its responsibilities;

(B) make technical and financial assistance (by grant, contract, or otherwise) available to the States to enable them to organize and conduct conferences and other meetings in order to prepare for the Conference; and

(C) prepare and make available background materials for the use of delegates to the Conference and associated State conferences, and prepare and distribute such reports of the Conference and associated State conferences as may be appropriate.

(3) (A) Each Federal department and agency is authorized and directed to cooperate with, and provide assistance to, the Commission upon its request under clause (A) of paragraph (2); and, for that purpose, each Federal department and agency is authorized to provide personnel to the Commission. The Commission shall be deemed to be a part of any executive or military department of which a request is made under clause (A) of paragraph (2).

(B) The Librarian of Congress is authorized to detail personnel to the Commission, upon request, to enable the Commission to carry out its functions under this joint resolution.

(4) In carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, the Commission is authorized to engage such personnel as may be necessary, without regard for the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments to the competitive civil service, and without regard for chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(5) The Commission is authorized to publish and distribute for the Conference the reports authorized under this joint resolution.

(6) Members of the Conference may, while away from their homes or regular places of business and attending the Conference, be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as may be allowed under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons serving without pay. Such expenses may be paid by way of advances, reimbursement, or in installments as the Commission may determine.

(d) A final report of the Conference, containing such findings and recommendations as may be made by the Conference, shall be submitted to the President not later than one hundred and twenty days following the close of the Conference, which final report shall be made public and, within ninety days after the receipt by the President, transmitted to the Congress together with a statement of the President containing the President's recommendations with respect to such report.

(e) (1) There is hereby established a twenty-eight member advisory committee of the Conference composed of (A) at least three members of the Commission designated by the Chairman thereof; (B) five persons designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives with no more than three being members of the House of Representatives; (C) five persons designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate with no more than three being members of the Senate; and (D) not more than fifteen persons appointed by the President. Such advisory committee shall assist and advise the Commission in planning and conducting the Conference. The Chairman of the Commission shall serve as Chairman of the Conference.

(2) The Chairman of the Commission is authorized, in his discretion, to establish, prescribe functions for, and appoint members to, such advisory and technical committees as may be necessary to assist and advise the Conference in carrying out its functions.

(3) Members of any committee established under this subsection who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United

States shall, while attending to the business of the Conference, be entitled to receive compensation therefor at a rate fixed by the President but not exceeding the rate of pay specified at the time of such service for grade GS-18 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including traveltime. Such members may, while away from their homes or regular places of business, be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as may be authorized under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(f) The Commission shall have authority to accept, on behalf of the Conference, in the name of the United States, grants, gifts, or requests of money for immediate disbursement by the Commission in furtherance of the Conference. Such grants, gifts, or requests offered the Commission, shall be paid by the donor or his representative to the Treasurer of the United States, whose receipts shall be their acquittance. The Treasurer of the United States shall enter such grants, gifts, and bequests in a special account to the credit of the Commission for the purposes of this joint resolution.

(g) For the purpose of this joint resolution, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(h) There are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitations such sums, but not to exceed \$10,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution. Such sums shall remain available for obligation until expended.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1977."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the gentleman from Minnesota is opposed to the Senate joint resolution?

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Minnesota opposed to the Senate joint resolution?

Mr. QUIE. No, I am not opposed to the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Senate joint resolution, and I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to give their full support to the measure before us this afternoon, Senate Joint Resolution 40, as amended, a measure to authorize a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1977.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Kentucky, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor (Mr. PERKINS), and to the gentleman from Minnesota, the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee (Mr. QUIE), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) for their assistance in seeing this measure through the committee.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 40, as amended, authorizes a White House Conference on Library and Information Services to be called in 1977. The Conference will include representatives of local, State, regional, and national institutions concerned with library and information services; public officials; and members of the general public.

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is charged with planning and conducting the Conference, and the Commission will be assisted in its work by a 28-member advisory committee made up of three members of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, five persons designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate, five persons designated by the Speaker of the House, and not more than 15 persons appointed by the President of the United States.

The Committee on Education and Labor has supported this conference because our society is now facing what has been called an "explosion" of knowledge and information, and a consequent growth in printed and other materials.

In light of this geometric growth of library and information materials, the committee believes it essential that a national conference on library and information services be called to discuss the future needs of users and providers of library and information services.

Such a conference can do much to develop principles and methods of cooperation among the States, and between the States and the Federal Government with a view toward improving the coordination and effectiveness of library services at local, State, and Federal levels.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

Mr. Speaker, let me call to the attention of my colleagues the bipartisan support enjoyed by Senate Joint Resolution 40. A similar measure calling for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services (H.J. Res. 737) was introduced by our distinguished Vice President, Mr. Ford, then minority leader of the House. As chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education, I sponsored House Joint Resolution 766, calling for the White House Conference; and our colleague from West Virginia, the Honorable KEN HECHLER, introduced still another such measure, House Joint Resolution 302.

SUPPORTING TESTIMONY

Testimony and communications received by the Select Education Subcommittee presented the case for enactment of the resolution in convincing terms. The president of the American Library Society, John B. Harlan, from my own Third District of Indiana, stated that—

Libraries and information centers are not only a precious tool for the individual in filling his or her educational, occupational, and recreational needs and desires but are also the foundation of our freedom and democracy and the foundation of future civilizations.

The White House Conference on Library and Information Services, Mr. Harlan went on to say—

Seems to me to be the most logical way in which to attain the long-range planning

necessary for effective strengthening and expansion of these treasured national resources.

Testimony from Dr. Jean E. Lowrie, president of the American Library Association, told us that—

The public forum a White House Conference provides would enable a knowledgeable body of citizens to focus national attention on the fiscal problems of libraries.

Dr. Frederick Burkhardt, Chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, which would direct the planning and conduct of the White House Conference, testified that—

The Commission . . . favors this conference because it will reinforce and strengthen the work being undertaken by the National Commission . . . and because a White House Conference will draw the attention of the American public to their libraries in a positive and productive way.

The Librarian of Congress, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, told us that—

A conference in Washington which would reflect all aspects of librarianship—school, public, state, academic, special, Federal, and computer technology—would have a . . . meritorious effect on the future of library and information services in this country.

Dr. Mumford added that "The time has come, I believe, for consideration and discussion of what has been achieved in years of phenomenal growth and of what needs to be achieved in the future."

OTHER SUPPORT

In addition to these and other distinguished witnesses who testified before the subcommittee, a number of organizations submitted statements for the record. Among those endorsing enactment of the resolution were spokesmen for the Association of Research Libraries, the American Association of University Professors, the National Audiovisual Association, the Association of Educational and Communications Technology, the Urban Library Trustee Association, the American Foundation for the Blind, and many other groups with a direct interest in high quality library and information services.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can all agree with these distinguished experts that as our Nation prepares for its third century of advance and development, we need a wide-ranging, broad review of library and information services and their users. Such a review can be developed in a White House Conference.

Let me address, Mr. Speaker, some of the specific topics the Conference can be expected to take up.

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY SYSTEM

On the basis of my service on the Joint Committee on Printing, I would hope that the White House Conference would give attention to the future of the depository library system.

Witnesses at our subcommittee hearings on the resolution testified about the importance of the depository library system "not only for business and industry, for the scientist and sociologist, the scholar and the student, but for countless others who find Government publications increasingly useful, even indispensable in their diverse activities."

We were told as well of the need to modernize the depository library system so that it can function effectively in making Government publications available

to all Americans through their local libraries.

Careful examination of the strengths and weaknesses of depository libraries is therefore required as a basis for future development of the depository system.

The White House Conference on Library and Information Services and the State conferences beforehand will provide a unique opportunity for the people to examine in depth the extent to which the depository library system can effectively serve the public.

ARCHIVES

The role of libraries as archival institutions—in general and with special reference to Federal activities—is also worthy of the attention of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services. I was pleased, therefore, to hear Dr. James B. Rhoads, the Archivist of the United States, tell the subcommittee:

Any consideration of the issues of information science should include the problems of archival agencies and manuscript repositories. Like libraries and information centers, they too provide basic information and educational services.

NEW ERA OF TECHNOLOGY

Mr. Speaker, the record of the subcommittee hearings makes clear that, in the judgment of the authoritative witnesses, we are on the threshold of a new era in library and information services. For example, television is having a significant impact on library service today should therefore also be discussed during the State conferences, as well as during the White House Conference.

The best services that are being offered today in a few libraries should be available to many. For instance, in my own State of Indiana, the Monroe County Library in Bloomington is participating with the Public Broadcasting Service's Public Television Library in a videocassette "Watchbook" program which offers library patrons viewing facilities for more than 150 programs on a variety of topics.

The Public Television Library assumed the cost of providing the Monroe County Library with a videocassette player, television receiver, and a specially designed viewing carrel, and assumed the cost of cassette dubbing. Since the inception of the project in July 1973, library patron usage have averaged 50 videocassettes weekly.

WTIU in Bloomington has also participated in the program, adding some of its community-oriented productions to the collection.

Hoosiers who have "watched" books in the library are enthusiastic about the program. A student described it as "the most progressive, beneficial service I have ever seen a library offer." A factory worker noted that "videocassette players allow freedom of choice."

This is only one example, Mr. Speaker, of what new technologies can mean for library and information services, and I think we can agree that all Americans should have access to such technology and not just a privileged few. The White House Conference and the State conferences beforehand will enable many Americans to learn more about the new kinds of library and information service that

television and other technology makes possible.

NEW LINKAGES

Libraries have always worked together in this country, formally or informally. They have exchanged materials for the benefit of their respective patrons. Some have agreed to serve certain users, while others specialize in other types of service. Now technological developments are making possible interconnections of many kinds between and among libraries and information centers. The Federal programs that assist libraries have been helping many of them realize the potential for greater cooperation inherent in the new technology.

As we have been told many times, part of the basic rationale for Federal assistance to libraries is that they can be interlinked for mutual benefit and better service to all Americans. Librarians are not thinking in terms of one national library system, nor do they seek any master plan or blueprint to which all libraries will have to conform. But they do want more extensive interrelationships and linkages of many kinds, and we in Congress should look favorably on these developments, for they can help equalize provision of library services in various parts of the country and to various groups within our society.

Under the Library Services and Construction Act, the States are working toward better coordination of the libraries within their borders. No matter how well the individual State plans for coordination are drawn, however, they inevitably impinge upon and have certain implications for the plans of other nearby States.

Moreover, there is a national interest here that must also be considered. The needs of libraries for personnel of all kinds, for example, cannot be appraised soundly except from a national viewpoint because every State does not have a graduate school of librarianship. This is one example of the reason the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is seeking to determine the national needs for library and information services.

The work of the NCLIS, however, like the process of State planning that is now going on, will not be complete nor will it be fully effective until it is rounded out with the reaction and response of the general public as well as of the professional librarians and information scientists and those who determine policies for libraries and information centers. That response can be obtained through the White House Conference.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge approval of this legislation.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, initially I want to compliment the distinguished chairman of our Select Subcommittee on Education and members of the subcommittee from both sides of the aisle for their continuing efforts to expand and strengthen library and information services for our citizens.

The resolution before us today is another important and significant library bill which has been developed and perfected by the subcommittee under the able and competent leadership of its chairman, JOHN BRADEMAS. I am confident that it is a resolution which every Member of the House will be able to support.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 40, as amended, requests and authorizes the President to convene a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1977. Ten million dollars is authorized to plan and conduct the White House Conference and to assist the States and Territories in the planning and conduct of their own conferences in advance of the White House Conference.

The resolution was favorably reported by the Committee on Education and Labor on May 24 by voice vote. It enjoyed bipartisan cosponsorship, as well as bipartisan support in the subcommittee and full committee.

While much remains to be done, the library programs the Congress has enacted over the years have had a tremendous impact on the lives of Americans all across the country.

We began aiding the development of public libraries in 1956 with enactment of the Library Services Act. Originally limited to rural libraries and to support for services only, this statute was through the years—extended and broadened and properly retitled as the Library Services and Construction Act.

We began aiding the development of school libraries with passage of the National Defense Education Act in 1958. Title III of the act permitted many schools to add instructional media centers, and title XI of the act supported short-term and regular session institutes attended by many school librarians to improve their professional skills.

We began aiding college and university libraries with the passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act in 1963, which authorized construction grants for libraries in institutions of higher education. Then the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 authorized substantial assistance for school libraries, and the Higher Education Act, also enacted in 1965, authorized grants for acquisition of materials by college and university libraries. Other provisions of the act supported research and demonstration projects and graduate training in librarianship and information science.

We have enacted the Medical Library Assistance Act. We have also made it possible for libraries to participate in programs under the Appalachian Regional Development Act, the Older Americans Act, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act, the Adult Education Act, and many other measures. In 1970 we established the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, a permanent body of citizens responsible for a continuing appraisal of the problems and future potential of libraries of all kinds, and in all parts of the Nation, and for recommendations of solutions to those problems and ways of realizing those potentials.

As I have indicated, Americans across the country have benefited from these library programs we have enacted over the years. May I briefly cite examples from my own State of Kentucky which illustrate the successes and accomplishments which are occurring.

The State Department of Libraries in Frankfort which is responsible for library development throughout Kentucky has received letters from many, many Kentuckians expressing enthusiasm and gratitude for their local libraries.

"This Library is one of the most important places in our community for all ages," one Kentucky resident wrote of his local public library. "What would we do without the knowledge and entertainment it provides?"

"The Bookmobile is our main source of receiving books in our area," another wrote. "We are located about 20 miles in the country from the Public Library. The Bookmobile brings to many elderly people who could not go to town, the enjoyment of reading."

"The Library represents the cultural center of our community and through it we are exposed to art and other forms of culture so desperately needed," remarked a rural resident of Kentucky. "I like the library program because, like I say, I'm a widow and I don't get a chance to get out of here very often," wrote another. "The bookmobile brings a little sunshine in my life," she went on to say.

The schoolchildren, too, are enthusiastic. "My two sisters and I find many books which help us in our schoolwork and we all love to read, especially during vacations; with the bookmobile we always have plenty to read." And a mother commented, "The Library has really broadened my child's mind and this to me is what a preschooler needs today."

Mr. Speaker, the Library Services and Construction Act requires each State to carry on a statewide process of assessing the needs for library services in all of its communities. In the course of its planning, each State is also required to rank its unmet needs for library services in the order of their relative priority so that those needs can be met in an equitable and systematic manner.

The State library agencies are responsive to the opinions of the people of their respective States, the users of their libraries. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is also concerned about the views of the public as well as the professionals who staff and manage libraries and information centers. There is a need now for the findings of these agencies at the State and national levels to be reviewed by outstanding citizens. There is a need for members of the general public to reach a consensus of opinion regarding the recommendations of the State Library planning bodies and those of the National Commission.

This would be the job of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services and of the State conferences that would precede it. We need to hear the voice of the people after groups of representative citizens have considered the future of their libraries in a careful and comprehensive way.

In 1976, two Federal programs impor-

tant to libraries will expire: The Library Services and Construction Act, and the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act. The Library Services and Construction Act has been a highly successful program which assists the States in the improvement of library services for all their people. It is my impression, however, that the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act has not been of much help to libraries, although in that enactment we declared public libraries to be one of several "priority expenditure" categories eligible for general revenue sharing funds available to local governments. We will want to know the views of the public regarding the impact of both of these programs on local library service.

Next year the Higher Education Act is scheduled to expire. We will need to know the views of the informed and interested public regarding the effects of the library provisions of that act, and the sooner we can begin to hear from the States, the better. This may be said, too, of the library provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which we recently amended in H.R. 69. Mr. Speaker, I much prefer the original Senate Resolution calling for the Conference in 1976 rather than in 1977 as provided in the amended resolution before us. It is important that we get to these issues as soon as possible.

Our committee and its subcommittees have, of course, had the benefit of many witnesses who have testified regarding the library legislation within our jurisdiction. We have received numerous communications from others, library trustees as well as professional librarians, educators and others.

However, I for one believe we should solicit a broader spectrum of views and as soon as possible. I share the views of librarians across the country that 1976 would be the preferred year for the Conference. I would also like to hear from people with a greater diversity of backgrounds and callings. I believe the Congress will debate the issues with greater assurance and vote with more confidence that we are expressing the will of the people once we have the reports of the White House Conference before us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 40 as amended.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I simply would like to say at this time that I urge the Members of the House to support this piece of legislation. The chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS), has really led in the development of this legislation. I think it is a bill that has the support of the libraries all over this country. There is a real need for this program. A real opportunity will be presented to the librarians and other educators and people involved in this type of conference. I hope that we see a very strong vote of support for this Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say

that I am not at all impressed by the statement of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAs) that the Vice President supports this resolution. I am impressed by the fact that this administration claims that it is trying to stop inflation. I am impressed by the fact that Dr. Arthur Burns, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, is appealing in every way that he knows how, calling upon Congress, calling upon those who have anything to do with the financial affairs of this Government, to cut down on spending in order to stop inflation.

What does this resolution do? It provides not \$100,000, not \$500,000 but \$10 million for a White House Conference on Libraries—\$10 million! At the rate of \$500,000 each, this would be the cost of constructing 20 libraries in this country.

I am amazed that any committee of Congress would come here today asking for \$10 million simply to stage a White House Conference on Libraries. How in the name of the Lord can anyone spend \$10 million on a White House Conference? I wish somebody would tell me. I cannot conceive of a conference that would drain the taxpayers of \$10 million and the report accompanying this resolution offers no justification.

The administration is opposed to this resolution, according to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. That department says it is duplicative, that it is not needed, but apparently there is no opposition to the resolution, and I cannot understand why. How can anyone even consider committing the government to this expenditure, and cowardly loading it as more debt on the backs of our children and their children. Every one of the Members knows in his or her heart that the Federal debt of nearly \$500 billion, almost a half trillion dollars, will never be retired by orderly means by our children or their children. Let us practice a little sanity here today. Let us defeat this resolution.

I am not opposed to libraries or the so-called science of information, not at all, but this goes far beyond any reason.

I see the Chairman of the committee sitting in the front row. I wish he would get up and justify to the House the expenditure of \$10 million for this purpose, when we are in the financial condition in this country that we are today, with runaway inflation, with an indication that some of the financial institutions of this country are beginning to come apart at the seams.

I also want to call attention to paragraph 4 of subsection (c), which appears on page 10 of the resolution, and I invite Members to turn their attention to that provision. This language authorizes the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to employ such personnel as may be considered necessary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, without regard to the provisions of title 5 relating to classification of positions, and without regard to the provisions of title 5 regarding general schedule pay rates.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has primary jurisdiction over all

matters relating to the appointment, classification, and compensation of Federal employees. The standards, controls, and limitations relating to these matters are set out very specifically in title 5 of the United States Code. Our committee feels that any exceptions to such statutory standards and controls should be granted only when fully justified before our committee. In the present case of this joint resolution, we have had no opportunity whatever to consider whether there is any justification—any justification—for exempting employees of this Commission from the statutory provisions governing appointments in the competitive service, classification, and pay.

I say again that under the language of this joint resolution there is no limit to the compensation that could be paid to any employee appointed under paragraph 4. This language does not provide for any control whatsoever by the Civil Service Commission over the number of individuals to be compensated even at supergrade rates, and furthermore, does not permit the Civil Service Commission to determine whether or not the duties of these positions justify the occupants receiving the rate of pay attached to a supergrade position, or for that matter to the pay of a level 1 in the executive branch of Government. It can be anything.

Mr. Speaker, the language contained in paragraph 4 of this joint resolution is unwarranted, it is damaging to the competitive civil service system, and I regret there is no way under the parliamentary circumstances to strike it out, but I say to the Members that this is another excellent reason why we should vote against this resolution and tell the House Labor and Education Committee that if it wants a White House conference it should come back here with a reasonable request and with this employment provision stricken out. In the meantime they should come to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and provide justification, if there is any, for the hiring of unlimited numbers of people at absolutely unlimited salaries.

I repeat that I still cannot believe a committee of the Congress would bring out this kind of resolution.

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

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment or two with regard to the observations made by the gentleman from Iowa.

I would simply reiterate what I said earlier, which may not have been clearly understood, that on September 19, 1973, when he was then a Member of the House of Representatives the present Vice President of the United States introduced a resolution (H.J. Res. 734) providing for a White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the point made by the gentleman from Iowa with regard to the provisions contained in the resolution for the employment of personnel outside the Civil Service, as every Member of this body knows this is not an unusual and this is not a radical and this is not an uncouth procedure with respect to temporary short-run confer-

ences of the kind contemplated to be authorized by this joint resolution.

We are all familiar in this body with the work of the White House Conferences on Youth, on Children, on Aging, and on Nutrition.

I think most fair-minded observers would agree that all of those conferences made very significant contributions to public understanding of the problems associated with those particular conferences.

It ought also to be made clear, of course, Mr. Speaker, that this measure must go before the Committee on Appropriations in order to make possible the moneys for carrying out the purpose of the resolution and that the language of the resolution does not provide for an appropriation of \$10 million, but rather provides for the authorization of appropriations for such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the conference, but with a limitation of \$10 million.

Finally, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of the exception to which the gentleman from Iowa made reference that would make possible the employment of personnel outside the Civil Service is not unusual, either, in that it makes possible the employment for short periods of persons who may be expert or knowledgeable in this particular field.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, because of the bipartisan nature of the measure before us, we are using the suspension calendar to bring Senate Joint Resolution 40 to the attention of the Members. It authorizes and requests the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1977.

The Conference will be planned and conducted by the Commission on Libraries and Information Services. The Commission was established in 1970 to make plans and recommendations affecting the Nation's libraries and information centers, has a wealth of knowledge accumulated in this area, and seems to be the proper agent for coordinating plans for the national conference.

Regional and State conferences will be set up in each State, at a rough cost of around \$55,000, I am told, and the thrust of this effort will be to bring together all the expertise available in the field to draft the State's plans for the 1977 participation in the conference in Washington.

The conference will be composed of—Representatives of local, statewide, regional, and national institutions, agencies, organizations, and associations which provide library and information services to the public;

Representatives of educational institutions, agencies, organizations, and associations—including professional and scholarly associations for the advancement of education and research;

Persons with special knowledge of, and special competence in, technology as it may be used for the improvement of library and information services; and

Representatives of Federal, State, and local governments, professional and lay people, and other members of the general public.

We are in an era of exploding technology, exploding information and exploding demand for the benefits of same by the general public. This will be a focus of the conference, not only within the States, but in the national conference in 1977.

I am told that libraries, generally, have not made use of the sophisticated methods of computerization for many reasons, including funding. The future storing and retrieval of information is in this direction.

The National Library of Medicine and its computer bank is a good case in point of what the wave of the future can be for the libraries if they acquire the expertise and the means to hook into for instance the vast library resources of the Federal system. I can foresee the day when such computerized systems can become available in cities and towns—when doctors, lawyers, and the other disciplines hook into the network of knowledge and, in the fraction of the time now taken—if taken at all now—expert knowledge is instantly made available.

If there is criticism I have heard about libraries—the universities of the common man—it is that they do not go out enough into the community and draw into their doors those who most need their help; that those who use libraries most are those who already know how to use them. This conference provides the potential for a cross-fertilization of ideas from those States and localities who are doing an imaginative job of outreach, to those who need the stimulation and assistance to do the same, and to prepare them to use the new technology to make library resources more available.

The Commission will have 120 days to submit final plans to the President, and will cost not more than \$10 million. There are anticipated to be 2,800 conferees. The departments of Government will offer personnel and technical assistance to the Commission, and such technical assistance will, in turn, be made available to the States in planning.

There will be an advisory committee set up to aid the Commission:

First. Three designated by the Chairman of the Commission.

Second. Five designated by the Speaker of the House, no more than three being Members of the House.

Third. Five designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate, no more than three being Members of the Senate; and

Fourth. Not more than 15 appointed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, it is the position of the administration to oppose Senate Joint Resolution 40, and I submit for the Record at this point a copy of the Honorable Caspar Weinberger's letter to Chairman CARL PERKINS of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I should like to express the hope that the President not veto this measure and allow the plans to go forward for the conference in 1977. Dr. Frederick Burkhardt, Chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Sciences told the Select Subcommittee on Education that he did not believe his Commission duplicated work which will be done by the national conference, and he further said that the

small number of staff and budget prevented the Commission from carrying out the charge to his Commission to develop and make comprehensive plans on the needs of the libraries, as well as plans for the future. He felt that the White House Conference was a way to do this and to draw attention to the needs of the libraries for assistance.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., December 4, 1973.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and
Labor, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your recent request for a report on H.J. Res. 766 and H.J. Res. 734, two bills "To authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Sciences in 1976." The bills are similar with the exception of one item noted below.

The purpose of the Conference would be to develop recommendations for the improvement of libraries and information centers. The conference would be composed of librarians, information specialists, educators, relevant technologists, and representatives of the general public. (H.J. Res. 766 would also include representatives of Federal, State and local governments.)

Planning and direction of the Conference would be carried out by the National Commission of Libraries and Information Science with cooperation and assistance from all Federal departments. The Commission would make technical and financial assistance available to the States for preparatory meetings and conferences and prepare background material for the use of delegates on the Federal and State levels.

Within 120 days of the close of the Conference, a report would be submitted to the President and the Congress. Ninety days later, the President would be required to submit to Congress a statement of recommendations regarding the report.

A 28 member advisory committee would be appointed by the President to assist the National Commission in planning and conducting the Conference.

Both bills would authorize such sums as may be necessary to carry out the terms of the resolution.

In certain circumstances, a White House Conference may serve to fill a need for the exposure and examination of critical and neglected problems of national concern. However, we do not believe there is any need for a White House Conference in an area where existing forums are providing an adequate opportunity for the identification and discussion of issues and ideas.

We recognize that there are important issues in the field of libraries and information science. Access to information is necessary for an enlightened technological society. The dissemination of information is an area where we must always seek improvements.

However, we do not believe that the White House Conference on Libraries and Information Sciences, as proposed in H.J. Res. 766 and H.J. Res. 734, is justifiable.

To the best of our knowledge, there is no evidence of critical unresolved issues in libraries and information science that cannot be handled through the existing channels of communications in the field, i.e., professional associations, meetings of civic groups, and governmental and legislative processes on all levels. Further the activities described in both bills to be conducted by the proposed Conference would duplicate the responsibilities of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Secondly, we think that a White House

Conference solely on the subject of libraries and information science would be too narrowly focused, both in terms of the prestige of such a conference and in terms of the considerable public expenditures necessary for such a conference. This is not to diminish the importance of libraries and information science but it does indicate that we believe that these subjects should be examined as a part of the broader issue of education.

We therefore oppose the enactment of H. J. Res. 766 and H.J. Res. 734, as not being needed.

We are advised by the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

CASPAR W. WEINBERGER,
Secretary.

COST

In accordance with Rule 13, the Committee estimates that the cost of S.J. Res. 40 will not exceed \$10,000,000.

COMMITTEE ACTION

H.J. Res. 734 was introduced on September 19, 1973 by Congressman Gerald R. Ford of Michigan.

On October 11, 1973, a similar resolution, H.J. Res. 766, was introduced by Mr. Brademas, Chairman of the Select Education Subcommittee.

S.J. Res. 40 passed the Senate on November 16, 1973 and was referred to the Select Subcommittee on Education. Hearings were held on this measure on November 29, 1973.

The Select Subcommittee on Education by a voice vote reported S.J. Res. 40 as amended.

On May 14, the full Committee on Education and Labor ordered reported S.J. Res. 40 as amended by voice vote.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 40, AS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The Preamble. The preamble to the joint resolution set forth in the material preceding the resolving clause, contains seven clauses which declare the reasons for enacting the joint resolution.

The first clause of the preamble states that access to information and ideas is indispensable to the development of human potential, the advancement of civilization, and the continuance of enlightened self-government.

The second clause of the preamble states that the primary purpose and function of libraries and information centers is the preservation and dissemination of information and ideas.

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

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate my support for the resolution and hope it can be adopted and that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services can get off the ground. It is needed.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN).

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill which would authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services (S.J. Res. 40). Not mentioned in the title of the bill but equally important are the provisions that the final national Conference be preceded by State conferences which would as-

sess the needs and problems of libraries in each of the States, based on sound knowledge of the facts of their individual situations. These State conferences will undoubtedly come up with recommendations for action by State and local governments as well as recommendations for action by the Federal Government. Thus the final White House Conference would not be an isolated, one-shot event but the culmination of nationwide comprehensive review of the library situation.

We very much need such a review of library problems, and I speak of all types of libraries—school libraries, public libraries, college and university libraries, and specialized libraries—all of which are becoming more closely interrelated in sharing their resources to provide better service to their respective clienteles. Costs of library materials and library services are affected by inflation, as are all public service activities—and in addition, in the case of libraries, there is the added factor of the tremendous rate of growth in the amount of knowledge and information which must be selected, organized, and made available. Technology may provide some answers to these problems, as may local, regional, and national cooperative systems. These possibilities, as well as others, require a new assessment of the existing factual situation as a basis for sound recommendations for the future. It has now been almost 10 years since the national inventory of library needs was conducted cooperatively by the U.S. Office of Education and the American Library Association. We need a new inventory of this type, both national and State-by-State in order that the State conferences and the national Conference may be productive.

Fortunately, as I understand it, the National Center for Educational Statistics in the U.S. Office of Education is beginning this year a new Federal-State system of collecting national library statistics for the principal types of libraries. This Library General Information Survey (LIBGIS) will for the first time make the same information available, both on a National basis and on a State basis. The LIBGIS results can be made available for the State conferences and form the basis for a new national inventory of library needs. I am encouraged also by the initiative of the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota, of the House Education and Labor Committee in pressing the bill (H.R. 13991) to improve and expedite the collection and dissemination of educational and library statistics. This initiative should be helpful in facilitating the participation of the U.S. Office of Education in providing much of the statistical and factual data required for sound consideration of library problems in the State and national conferences.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill. It has my full support. To be effective, however, it must be followed up promptly by providing the necessary appropriations to carry it out and to enable the States to begin organizing for the State conferences a year or two in advance of

the projected date for the national Conference.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) and his allusion to the fact that there is still the Committee on Appropriations, I wonder why this committee, the Committee on Labor and Education, put \$10 million in the bill if they did not want \$10 million?

Can the gentleman tell me why he would put that figure in the bill? Is he inviting the Committee on Appropriations to cut that figure and to what figure does he want to cut it?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it was the judgment of the committee that that was a sensible ceiling to put on the authorizing figure and, as my friend from Iowa knows, grateful as I am for his rhetorical question, this is a procedure that has been customary in this body for many years.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what the gentleman means by that. Does he mean to put a high asking price on the bill? I still do not know on what figure the gentleman wants to settle.

The gentleman has indulged in the tired old argument that well, this is just a figure we put in the bill; the Committee on Appropriations will take care of it.

The gentleman is asking Members of the House to vote \$10 million in this bill for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services. I have yet to hear any kind of an explanation on the floor of the House as to why it should cost any part of \$10 million for a conference of this kind.

The SPEAKER The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, does the administration favor action on this legislation?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I said that the administration is opposed to this legislation. I say that it is completely unjustified and totally unnecessary.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that the administration is opposed to the legislation. It is true that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) is opposed to the legislation. It is also true that librarians all over this country are strongly in support of the legislation. It is true that members of the Committee on Education and Labor, both Republicans and Democrats, are in strong support of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would invite the Members of the House to choose for themselves.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to inquire of the gentleman from Indiana, as I understand the bill, one of the items that I believe we include in this is an allocation to each State in order that they can conduct a conference within the State in preparation for this White House Conference. I believe that we are authorizing every State up to \$55,000 for this Conference within the State. Is that correct?

Mr. BRADEMAS. No, I think the gentleman is not correct. The observation of the gentleman would be correct if he were to appreciate that the figure to which he has made reference is an estimate of the amount of money to be made available, but is not a mandatory allocation.

Mr. PEYSER. In other words, is it not conceivable that at least \$2 million or \$2½ million might be spent by the States throughout this country in order to organize for this White House Conference?

What I am simply saying is that this is a key part of the expenditure so that we can have a fruitful meeting at that time.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman is exactly right. The amount of money contained in the bill with respect to the authorizing figure is based on the experience, the actual practical experience with other White House conferences, so that the money figures is not pulled from out of the sky.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss to understand why the several States of this Union do not stage their own conferences on libraries; why they do not expend their own money. I do not know of a single State treasury that is as bankrupt as the Federal Treasury is today.

Moreover, I am not surprised that the librarians are for this bill, but what about the taxpayers of this country? I wish we could submit this to a vote of the people; the spending of \$10 million figure for a White House Conference on Libraries. I do not think there would be any doubt as to the outcome. It would be about 90 to 10 or even less, perhaps 95 to 5, against this kind of wild spending.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I support passage of Senate Joint Resolution 40, a bill to authorize a White House Conference on Library and Information Services. This bill will make it possible for States to hold prior conferences involving local citizens to evaluate library services and funding on local, State, and National levels in order to plan for the improvement of library services to all citizens.

A White House conference preceded by State conferences would provide an excellent base for determining priorities in providing quality services to all citizens. In this day of instant communication, such a conference would consider the effects of technological communications innovations on society. The conference would help provide a focus for efficient planning for the effective use of this technology. The conference would help develop recommendations for the improve-

ment of services and facilities, perhaps leading toward an integrated national network of library and information services.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on Senate Joint Resolution 40, the White House Conference on Library and Information Sciences.

I cannot believe that the \$10 million ceiling authorized by this legislation could not be better spent. In fact, that figure could well add over 1 million books to our Nation's libraries—or provide critically needed additional facilities. I concur with Secretary Weinberger's statement that there are sufficient existing forums for discussions of mutual concern and the generation of future programs. I also agree that there appears to be, in the legislation before us, a duplication of responsibility between the new Advisory Committee for the Conference, and the well-established and effective National Commission on Libraries and Information Sciences.

I am in great sympathy with adequate funding and responsible legislation directed toward strengthening our Nation's libraries system, but this measure would dissipate moneys which I would like to see directed toward more positive results and more tangible projects. The \$55,000 suggested as a figure for implementation of technical and financial assistance to the States in preparation for the Conference, means over \$2 million spent just to get organized. Let us use that money for additional library materials for the handicapped. Let us use some of this State and Federal taxpayer money for assistance to medical libraries—that appropriation last year amounted to \$2 million less than the Conference would cost. There are 1,000 worthwhile projects which have suffered from appropriation cuts—and \$10 million would have meant a great deal to any one of them.

Congress simply must face up to its role as the financial watchdog for the Nation, and stop this continual erosion of our dwindling resources.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating Senate Joint Resolution 40.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support Senate Joint Resolution 40 as amended, calling for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services. As former chairman of the Dade County School Board, I am well aware of the importance of good libraries to quality education. "School libraries are dependent upon the school they serve for their funds," the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science points out in its 1972-73 annual report. "A wealthy school district can afford an inspired library program. A poor district may have no library program at all." Witnesses from all parts of the country appearing before the National Commission have recommended that the Commission give added support to school libraries and make them viable throughout all school systems. The Commission states:

Adequate funding of the school library appears to evolve in part from the value placed on libraries by the superintendent of schools. His (or her) priorities for supporting

(nonclassroom) services determine the attitude toward libraries and the share of the funds they receive. Educating the chief school officer to the value of the library in the educational process thus becomes an important task in many communities.

Many new and innovative programs are under way in the schools in my own district of Florida. School libraries, for example, are working hard to build up collections of books and audiovisual materials in career education. Not just the traditional professions, such as teaching, law or medicine, but many other types of work are being featured—how to be a carpenter or an electrician, for example, or what kinds of jobs are done in an airport other than those of pilot or stewardess.

Retired persons, too, have an important role in schools in my district, particularly in the area of tutoring students who need practice in reading. On a 1-to-1 basis, retired persons meet with students who may be slow learners and listen while the students read to them. This gives the student some special attention, a chance to improve their reading skills, and it gives the retired persons an opportunity to make a useful and much-needed contribution to society.

The White House Conference, and perhaps even more, the conferences Senate Joint Resolution 40 authorizes for each of the States before the White House Conference, will provide an opportunity for parents and teachers, school administrators, board members and students a chance to plan for the improvement of their school libraries, including cooperative arrangements with public, college and other libraries so that all elementary and secondary school students have access to whatever information they need.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, libraries of all kinds provide many needed services in my district, throughout the State of Florida, and indeed throughout the Nation. I wholeheartedly support Senate Joint Resolution 40.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic de-

vice, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 264]

Addabbo	Edwards, Ala.	Melcher
Anderson	Erlenborn	Metcalfe
Calif.	Ford	Mitchell, Md.
Anderson, Ill.	Fraser	Nichols
Badillo	Frelinghuysen	Pike
Beard	Frey	Podell
Bell	Gray	Powell, Ohio
Blester	Griffiths	Price, Tex.
Bingham	Gubser	Rees
Bowen	Gude	Reid
Brasco	Hanna	Rooney, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Hansen, Wash.	Rousselot
Brown, Mich.	Harsha	Roybal
Burke, Calif.	Hawkins	Runnels
Burke, Fla.	Hébert	Ruth
Burton	Heckler, Mass.	Ryan
Carey, N.Y.	Helstoski	Smith, N.Y.
Casey, Tex.	Hinshaw	Stark
Cederberg	Hogan	Stubblefield
Clausen	Hollifield	Talcott
Don H.	Holtzman	Thompson, N.J.
Clay	Horton	Treen
Cochran	Howard	Udall
Cohen	Huber	Ullman
Conyers	Hutchinson	Van Deerlin
Coughlin	Jones, Tenn.	Vander Jagt
Culver	Kuykendall	Waldie
Daniels	Kyros	Ware
Dominick V.	Landgrebe	Whalen
Danielson	McCloskey	Widnall
Dellums	McKinney	Wiggins
Dickinson	McSpadden	Wilson, Bob
Diggs	Macdonald	Wilson,
Dingell	Martin, Nebr.	Charles H.,
Dorn	Mathis, Ga.	Calif.
Drinan	Mazzoli	Wilson,
Eckhardt	Meeds	Charles, Tex.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 328 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate Joint Resolution 40, as amended, just considered by the House.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 11864, SOLAR HEATING AND COOLING DEMONSTRATION ACT OF 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11864) providing for the early commercial demonstration of the technology of solar heating by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, the General Services Administration, and other Federal agencies, and for the early development and commercial demonstration of technology for combined solar heating and cooling, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

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

points the following conferees: Messrs. TEAGUE, McCORMACK, FUQUA, SYMINGTON, MOSHER, GOLDWATER, and WYDLER.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13998, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TEAGUE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 13998) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and development program, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 93-1078)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13998) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate insert the following:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

(a) For "Research and development," for the following programs:

- (1) Space Shuttle, \$805,000,000;
- (2) Space flight operations, \$313,300,000.
- (3) Advanced missions, \$1,500,000;
- (4) Physics and astronomy, \$140,515,000;
- (5) Lunar and planetary exploration, \$266,000,000;

(6) Launch vehicle procurement, \$143,500,000;

(7) Space applications, \$196,300,000, of which \$2,000,000 is designated for research on Short Term Weather Phenomena; and \$1,000,000 is designated for research on ground propulsion systems;

(8) Aeronautical research and technology, \$171,500,000;

(9) Space and nuclear research and technology, \$79,700,000, of which \$1,000,000 is designated for research on hydrogen production and utilization systems;

(10) Tracking and data acquisition, \$250,000,000;

(11) Technology utilization, \$5,500,000;

(b) For "Construction of facilities," including land acquisition, as follows:

(1) Addition to flight and guidance simulation laboratory, Ames Research Center, \$3,660,000;

(2) Rehabilitation and modification of science and applications laboratories, Goddard Space Flight Center, \$890,000;

(3) Modifications for fire protection and safety, Goddard Space Flight Center, \$1,220,000;

(4) Acquisition of land, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, \$150,000;

(5) Addition to systems development laboratory, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, \$4,880,000;

(6) Addition for integrated systems testing facility, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, \$3,790,000;

(7) Modification of water supply system, Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center, \$935,000;

(8) Modification of 6,000 pounds per square inch air storage system, Langley Research Center, \$515,000;

(9) Rehabilitation of 16-foot transonic wind tunnel, Langley Research Center, \$2,990,000;

(10) Modification of propulsion systems

laboratory, Lewis Research Center, \$2,580,000;

(11) Modification of rocket engine test facility, Lewis Research Center, \$660,000;

(12) Construction of X-ray telescope facility, Marshall Space Flight Center, \$4,060,000;

(13) Modification of beach protection system, Wallops Station, \$1,370,000;

(14) Construction of infrared telescope facility, Mauna Kea, Hawaii, \$6,040,000;

(15) Modifications for fire protection and safety at various tracking and data stations, \$1,430,000;

(16) Space Shuttle facilities at various locations as follows:

(A) Construction of Orbiter landing facilities, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$15,880,000;

(B) Construction of Orbiter processing facility, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$13,380,000;

(C) Modifications to launch complex 39, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$37,690,000;

(D) Modifications for dynamic test facilities, Marshall Space Flight Center, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration Industrial Plant, Downey, California, \$3,920,000;

(E) Construction of Orbiter horizontal flight test facilities, Flight Research Center, \$3,940,000;

(F) Modifications for crew training facilities, Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center, \$420,000;

(G) Modification of the vibration and acoustic test facility, Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center, \$410,000;

(H) Construction of materials test facility, White Sands Test Facility, \$790,000;

(I) Modifications for solid rocket booster structural test facilities, Marshall Space Flight Center, \$2,590,000;

(17) Rehabilitation and modification of facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$500,000 per project, \$14,900,000;

(18) Minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities at various locations not in excess of \$250,000 per project, \$4,500,000;

(19) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, \$10,900,000.

(c) For "Research and program management," \$749,624,000, and such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 1(g), appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required at locations other than installations of the Administration for the performance of research and development contracts, and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities, and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used in accordance with this subsection for the construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the

Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the "Research and program management" appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed \$35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsections 1(a) and 1(c), not in excess of \$10,000 for each project, including collateral equipment, may be used for construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and not in excess of \$25,000 for each project, including collateral equipment, may be used for rehabilitation or modification of facilities: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a), not in excess of \$250,000 for each project, including collateral equipment, may be used for any of the foregoing for unforeseen programmatic needs.

(h) The authorization for the appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of \$10,900,000, which amount represents that part of the authorization provided for in section 1(b)(12)(I) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1974, for which appropriations have not been made, shall expire on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1) through (18), inclusive, of subsection 1(b) may, in the discretion of the Administrator or his designee, be varied upward 10 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed the total of the amounts specified in such paragraphs.

SEC. 3. Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with \$10,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (19) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next Authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of

the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee,

unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 5. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

SEC. 6. Section 203(b) (9) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2473(b) (9)), is amended to read as follows:

"(9) to obtain services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18;"

SEC. 7. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is authorized, when so provided in an appropriation Act, to enter into a contract for tracking and data relay satellite services. Such services shall be furnished to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in accordance with applicable authorization and appropriation Acts. The Government shall incur no costs

under such contract prior to the furnishing of such services except that the contract may provide for the payment for contingent liability of the Government which may accrue in the event the Government should decide for its convenience to terminate the contract before the end of the period of the contract. Title to any facilities which may be required in the performance of the contract and constructed on Government-owned land shall vest in the United States upon the termination of the contract. The Administrator shall in January of each year report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate the projected aggregate contingent liability of the Government under termination provisions of any contract authorized in this section through the next fiscal year. The authority of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to enter into and to maintain the contract authorized hereunder shall remain in effect as long as provision therefor is included in Acts authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for subsequent fiscal years.

SEC. 8 This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1975."

And the Senate agree to the same.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
KEN HECHLER,
DON FUQUA,
J. W. SYMINGTON,
C. A. MOSSER,
ALPHONZO BELL,
JOHN W. WYDLER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

FRANK E. MOSS,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
BARRY GOLDWATER,
CARL T. CURTIS,

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 amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13998) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for FY 1975 for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management 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 NASA request for Fiscal Year 1975 totaled \$3,247,129,000. The House authorized \$3,259,084,000, and the Senate amendment authorized \$3,267,229,000. The committee of conference agrees to a total authorization of \$3,266,929,000, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL ADJUSTMENTS TO NASA FISCAL YEAR 1975 BUDGET REQUEST

	Budget request	House	Senate	Committee of conference
Research and development:				
Space Shuttle.....	\$800,000,000	\$820,000,000	\$800,000,000	\$805,000,000
Space flight operations.....	323,300,000	308,300,000	318,300,000	313,300,000
Advanced missions.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Physics and astronomy.....	140,515,000	140,515,000	140,515,000	140,515,000
Lunar and planetary exploration.....	266,000,000	266,000,000	264,000,000	260,000,000
Launch vehicle procurement.....	140,500,000	140,500,000	143,500,000	143,500,000
Space applications.....	177,500,000	179,500,000	200,500,000	196,300,000
Aeronautical research and technology.....	166,400,000	170,655,000	171,500,000	171,500,000
Space and nuclear research and technology.....	74,800,000	80,500,000	74,800,000	79,700,000
Tracking and data acquisition.....	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000
Technology utilization.....	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
Total.....	2,346,015,000	2,362,970,000	2,370,115,000	2,372,815,000
Construction of facilities.....	151,490,000	146,460,000	147,490,000	144,490,000
Research and program management.....	749,624,000	749,624,000	749,624,000	749,624,000
Grand total.....	3,247,129,000	3,259,084,000	3,267,229,000	3,266,929,000

The points in disagreement and the conference resolution of them are as follows:

1. The House authorized \$820,000,000 for the Space Shuttle program, adding \$20,000,000 to the NASA request.

The Senate authorized \$800,000,000.

The Conference substitute authorizes \$805,000,000.

The Conference agreement recognizes that funds have been utilized from the program management reserve to solve the unanticipated technical difficulties encountered in the preparation of the Santa Susana test facilities to support Space Shuttle main engine component and subsystem development testing.

2. The House authorized \$308,300,000 for the Space Flight Operations program.

The Senate authorized \$318,300,000.

The Conference substitute authorizes \$313,300,000 for this program.

The Conference substitute is a reduction of \$10,000,000 from the NASA request and both Houses were in agreement that \$5,000,000 of this reduction is to be made against the Apollo-Soyuz Test Project. The Committee of Conference agrees that the additional \$5,000,000 reduction in the NASA request contained in the Conference substitute is to be taken from Development, Test and Mission Operations authorization provided, however, none of the reduction is to be applied against the supporting activities at the Mississippi Test Facility.

3. The House approved \$266,000,000, the NASA request, for the Lunar and Planetary Exploration program.

The Senate authorized \$264,000,000.

The Committee of Conference adopts the House position authorizing \$266,000,000 for this program.

4. The House authorized \$140,500,000 for the Launch Vehicle Procurement program, the amount of the NASA request.

The Senate authorized \$143,500,000 for this program, an increase of \$3,000,000 to initiate procurement of the Delta launch vehicle to be used to launch the ERTS-C spacecraft.

The Committee of Conference adopts the Senate position.

5. NASA requested \$177,500,000 for the Space Applications program. The House authorized \$179,500,000, an increase of \$2,000,000, and specifically designated in the bill that \$2,000,000 of the authorized funds are to be used for research on short-term weather phenomena, \$2,000,000 for research on hydrogen production and utilization systems, and \$1,000,000 for research on ground propulsion systems.

The Senate authorized \$200,500,000, adding \$23,000,000 to the request—\$13,000,000 to initiate the ERTS-C spacecraft, \$6,000,000 for additional energy research, \$2,000,000 for research on short-term weather phenomena, and \$2,000,000 for ERTS data processing activities.

The Conference substitute authorizes \$196,300,000 for this program and designates \$2,000,000 for research on short-term weather phenomena and \$1,000,000 for research on ground propulsion systems.

The Committee of Conference agrees that NASA should initiate promptly the ERTS-C spacecraft project and should apply added resources to its energy research and development activities including the solar satellite power station study.

6. NASA requested \$166,400,000 for Aeronautical Research and Technology.

The House authorized \$170,655,000, an increase of \$4,255,000 for additional effort in selected areas of aeronautical research.

The Senate authorized \$171,500,000, an increase of \$5,100,000 in the NASA request, with generally similar objectives to those of the House.

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate position.

7. The House authorized \$80,500,000 for the Space and Nuclear Research and Technology program, increasing the NASA re-

quest \$5,700,000 for coal and other energy-related research.

The Senate authorized \$74,800,000, the amount of the NASA request.

The Conference substitute authorizes \$79,700,000, designating \$1,000,000 for research on hydrogen production and utilization systems.

The Conferees agree that \$3,900,000 of the additional authorization is to be applied to coal-related research.

8. The House authorized \$10,040,000 for an optimized infrared telescope facility to be constructed at Mauna Kea, Hawaii.

The Senate authorized \$6,040,000 for this facility as requested by NASA.

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate position.

9. NASA requested \$42,690,000 for modifications to Launch Complex 39, John F. Kennedy Space Center, to accommodate the Space Shuttle.

The House authorized \$35,690,000 for this project, a reduction of \$7,000,000.

The Senate authorized \$42,690,000.

The Conference substitute authorizes \$37,690,000.

10. The House authorized \$3,940,000 for the construction of orbiter horizontal flight test facilities at the Flight Research Center, an increase of \$2,000,000 above the NASA request to provide a capability for long-term aeronautical research.

The Senate authorized \$1,940,000 for this facility.

The Conference substitute adopts the House position.

11. The House authorized a lump sum amount of \$77,020,000 for Item 16, Section 1(b) for the several projects authorized for the Space Shuttle program.

The Senate authorized each individual Shuttle project with a specified amount therefor in lieu of a lump sum total for all projects.

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate position.

12. The House inserted Section 1(h) in the bill rescinding \$10,900,000 of FY 1974 authorization for the construction of Orbiter landing facilities at the John F. Kennedy Space Center.

The Senate did not include a comparable provision in its action on this bill.

The Committee of Conference adopts the House position.

13. The Committee of Conference adopts the House position opposing the NASA proposal to place the Plum Brook Station in a standby mode and considers that every effort should be made to maintain this facility in a minimum operating condition so as to continue to provide support for NASA and other associated research activities for at least one year.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
KEN HECHLER,
DON FUQUA,
J. W. SYMINGTON,
C. A. MOSHER,
ALPHONZO BELL,
JOHN W. WYDLER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

FRANK E. MOSS,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
BARRY GOLDWATER,
CARL T. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 3373) relating to the sale and distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 3373

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 910 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 910. Congressional Record: subscriptions; sale of current, individual numbers, and bound sets; postage rate

"(a) Under the direction of the Joint Committee, the Public Printer may sell—

"(1) subscriptions to the daily Record; and
"(2) current, individual numbers, and bound sets of the Congressional Record.

"(b) The price of a subscription to the daily Record and of current, individual numbers, and bound sets shall be determined by the Public Printer based upon the cost of printing and distribution. Any such price shall be paid in advance. The money from any such sale shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in the Public Printer's annual report to Congress.

"(c) The Congressional Record shall be entitled to be mailed at the same rates of postage at which any newspaper or other periodical publication, with a legitimate list of paid subscribers, is entitled to be mailed."

(b) Section 906 of such title 44 is amended—

(1) by striking out of the section caption the last semicolon and "SUBSCRIPTIONS"; and

(2) by striking out the last full paragraph thereof.

(c) The analysis of chapter 9 of such title 44, immediately preceding section 901, is amended—

(1) by striking out of item 906 the last semicolon and "subscription"; and

(2) by striking out item 910 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"910. Congressional Record: subscriptions; sale of current, individual numbers, and bound sets; postage rate."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, a similar bill, H.R. 14282, was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WAYNE L. HAYS), the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, and the chairman of the Committee on House Administration.

The purpose of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is to provide that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be entitled to be mailed at the same postage rate at which any newspaper or any other periodical publication with a list of paid subscribers is entitled to be mailed.

The effect of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to save the Government Printing Office some \$8 million a year in postal rates for mailing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is intended to resolve a disagreement between the Government Printing Office and the U.S. Postal Service regarding the authority to establish postal rates for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Allow me to explain, Mr. Speaker: Before the creation of the Postal Service, Congress reimbursed the Government

Printing Office for the cost it daily incurred for mailing the RECORD of between 8 and 9 cents per copy, or approximately the second-class newspaper rate. However, after the U.S. Postal Service assumed control of mail distribution it notified the Government Printing Office that it would thereafter be required to pay the first-class postal rate for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Joint Committee on Printing which has jurisdiction over the production and distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, directed the U.S. Postal Service to comply with the committee rules and regulations regarding the distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Joint Committee on Printing promptly applied for second-class handling of the RECORD.

The U.S. Postal Service maintained, however, that according to its regulations, only newspapers and periodicals whose circulation includes a majority of paid subscribers could qualify for second-class treatment, and rejected the application.

Since less than half the copies of the RECORD were sent to paid subscribers, the Postal Service concluded that the RECORD was not eligible for second-class treatment.

Mr. Speaker, although the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is similar to many publications in the commercial sector which are mailed at second-class rates, the RECORD does not meet the "paid-subscriber" requirement, because, by law, thousands of copies of the RECORD must be distributed free of charge. These free subscriptions include copies for the various Federal agencies, the libraries of Federal courts, and copies designated by Members of Congress for individuals and institutions within their constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is mailed at first-class postal rates at a cost of \$1.25 per copy. The total cost of the postage for a single subscription is, therefore, \$265 per year.

The bill under consideration, S. 3373, would qualify the RECORD for the second-class newspaper rate, which would bring the cost of mailing to approximately 9 cents a copy, and \$35.63 annually for a single subscription.

Mr. Speaker, since approximately 35,000 subscriptions of the RECORD are mailed each year, this bill would result in a total saving to the Government Printing Office of over \$8 million.

Mr. Speaker, the effect of this bill would provide that the GPO pay the postage rate appropriate to the delivery treatment that the RECORD is now receiving. For, according to the Public Printer, although the RECORD is being charged first-class postage rates, it is being given second-class delivery treatment.

Mr. Speaker, it may be argued by some that this bill would not save any money in that it would simply shift the expense from the Government Printing Office appropriation to the appropriations for the U.S. Postal Service. However, according to the officials at the U.S. Postal Service, the cost estimates which I have provided today reflected the full cost of second-class handling of the RECORD. There cannot be, therefore, any further

costs attributable to the second-class delivery of the RECORD which could justify additional appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, S. 3373 simply provides for a just and reasonable price for the delivery of the RECORD, one which would assure the timely delivery of this essential document, and one which would assure that the costs properly attributable to second-class handling of the RECORD will be met.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to give this measure their full support and vote to suspend the rules and pass the bill, which has already been approved by the other body.

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

Mr. BRADEMAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it the intent of the committee that the publication would go second-class mail in concert with the phase-in rate, as all second-class mail will go?

Mr. BRADEMAM. There is no requirement with respect to the phase-in rate, I may say to the gentleman from New York, since the RECORD would be mailed at the full second-class newspaper rate, which officials at the Postal Service advise me is the full cost of second-class handling of the RECORD.

Mr. HANLEY. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to this bill. However, I do not believe it will do what the sponsors think it will do by way of saving \$6 million, but it is a better bookkeeping transaction.

The new Postal Corporation, quasi-corporation, is already elbow deep in the taxpayers' pockets, although it was organized on the assumption that it would be self-sustaining, more efficient. I remember all of the wonderful kudos that were tossed out here on the House floor when the Postal Corporation, so-called, was put through the House. But they are already in the Federal Treasury clear up to the elbows, and I have no doubt that if they make a case that the postage charge for carriage of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not sufficient, that they will come right in, and Congress will roll over and play dead, as they are now doing, and give them more revenue right out of the back door of the Treasury.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the point of this bill and the reason it is here is because it is in my judgment an attempt by the Post Office Department to rip off the Congress. There is no reason why the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should be treated differently from a magazine for example or any other kind of printing of that sort. They hung their ruling on a technicality. That is what it amounts to because certain copies of the RECORD are sent to certain bureaus and organizations free of charge. They are just trying to rip off the House of Representatives and the Senate to force us to take

some of the money appropriated to us and turn it over to them so they can continue their wasteful practices of \$150,000 office renovations for the top brass and contracts for Mr. Klassen's friends at the rate of \$20,000 to \$40,000 a year for no discernible work whatever.

If there is any subject around here that needs an investigation and if there is anybody maybe that ought to be indicted it seems to me it would be some of the people in that organization who are engaged in what I consider to be fraud of the first order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has stated the proposition more clearly than I could and that is the reason why I support the legislation, but I hope the gentleman from Ohio will join some of the rest of us in trying to stop this new Postal Corporation from coming to Congress for ever more and more money. This year we will appropriate some \$2 billion, if we accede to the requests they have made and that is more than Congress appropriated in any year heretofore to the old Post Office Department.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman well knows that the gentleman from Ohio as well as the gentleman from Iowa voted against the creation of this monstrosity.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, that is certainly correct.

Mr. HAYS. And as far as I am concerned I would not vote to give them 2 cents let alone \$2 million; I do not care what happens to them, because we would be better off if we would return the mail to the Pony Express.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill and I think I concur with the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Iowa in connection with their appraisal of the present Corporation. I recall when it was first proposed, but I am certain if the corporate structure had been offered by itself it would have been defeated, but by whatever legislative legerdemain we were boxed in at the time the postal employees had their salary increase coupled with the corporate proposal.

In the light of what has been said today and in the light of bitter experience it would appear to me we should be talking in terms of restoring the postal service to its former status. If there ever was a rip off, as we colloquially express ourselves, this is the greatest.

And whether we approve the service, the service is being deteriorated and the people in the name of reform are being deluded into espousing the corporate aspect of postal reform. I would suggest that the leaders and Members think in terms of dismantling the Corporation and bringing it back where it was, saving the taxpayers' money and having more and better service and making the employees a great deal happier.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observations.

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

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

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I merely want to say that the minority on the committee have no objection to the bill. Their feeling on the bill is about the same as that expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, that it is a proper way to handle mailing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it will, in fact, save the Congress money. We hope it will save the country some money too, but there is some question on that latter point.

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

Mr. BRADEMAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to consume more than a minute or so. I was not kidding when I talked about returning to the Pony Express, because prior to the Postal Corporation it used to be that one could get mail from here to my district, the nearest part of which is 300 miles from Washington, sometimes overnight; but certainly in a day. Now it is taking from 5 to 7 days.

The Pony Express used to take mail from St. Joseph, Mo., to San Francisco, in 5 days; so when I say let us return to the Pony Express, I am talking about saving time and getting the mail there quicker.

Mr. BRADEMAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GUYER).

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word that would be realistic, that is to pay all postal employees by mail. They might get all the mail delivered on time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill S. 3373.

The question was taken.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I reinstate the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BRADEMAM. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 265]

Anderson, Calif.	Brasco	Chisholm
Badillo	Brown, Calif.	Clausen
Bell	Burke, Calif.	Don H.
Blester	Burke, Fla.	Cochran
Bingham	Burton	Conyers
Bowen	Carey, N.Y.	Coughlin
	Cederberg	Culver

Daniels,	Holtzman	Roybal
Dominick V.	Horton	Runnels
Danielson	Howard	Ryan
Davis, Ga.	Huber	Scherle
Dellums	Hutchinson	Stark
Dickinson	Jones, Tenn.	Steele
Diggs	Kyros	Stokes
Dorn	Landgrebe	Stubblefield
Drinan	Landrum	Talcott
Eckhardt	Lehman	Teague
Esch	McCloskey	Thompson, N.J.
Fisher	McSpadden	Tiernan
Fraser	Macdonald	Udall
Frelinghuysen	Mathis, Ga.	Ullman
Gettys	Mazzoli	Van Deerlin
Gray	Meeds	Vander Jagt
Gubser	Melcher	Waldie
Gude	Metcalfe	Ware
Hanna	Mitchell, Md.	Whalen
Hansen, Wash	Pike	Widnall
Harsha	Podell	Wiggins
Hawkins	Price, Tex.	Wilson, Bob
Hébert	Quillen	Wilson,
Helstoski	Rangel	Charles H.,
Hinshaw	Reid	Calif.
Hogan	Rooney, N.Y.	Wilson,
Holifield	Rousselot	Charles, Tex.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 337 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION—FISCAL YEAR 1975

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13296) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1975 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13296

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation as the Appropriation Act may provide for the use of the Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year 1975, as follows:

(a) acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of vessels and construction-differential subsidy and cost of national defense features incident to the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of ships, \$275,000,000;

(b) payment of obligations incurred for ship operating-differential subsidy, \$242,800,000;

(c) expenses necessary for research and development activities \$27,900,000.

(d) reserve fleet expenses, \$3,742,000;

(e) maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York, \$10,518,000; and

(f) financial assistance to State Marine Schools, \$2,973,000.

Sec. 2. In addition to the amounts authorized by section 1 of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1975 such additional supplemental amounts for the activities for which appropriations are authorized under section 1 of this Act as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge passage of H.R. 13296, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1975 for certain maritime programs of the Department of

Commerce in the total amount of \$562,900,000—to be apportioned as follows:

Construction subsidy—\$275 million.

Operating subsidy—\$242,800,000.

Research and development—\$27,900,000.

National Defense Reserve Fleet—\$3,742,000.

Federal Merchant Marine Academy—\$10,518,000.

State marine schools—\$2,973,000.

As you know, construction subsidy is based on the difference between United States and foreign shipbuilding costs, and paid to U.S. shipyards so that our vessels can compete in international trade. The construction subsidy request of \$275 million will permit the Maritime Administration to contract for nine ships in fiscal year 1975, as part of the new maritime program provided by the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

I am pleased to be able to inform the House that this continues to be a very successful program. Contracts have been let for 52 ships of 4.7 million deadweight tons and the conversion of 19 ships. All these contracts have come within the declining construction subsidy rates provided by that act. The Merchant Marine Act of 1970 generally provides for the reduction of subsidy from 45 percent in 1971, until 35 percent is reached in 1976. In 1975, the construction subsidy rate will decline from 39 to 37 percent.

The next element in the authorization request is for operating subsidy that is generally based on the difference between United States and comparable foreign operating costs, and paid so that U.S.-flag operators can provide essential shipping services. The authorization request of \$242,800,000 for this activity in fiscal year 1975 would be used for the operation of U.S.-flag passenger, cargo, and bulk vessels in our foreign commerce.

I am pleased to be able to inform the House that not all U.S.-flag vessels require operating subsidy. A number of capital intensive vessels, such as container ships, are operated without subsidy in our foreign trade by operators such as Sea-Land. More significantly, 19 vessels that were formerly operated under subsidy by U.S. Lines and American Export Lines, now compete in our foreign trade without such Government assistance.

The Research and Development authorization request of \$27,900,000 would be used by the Maritime Administration to increase the productivity of the American shipping and shipbuilding industries in order to improve the competitive position of the U.S.-flag merchant marine. Priority will be given projects with near-term benefits. Industry participation and cost sharing will be expanded. With the sky-rocketing cost of fuel oil, I am pleased to note that the largest single elements of the research and development program concerns the development of competitive nuclear ships.

The authorization request of \$3,742,000 for the National Defense Reserve Fleet would be used by the Maritime Administration to continue to maintain ships under preservation to supplement the active fleet in times of war or national emergency and 294 merchant

ships would be retained for national defense purposes.

The last two authorization requests concern maritime training. Section 1(e) of the bill would authorize \$10,518,000 for the continued operation of the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y. Section 1(f) would authorize \$2,973,000 for Government aid to the State marine schools. In this regard, an Ad Hoc Committee on Maritime Education and Training, of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, is in the process of making a comprehensive evaluation of all of our Nation's maritime schools. This study should be completed during the later part of this session of the Congress.

Section 2 of H.R. 13296 is basically a technical amendment to avoid having to amend the fiscal year 1975 authorization request if supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1975 are required for the remuneration of Maritime Administration employees at the National Defense Reserve Fleet and the Federal Merchant Marine Academy. An identical provision was in the authorization act for fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Speaker, the annual authorization request of the Maritime Administration is the most important piece of legislation to come before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee each year. Every item has been carefully reviewed. After full and careful consideration of the entire record, H.R. 13296 was reported unanimously, and I am unaware of any opposition to it.

I strongly urge the House to support this very vital piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time to the distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee as she may consume.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee in urging the support of the House for H.R. 13296, the authorization of appropriations for the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1975.

The subcommittee chairman has gone into some detail with respect to the various elements of H.R. 13296 and I am sure there are Members on both sides of the aisle who would like to speak in support of this worthwhile bill, so I will be brief. I would like to say that I am in full support of H.R. 13296, which is the funding for various programs for the Maritime Administration.

This bill is necessary because it provides funds for the construction and operating subsidy programs, for research and development, and for such items as the National Defense Reserve Fleet and the maritime schools. If we wish to keep the American flag on the high seas, then it is necessary to support this bill and provide the necessary funds for the Maritime Administration to carry on its programs.

It is common knowledge that the Russians have advanced greatly in the maritime area and in their naval fleets. At the same time that Russian commercial and military fleets have been increasing, the U.S. maritime and military capacity has been deteriorating. This is not to say, however, that the picture is completely black, because we do have the most modern and efficient liner fleet in the world

and we have been making strides in the last several years to increase our bulk carrier fleet and our bulk carriage capacity. Recently, the House passed H.R. 8193, which would provide that a certain percentage of petroleum imported into the United States be carried in U.S.-flag vessels. This piece of legislation should give more impetus to the construction of U.S. bulk carriers, which is an area of the U.S.-flag fleet which has been neglected for years and which is now receiving proper attention. This latter piece of legislation should be helpful as a supplement to the landmark Merchant Marine Act of 1970, which provided a new maritime program for the revitalization of the U.S.-flag merchant fleet. In the last several years, we have been constructing new tonnage under that program. The total amount set out in H.R. 13296, is \$562,900,000 and I do not think this is too high a price to pay to keep U.S.-flag merchant vessels on the oceans of the world.

Of the total figure set out above, \$275 million is requested for construction-differential subsidy. The Maritime Administration plans to contract for nine ships under the fiscal year 1975 building program: Three VLCC's, and six liquefied natural gas carriers (LNG's).

It is noted that all of these vessels are so-called energy carrying vessels, which is what our requirements are at the present time. I would like to point out at this time that the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 set forth guidelines for the gradual reduction of the construction-differential subsidy level to 35 percent in fiscal year 1976, and thereafter. In fiscal year 1975, the CDS level will be reduced from 39 percent to 37 percent. When the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 was enacted, the CDS level was 50 percent, so there has been a dramatic reduction in the percentage of subsidies paid for the construction of vessels in U.S. shipyards. I am pleased to report that the shipyards have been able to meet the percentage reductions outlined in the 1970 act. I would like to note that subsidy rates of LNG carriers are as low as 16.5 percent. This, of course, is due to the high cost of constructing the same type of vessel in foreign yards. It does appear that the gap between ship construction in U.S. and foreign shipyards is narrowing.

H.R. 13296 provides \$242,800,000 for ship operating subsidies for fiscal year 1975. This operating subsidy will be allocated to passenger vessels, combination cargo and passenger vessels, general cargo vessels, and bulk carriers. I would like to point out that there are no funds authorized in this bill to subsidize the carriage of grain purchases by the Soviet Union in U.S.-flag vessels.

With respect to the funding in this bill which relates to the Federal Maritime Academy at Kings Point and the six State maritime schools, I would like to point out that the committee has a special ad hoc committee making a study of these maritime academies. It is true that the expenditures for these schools are not great but a number of Members have expressed concern that the taxpayer receive full value for his investment in these schools. There are a number of hard questions which must be asked concerning Federal funding of these mari-

time schools and it is hoped that the ad hoc committee studying the maritime academy situation will come up with a report that can assure us that the taxpayer is indeed receiving reasonable value for his investment in these maritime academies. It is hoped that this study will be completed this year.

I can assure the Members of the House that all the provisions of this bill were given ample hearing and careful study and that the maritime industry supports this legislation which was reported unanimously out of committee after full and careful consideration of the entire record.

I strongly urge the Members of the House to support H.R. 13296.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER).

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues on the Merchant Marine Committee in supporting H.R. 13296 authorizing appropriations for the Maritime Administration. Marad is a very necessary and worthwhile program in the Nation's interest.

However, there is one weakness in Marad which greatly concerns me, and although it does not relate directly to this particular bill. I take this opportunity to comment upon the failure of the Maritime Administration to establish a regional office for the Great Lakes.

As my colleagues will recall, the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 placed the Great Lakes on the same footing as the other seacoasts with respect to administration of our various maritime aid programs. A number of these programs, particularly the tax deferral provisions of section 607 of the act, have been imminently successful in the Great Lakes.

There is a strong feeling among Great Lakes' shippers, however, that the unique aspects of Great Lakes transportation are not fully recognized here in Washington, and that it would be very valid and helpful to have a regional Marad office for the Great Lakes.

A regional office need not be located physically on the Great Lakes; it could be situated here in Washington. But it certainly should be staffed with people who are experienced and knowledgeable in Great Lakes shipping, and who have line authority with respect to the various programs as they relate to the Great Lakes.

In discussing this matter with the Assistant Secretary for Maritime Affairs, Mr. Blackwell, during the hearings on this bill, he replied that there was no need for a Great Lakes regional office, for the simple reason that his own door is always open, and that Great Lakes matters do receive his personal attention. In effect, he said that the Great Lakes received better treatment than they would if a separate office were established.

I am fully aware, of course, of Mr. Blackwell's very valuable work on behalf of Great Lakes shipping, but I also am aware that he will not remain the head of the Maritime Administration forever. I do not believe we can assume that the door of the Maritime Administrator always will be open to the Great Lakes.

Again, therefore, I take this opportunity to urge that the strong desire of

our people in the Great Lakes area for the establishment of a regional office be considered by Mr. Blackwell, and I hope that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will review this matter at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H.R. 13296, the Maritime Administration Authorization bill. The Maritime Administration performs an invaluable service to our country by administering programs to aid in the development, promotion, and operation of the U.S. Merchant Marine. It administers subsidy programs which assist greatly in the construction, reconstruction, and reconditioning of ships.

Mar Ad helps industry generate increased business for U.S. ships, and conducts programs to develop ports, facilities, and intermodal transportation systems. It conducts research and develops activities which in turn improve the efficiency and economy of the merchant marine, and it operates the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, the main fountainhead of merchant marine officers and specialists.

I think a word should be said for the steadfast support which President Nixon has given the merchant marine. He has spoken eloquently of the need to make our merchant marine the most modern and efficient in the world by the end of this decade, and he has backed his words with action.

The merchant marine makes a definite contribution to the area around Mobile, Ala., in my district, and to the entire Nation's economy and security. Making the merchant marine a more viable contributor to the Nation is something which I have worked toward for the 10 years I have served in the Congress. We must continue our shipbuilding and rebuilding programs to provide the merchant marine with the means to perform its important tasks. I urge passage of H.R. 13296 so that the work of the Maritime Administration and the merchant marine can proceed.

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

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee (Mr. CLARK) has carefully described the provisions of H.R. 13296, authorizing appropriations for the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1975, and I will not attempt to duplicate his statement. I believe it is sufficient to state that this authorization bill reflects the continuing commitment of the administration and the Congress to the rebuilding of the American merchant marine pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

The principal thrust of the 1970 act was toward the creation of a bulk carrier capability under the U.S. flag. Just recently we passed and sent to the other body the Energy Transportation Security Act of 1974, legislation designed to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag tankers. As I indicated in my remarks in support of that legislation, the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 and the Energy Transportation Security Act have complementary

provisions to insure that the United States will become independent of foreign shipping in the carriage of its essential energy imports. The legislation we are now considering provides the seed money, if you will, to insure the construction of vessels which will give the United States this necessary degree of independence. At the subsidy rates prevailing in fiscal year 1975 of from 16½ percent to 37 percent, the construction funds authorized in this legislation will support almost a billion dollars worth of ship construction in U.S. yards, and many thousands of man-hours of employment not only in the shipyards themselves but in the steel industry and all the related industries that contribute to the building of a ship.

The operating subsidies provided for in this legislation will provide a minimum of support for liner companies operating on essential trade routes and bulk carriers in various worldwide services. While great strides have been made with respect to the construction of technologically advanced liner vessels, such as container and barge-carrying ships, the liner companies of the U.S. merchant marine are beset by a number of competitive problems which have seriously undermined their financial stability. The technological revolution which swept the liner trades in the 1960's made this a capital-intensive industry. The liner industry is no longer in truth a shipping industry but has become an integrated land-sea transportation industry, where terminal facilities, containers and trucks are as important elements in the business as the ships themselves.

The purchase of modern container and LASH ships has seriously strained the resources of our liner companies. A number of them have become subsidiaries of major conglomerate organizations in order to secure the great amounts of money required to pay for the ships, containers, and other facilities essential to a modern liner service.

While the technological revolution in shipping began in the United States, it quickly expanded to Europe and Japan and the major shipping nations of the world have now fully equalized whatever competitive edge the U.S. merchant marine may have enjoyed during the late 1960's. Both the North Atlantic and the trans-Pacific trades, our principal trade routes, are heavily over-tonnaged and will remain so for years to come under current projections of trade growth. In this highly competitive international environment, the American carrier with a substantially higher cost structure is at a distinct disadvantage. Subsidy is a mixed blessing. It imposes rigidity, and in return for money to meet the higher U.S. costs, the carrier must forego the flexibility which its foreign competitor enjoys. At the same time, the U.S. system of shipping regulation imposes constraints upon U.S.-flag carriers of which the foreign competition is largely free.

This year under the auspices of the United Nations a so-called code of conduct for liner conferences has been promulgated and is open for ratification. During the negotiations over this code in Geneva, the U.S. delegation sought international approval of our system of open

steamship conferences and free competition for trade. These concepts, which we have adhered to in the U.S. foreign trade since enactment of the Shipping Act of 1916, were resoundingly defeated by the international community during the code of conference practice deliberations. Apparently, what the rest of the world wants is free, open competition in the U.S. foreign trade and closed cartels in all other trades. The effect of this is that the Japanese and European carriers, and now most recently the Russians, are able to come into the U.S. trades at will and skim off the most lucrative cargo while effectively denying to U.S. carriers any opportunity to engage in foreign-to-foreign trades. This highly discriminatory system must end.

We are today authorizing almost \$250 million for operating subsidies mostly for U.S.-liner vessels. It makes no sense to spend this kind of money, on the one hand, and then on the other hand permit foreign shipping interests to undercut our fleet in our own trades.

Understandably, the Maritime Administration has concentrated attention on the tanker shipbuilding program during the past 4 years. It is time, however, to take a serious look at the problems that beset our liner industry. Responsibility for this is divided between the Federal Maritime Commission, which administers our regulatory statutes, the Maritime Administration, Justice Department and the State Department. Unfortunately, none of these agencies has exercised any leadership in tackling the problems of our liner industry. The time is growing short, and I urge these agencies to undertake a thorough review of our promotional and regulatory policies with respect to liner shipping with a view toward developing a system of shipping subsidy that will not place our carriers on a straitjacket, and a system of regulation which will recognize the realities of international trade in this decade. Undoubtedly, such a review, to be meaningful, must involve fundamental statutory changes. I know that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is prepared to consider seriously the highly discriminatory climate in which the U.S.-liner fleet must operate today. We are, however, a legislative body, and the administrative agencies which have the basic expertise in this field must come forward and present at least the broad outlines of a program which will permit the U.S.-liner fleet to compete effectively with those of other nations with whom we trade.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, this bill represents a continuing commitment to the rebuilding of the American merchant marine which we should support wholeheartedly, and I urge all of my colleagues to support its passage.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask someone conversant with this subject why a bill authorizing more than a half billion dollars is brought here under suspension of the rules, which means that no amendments can be offered? I am not necessarily opposed to the bill, but how does a Member of the

House, who is not a member of the committee, have the opportunity to work his or her will upon a bill of this magnitude when it is brought in here under suspension of the rules?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there was no opposition to this bill in any way, shape, or form in our committee, and we felt that since there was no opposition in the committee on both sides of the aisle that there would be no problem with this bill at all.

It is a bill that is needed very badly in the shipping industry.

Mr. GROSS. That is a lovely statement in behalf of the members of the committee, most of which, if not all of whom have maritime interests, that they are all satisfied with the bill. But what about the poor devil who is not a member of the committee who might have some disagreement with the bill? Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania think that it is good practice to bring authorization bills of this dimension to the House floor under suspension of the rules?

Mr. CLARK. If the gentleman will yield further, this is an annual authorization bill, and there has not been any opposition to it in the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope we would have annual authorizations of this kind, but that still does not explain why this bill, involving more than a half billion dollars, comes to the floor under a suspension of the rules so that the other House Members are prohibited from offering amendments. We must either vote it up or down.

For instance, I do not know whether the squash courts at the Merchant Marine Academy are justified or not. Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania does.

Also I do not know whether the new facilities for visiting football teams, as well as the home team at the Academy, are justified or not. I do know that I cannot offer an amendment to strike any of it out.

But, Mr. Speaker, I still have no answer to the question of why these authorization bills are brought in under a suspension of the rules involving the amounts of money that they do.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that there could be very little opposition to the subsidies because the average person on the floor would not know and would not be able to know other than possibly offering to cut the subsidies, which could have no meaning. The committee has to study this with the maritime industry, and they come up with the subsidies for operation and for building of ships.

But there are questions to be asked about the maritime academies. I should like to say to the gentleman from Iowa that with respect to the funding of the bill relating to the maritime academies at King Point and the six State maritime schools, the committee has a special ad hoc committee in being right now studying the costs and all of the details of all of these schools, and the amount of

money that Congress appropriates to help them. I hope that we can have this study completed by this year so that we can have a better understanding of where this money goes and how it is spent.

Mr. GROSS. I should hope that somebody would be making a study of the cost, because it is my understanding that it costs a great deal more in the service academies for the training of future officers for the merchant marine than it does in private schools.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is one reason that we formed this ad hoc committee this year, to make this study and come back, because we do think the costs are high, and we want to know why and if this would continue.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING).

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee in strong support of H.R. 13296, a bill to authorize appropriations for certain Maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

Passage of this bill is absolutely necessary to the concerted effort inaugurated in 1970 to restore this Nation to the rank of a first-rate maritime power. The bill provides \$275 million for so-called construction subsidy. These funds would generally be used to make up the difference between United States and foreign shipbuilding costs for the 1975 building program, and would be paid directly to American shipyards.

When the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 was enacted, the construction-subsidy rate was as high as 55 percent. In other words, when the subsidized vessel was constructed, the Government paid most of the cost. I am pleased to inform my colleagues that pursuant to that act this is no longer the case. All construction subsidy contracts have come within the declining scale provided by the Merchant Marine Act of 1970. The construction subsidy rate is scheduled to decline to a record low of 37 percent in fiscal year 1975. In addition, subsidy rates for liquefied natural gas carriers have been as low as 16.5 percent.

Since enactment of the 1970 act, the Maritime Administration has contracted for the construction of 52 new vessels and the conversion of 19 vessels.

The amount requested for construction subsidy for fiscal year 1975 is the same as in fiscal year 1974. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee concluded that these funds are the minimum required to carry on the building program mandated by the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the House to support H.R. 13296, so that our efforts to provide for the essential needs of the United States in the area of ocean transportation may be continued.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that we have not thoroughly assessed the maritime authorization for

fiscal year 1975. With inflation reaching the double figure level, soaring interest rates, and a \$13 billion deficit we should be looking for means of cutting back. The maritime authorization of \$562.9 million for 1975 would seem to be one area where such a cutback could occur. The present bill maintains the same figure of \$275 million for ship construction subsidy that was authorized for fiscal 1974—which is projected to generate approximately \$976 million in shipyard orders. This quite possibly could put an unnecessary burden on an already overburdened steel industry and is certain to contribute to inflation.

While I generally do not argue the importance of Government subsidization of the maritime industry, I do feel that under the present economic conditions we must cut back. A reduction in this authorization affords an opportunity to make needed savings.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13296.

The question was taken; and—two-thirds having voted in favor thereof—the rules were suspended and the bill was passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 13296, just passed.

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

There was no objection.

MARINER VESSELS TRADED INTO NATIONAL DEFENSE RESERVE FLEET

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12427) to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12427

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 510(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1160 (1)) is amended to read as follows:

*"(1) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized, within two years after enactment of this subsection, to acquire mariner class vessels constructed under title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and legislation in Public Law 911, Eighty-first Congress, in exchange for obsolete vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet that are scheduled for scrapping. For purposes of this subsection, the traded-in and traded-out vessels shall be valued at the higher of their scrap value in domestic or foreign markets as of the date of the exchange: *Provided*, That any exchange transactions the value assigned to the traded-in and traded-out vessels will be determined on the same basis. The value of the traded out vessel[s] shall be as nearly as possible equal to the value of the traded-in vessel[s] plus the fair value of the cost of towing the traded-out vessel[s] to the place of scrapping. To the extent the value of the*

traded-out vessel[s] exceeds the value of the traded-in vessel[s] plus the fair value of the cost of towing, the owner of the traded-in vessel[s] shall pay the excess to the Secretary of Commerce in cash at the time of the exchange. This excess shall be deposited into the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund and all costs incident to the lay-up of vessels acquired under this Act may be paid from balances in the Fund. No payments shall be made by the Secretary of Commerce to the owner of any traded-in vessel[s] in connection with any exchange under this subsection. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1961, vessels traded out under this subsection may be scrapped in approved foreign markets. The provision of this subsection (1) as it read prior to this amendment shall govern all transactions made thereunder prior to this amendment."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12427, a bill to upgrade our National Defense Reserve Fleet of merchant vessels that are used to augment sealift capacity in times of war and national emergency.

The age and condition of the World War II-built vessels in this fleet has been a source of grave concern for some time now. In short, the further utility of these vessels is questionable.

It is clear that as these old vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet are scrapped, they must be replaced by more modern vessels that can efficiently transport military requirements, such as the Vietnam sealift. It is also clear that the increasing sophistication of vessels in our merchant marine have made some Mariner vessels surplus to the owner's needs.

These Mariners were constructed for national defense purposes in the 1950's and would be ideal for the National Defense Reserve Fleet. Indeed, the Maritime Administration recently purchased one Mariner for layup.

Rather than see these surplus Mariners scrapped, the bill would generally authorize them to be exchanged for wornout vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet that would be scrapped instead. H.R. 12427, as reported, provides the mechanism whereby the traded-in and traded-out vessels could be determined on the same scrap basis, provides for funding the cost of laying up the traded-in Mariner, and other procedural aspects of the transaction.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is in complete agreement with the position of the Department of Defense that the opportunity afforded by H.R. 12427 to rejuvenate our National Defense Fleet by the acquisition of relatively modern cargo ships must not be lost. The reported bill provides for a most efficient method of accomplishing this objective.

The bill was reported, unanimously, and I am unaware of any opposition to it.

I strongly urge the House to support H.R. 12427.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now such time as she may consume to the distinguished chairwoman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN).

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the Honorable FRANK M. CLARK, has set out the details of this bill. As chairman of the full committee, I would like to add my full support to what I consider to be a very worthwhile piece of legislation. I do not know of any opposition to this bill and I think the reason is, that the bill would benefit all parties involved. It is not often when we can say this about legislation, but I think this is a bill in which no one has any complaint, and everyone benefits. As the chairman of the subcommittee has stated, this bill would provide for trading in a so-called Mariner vessel to be kept in the National Defense Reserve Fleet, for two rusting hulks which would be taken out for scrapping.

The so-called Mariner vessels which would be traded in under the bill were built for national defense purposes. Thirty-five Mariners were built by the Government and they were 20-knot vessels of 13,400 deadweight tons. They were by far the most efficient and productive dry cargo vessels built anywhere up to that time. Five of these vessels were turned over to the Navy and the remaining 30 were sold to private operators. There are now 26 Mariners remaining which would be eligible for trade-in to the National Defense Reserve Fleet under this legislation.

As the Members know, the Secretary of Commerce has the responsibility to provide merchant shipping during times of national emergency. One of the most available and larger sources of merchant shipping available to the Secretary during a national emergency are the vessels which are laid up in the National Defense Reserve Fleet. Many of the vessels in this fleet, unfortunately, date back to the 1943-45 period. By relative standards, they are slow, have a small carrying capacity, and are generally nonproductive, aside from the fact that they are rapidly becoming nothing but rust buckets. Previously, break bulk ships were available from both the scheduled liner service—both subsidized and unsubsidized—and so-called tramp, or unscheduled shipping. The tramp fleet, once a large source of contingency surge capability, now numbers only about a dozen. Since the tramp fleet is no longer available to turn to, the National Defense Reserve Fleet is more important than ever. Remaining in the National Defense Reserve Fleet are 130 obsolete Victory ships, built during World War II, that served well in the recent crises in Korea and Vietnam. However, age and condition require their scrapping in the very near future. For the reasons mentioned above, the opportunity afforded by this legislation to pump some productive, efficient, useful vessels into the National Defense Reserve Fleet must not be lost.

The Department of Defense witness

testified that the Mariner vessels which would be traded in under this legislation are better suited to DOD use in wartime because of their high speed, large cargo stowage areas, and supporting cargo handling capability.

We cannot tell how many Mariners might be traded in to be put in the Reserve Fleet in the next 2 years for the scrap hulks which would be traded out. We would hope that all 26 eligible Mariners might end up in the National Defense Reserve Fleet, but if even half this number are traded in in the next 2 years, it will be a great shot in the arm for the National Defense Reserve Fleet. This bill would help the few remaining commercial operators who have Mariners which are no longer useful because of the shift in technology to container and barge vessels so that the Mariners would not be a drain in lay-up costs. On the other hand, the Government will profit by getting the rust buckets out of the Reserve Fleet and getting some newer, more productive, efficient vessels into that fleet.

As I mentioned in the beginning, obviously no one opposes this bill which was reported unanimously out of committee. It is indeed a meritorious piece of legislation and I urge the Members to support H.R. 12427.

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly endorse H.R. 12427, a bill to permit the trade-in of Mariner class vessels into the National Defense Reserve Fleet in exchange for ships that are scheduled for scrapping. Following World War II, the many Liberty and Victory ships which had made it possible to support our troops in Europe and Asia were placed in National Defense Reserve Fleet anchorages at strategic coastal locations. At a modest cost to cover initial mothballing and continual preservation against the effects of salt water, the United States was assured of adequate numbers of merchant ships to support national defense needs during an emergency. It was not long before such an emergency occurred, and in 1950 with the outbreak of the Korean conflict, hundreds of vessels were placed back in active service and operated by commercial steamship operators for the account of the Federal Government.

Again with the acceleration of the hostilities in Vietnam, the National Defense Reserve Fleet proved to be indispensable. These ships are now, however, worn out. Only a handful of vessels remaining in the National Defense Reserve Fleet could be reactivated and placed into service without many months of refurbishing. For all practical purposes, today we have no National Defense Reserve Fleet that can be tapped to provide an immediate increase in sealift capability of any significance. The majority of ships in the Reserve Fleet are there awaiting scrapping and are kept only to avoid a sudden glut on the scrap market.

For the purpose of augmenting sealift capability during the emergency, the Department of Defense requires vessels which do not depend upon sophisticated shoreside loading and unloading facilities; in other words, conventional so-

called break bulk freighters which load and discharge their cargoes with booms and tackle. The ships, of course, must be in first-class condition requiring a minimum of work in order to be made ready for sea. The Mariner class vessels built for the Federal Government during the early 1950's meet these requirements in every respect. They are relatively fast ships capable of 20 knots, almost double the speed of the typical freighter of World War II vintage. Twenty-four of these ships are owned by U.S.-flag steamship companies. Most of these operators have upgraded their fleets to take advantage of the technological revolution that has swept the maritime industry during the past decade. The majority of Mariner vessels in service today, therefore, are obsolete from a technological standpoint so far as commercial shipping is concerned. It is likely that in the absence of legislation such as H.R. 12427, most of these vessels will be scrapped.

In order to gain these ships for the National Defense Reserve Fleet at a nominal cost to the Federal Government, this bill permits the Secretary of Commerce to accept Mariners for trade-in to the Reserve Fleet in exchange for ships of equal scrap value that are scheduled for scrapping. The commercial operator trading in Mariners will be permitted to scrap the traded-out tonnage either in the United States or abroad. The bill requires an equal exchange of scrap value. In no event may the Federal Government pay the commercial operator should the value of the tonnage traded out of the Reserve Fleet exceed the value of Mariners traded in. However, should the value of Mariners traded in be less than the value of scrap tonnage traded out, the commercial operator must pay the difference to the Federal Government. Any such excess payment would be credited to the Vessels Operations Revolving Fund, which is maintained by the Secretary of Commerce, and under the committee amendment to the bill the layup costs for Mariners acquired under this act may be paid for from the fund. It is estimated that these layup costs will average \$200,000 per Mariner. While it is unlikely that all of the Mariners will be traded in, since there are still commercial trades where the traditional break-bulk type vessel is usable, I hope that the majority of them will be traded in, thereby providing us a nucleus of modern dry cargo ships for emergency use. The bill is strongly supported by the Department of Defense, and I urge its passage.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 12427, a bill that would provide a most efficient method to upgrade the vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet, by acquiring relatively modern Mariner vessels in exchange for wornout vessels in that fleet scheduled for scrapping.

The bill is straightforward, and let me give you an example of a typical transaction.

The owner of a Mariner worth \$1 million in a Far East scrap yard would trade in his vessel in exchange for two old Victory ships worth \$600,000 each, for a total value of \$1.2 million. Of this

\$1.2 million, the owner of the traded-in Mariner would pay \$50,000 into the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund, and bring the two traded-out vessels to the Far East for scrapping at a towing cost to him of \$150,000. The Government would preserve and lay up the trade-in Mariner at a cost of \$200,000 from the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund. The fund now has a balance of about \$16 million.

In this way, the National Defense Reserve Fleet would acquire an efficient vessel to augment sealift capacity in times of war and national emergency. When you consider that the Maritime Administration recently purchased a Mariner vessel for layup in the National Defense Reserve Fleet at a cost of \$3.5 million, the merits of the bill are readily apparent.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the House to support H.R. 12427.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 12427, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 12427) just passed.

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

There was no objection.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13595) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, to authorize appropriations for bridge alterations, to authorize for the Coast Guard an end-year strength for active duty personnel, to authorize for the Coast Guard average military student loads, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13595

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1975 for the use of the Coast Guard as follows:

VESSELS

For procurement, renovation, and increasing the capability of vessels, \$22,676,000.

A. Procurement:

- (1) One one-hundred-and-sixty-foot inland construction tender;
- (2) small boat replacement program; and
- (3) design of vessels.

B. Renovation and increasing capability:

- (1) renovate and improve buoy tenders;
- (2) re-engine and renovate coastal buoy tenders;

- (3) modernize and improve cutter, buoy tender, and icebreaker communications equipment;

- (4) abate pollution by oily waste from Coast Guard vessels; and

- (5) abate pollution by nonoily waste from Coast Guard vessels.

AIRCRAFT

For procurement of eight replacement fixed-wing medium-range search aircraft, \$17,793,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For the establishment or development of installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following, \$74,731,000:

- (1) St. Petersburg, Florida: Establish a new consolidated aviation facility.

- (2) Arcata, California: Construct air station, phase II.

- (3) Sitka, Alaska: Construct new air station.

- (4) Woods Hole, Massachusetts: Construct small boat maintenance facility at Coast Guard base.

- (5) New London, Connecticut: Renovate and expand cadet galley and dining facilities at Coast Guard Academy.

- (6) Curtis Bay, Maryland: Renew steam system at Coast Guard yard, phase II.

- (7) Yorktown, Virginia: Construct classroom building at Reserve training center.

- (8) Portsmouth, Virginia: Construct new Coast Guard base, phase III.

- (9) Virginia Beach, Virginia: Replace Little Creek Station waterfront facilities.

- (10) Rodanthe, North Carolina: Improve Oregon Inlet Station.

- (11) Port Canaveral, Florida: Replace Port Canaveral Station (leased property).

- (12) Miami, Florida: Renovate Miami Air Station.

- (13) Port Aransas, Texas: Rebuild Port Aransas Station.

- (14) Traverse City, Michigan: Rebuild air station.

- (15) Keokuk, Iowa: Construct depot building.

- (16) Seattle, Washington: Relocate Coast Guard units to piers 36/37, phase I (leased property).

- (17) Alaska, various locations: Establish VHF-FM distress communications system.

- (18) Kodiak, Alaska: Renovate and consolidate Coast Guard base, phase II.

- (19) Valdez, Alaska: Establish vessel traffic system and port safety station.

- (20) Various locations: Improve radio navigation system of Pacific coastal region.

- (21) New York, New York: Complete vessel traffic system, phase I (part II).

- (22) Various locations: Waterways aids to navigation projects.

- (23) Various locations: Lighthouse automation and modernization program (LAMP).

- (24) Various locations: Mediterranean loran C equipment replacement.

- (25) Various locations: Public family quarters.

- (26) Various locations: Advance planning, survey, design, and architectural services; project administration costs; acquire sites in connection with projects not otherwise authorized by law.

Sec. 2. For fiscal year 1975, the Coast Guard is authorized an end strength for active duty personnel of thirty-seven thousand seven hundred and forty-eight; except that the ceiling shall not include members of the Ready Reserve called to active duty under the provisions of Public Law 92-479.

Sec. 3. For fiscal year 1975, military training student loads for the Coast Guard are authorized as follows:

- (1) recruit and special training, four thousand and eighty man-years;

- (2) flight training, eighty-five man-years;

- (3) professional training in military and

civilian institutions, three hundred and seventy-five man-years; and

- (4) officer acquisition training, one thousand one hundred and sixty man-years.

Sec. 4. For use of the Coast Guard for payment to bridge owners for the cost of alterations of railroad bridges and public highway bridges to permit free navigation of navigable waters of the United States, \$6,800,000 is hereby authorized.

Sec. 5. Section 657 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

- (a) by deleting from the catchline the semicolon and the words following "children";

- (b) by designating the existing section as subsection (b); and

- (c) by inserting a new subsection (a) as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 236-244), the Secretary may provide, out of funds appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard, for the primary and secondary schooling of dependents of Coast Guard personnel stationed outside the continental United States at costs for any given area not in excess of those of the Department of Defense for the same area, when it is determined by the Secretary that the schools, if any, available in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of those dependents."

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. As a matter of record, I say now that the chairman and, indeed, all of the members of the Coast Guard Subcommittee and the full committee, have continually worked and supported our efforts to give the Coast Guard a greater capability to save lives, prevent oil pollution, protect the interests of U.S. fishermen, and to provide the best in domestic and international navigational aids among its many worthwhile missions.

The 33 percent increase in funds represented by this legislation in just 1 year is progress, but I feel that the Coast Guard will need even more in the future to do the important job it has to do.

Some of the items in the 1975 budget are of great significance in protecting our territorial waters against raids from foreign fishing fleets, the installation of navigation aids to protect the west coast from oil pollution when the crude oil begins to flow down from Alaska, replacing important navigational equipment needed by our naval forces and the Department of Defense, and modernizing the Coast Guard's search and rescue fleet.

These items include:

Initial procurement of 8 of a proposed fleet of 41 modern and more powerful medium-range surveillance aircraft for offshore patrols;

Two controversial long-range navigational programs, one of which has been the subject of governmental vacillation for the past 6 years;

Sizable increases in moneys for research and development for antipollution equipment;

Construction of a vessel traffic system at Valdez, Alaska, and continuation of work on the vessel traffic system already

begun in New York/Long Island Sound; and the

SAR boat replacement program.

AIRCRAFT

This bill authorizes \$17,793,000 for the procurement of 8 medium-range fixed-wing surveillance aircraft.

The aircraft are the first replacements for the Coast Guard's fleet of HU-16E amphibious aircraft, all of which are reaching the point of total operational and engineering obsolescence. The Coast Guard had originally indicated its intention to purchase the Rockwell International Sabre jet 75-A as the replacement aircraft. During the hearings, the subcommittee made lengthy inquiries into this intended purchase. Those inquiries have resulted in the Coast Guard's decision to change its procurement process from one of sole-source to a two-step competitive bid process.

The subcommittee intends to exercise continuing oversight of this procurement to insure that the competitive process is conducted in strict accordance with the principles of the Federal procurement regulations. The change to a competitive bid process will not significantly delay the purchase of these needed replacement aircraft since the Coast Guard advises that the purchase contracts are expected to be let during fiscal year 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress too strongly the need for these MRS aircraft. They are a must item if the Coast Guard is to keep up with its search and rescue missions and its activities in the areas of marine environmental protection, enforcement of laws and treaties, marine science activities and aids to navigation.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION—POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The increase in navigational aids and anti-pollution moneys is imperative.

Changes will occur in the volume of shipping and the related hazards to the environment over the next decade that stagger the imagination. Crude oil import by 1978—assuming a relative return to normalcy—will double what it was a year ago.

Bulk shipments of liquefied natural gas and other highly hazardous materials and exotic chemicals will increase. Regular arrivals in greater and greater quantities can be expected.

Deepwater terminals and offshore superports will appear to handle the jumbo tankers and special vessels that are being built to accommodate the volume needed.

This means that sealane approaches to the U.S. ports will be near the saturation point; and this means an even greater risk of collision or grounding.

Other factors that will cause potential danger include highspeed coastal container fleets that are joining the mass of other coastal traffic which now crisscross the approach routes.

Offshore exploration, fishing and oil drilling involve even more traffic and obstructions.

And creating an alarming risk for this country, and the men of the Coast Guard, are the new mammoth oil tankers. They are difficult to maneuver, and they take 7 miles to stop. More ominous, they have spill potential of up to 10 times that of present tankers.

Faced with this situation, it was considered an absolute must that we select a navigation system of the necessary accuracy and reliability to permit these sea-going giants to keep from sideswiping one another or running aground. The Coast Guard argued that the only reasonable way to minimize catastrophic accidents was a reliable navigation system with a quarter to one-half mile accuracy. The Coast Guard felt the best device that could provide this cost effectively was the Loran-C system.

After hearing all of the evidence from every facet of the navigation aid community and the responsible Federal agencies, the committee was fully satisfied that the Coast Guard's choice of Loran-C was sound and appropriate. Therefore, the committee authorized the funding of an improved radio navigation system for the Pacific coastal confluence zone. The committee, in so authorizing, expressed the strong belief that Loran-C is the only system suitable. Further, it is the desire of the committee that should any other system be selected, a full report be made to the committee prior to the expenditure of any of the funds authorized by this act.

The Coast Guard Subcommittee and the full Merchant Marine Committee debated the Loran-C issue at length last year and authorized similar moneys for the Mediterranean and west coast CCR. The Office of Management and Budget was against the selection of this system, and the funds were not appropriated. However, this year, OMB agreed that Loran-C is the preferred radio navigational aid and now supports the committee position.

VESSEL TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS

Public Law 93-153 authorized the trans-Alaska oil pipeline. A section of that act established a requirement for a vessel traffic control system for Prince William Sound and Valdez, Alaska. This bill, therefore, authorizes funds for the Coast Guard to meet that requirement. The project will provide for an integrated traffic system for the Port of Valdez, Valdez Arm and Narrows including a manned vessel traffic center.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION AMENDMENT, NEW YORK, N.Y.—VESSEL TRAFFIC SYSTEM

During last year's authorization hearings, the Coast Guard stated there was no traffic system called for under the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972 in New York at that time. Corps of Engineers statistics cited 350,465 vessel transits of New York Harbor in 1971. Coast Guard casualty data for 1971 cited 34 collisions and 21 groundings. The New York Port Authority estimated that in 1970, every fourth vessel entering was a tanker.

The VTS project authorized by the committee was a phasing approach to providing an integrated traffic system using VHF-FM communications, improved aids to navigation, limited electronic surveillance, and a manned traffic center for coordination of traffic movements on the waterways around New York. The traffic center is to be located on Governors Island, N.Y., and the service will be available 24 hours a day.

This year the Coast Guard requested \$1,100,000 to complete the New York

Vessel Traffic System, phase I, part II. The money was approved by the Department of Transportation but eliminated by OMB.

Testimony before the committee indicated an urgent need for a vessel traffic system in New York Harbor. Of all the ports in the United States, according to a Coast Guard study, the Port of New York ranked No. 1 in all negative categories such as collisions, ramblings, groundings, pollution from oil and other spills, deaths and injuries due to ship accidents, et cetera.

The committee unanimously voted to authorize an additional \$1,100,000 to the construction request of the Coast Guard to complete phase I, part II of the New York Vessel Traffic System begun last year.

The money requested by the Coast Guard and approved by the Department of Transportation was for the purchase and installation of radar equipment for two radar sites. Under the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972, the Secretary of Transportation was given the mandate of installing traffic systems to make our ports and waterways safer. New York, because of its congestion and the fact that it is a high hazard area, was one of the ports selected to install such a system.

The moneys we authorized in fiscal year 1974—\$4,200,000—as part of the system incorporated two radar sites but without the actual radar equipment. The radar sites are now ready to accept the equipment, and this amendment provides for the purchase and installation of those radars including data links back to the command system which will complete phase I of the system.

SCHOOLING OF COAST GUARD DEPENDENTS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

This committee amendment will add a new section to the bill to amend section 657 of title 14, United States Code. The amendment authorizes the expenditure of funds, out of money appropriated for the use of the Coast Guard, for the primary and secondary schooling of dependents of Coast Guard personnel stationed outside the continental United States, whenever schools in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of those dependents.

This identical provision was considered by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and favorably reported on September 13, 1973 (H. Rept. 93-509), as part of the Coast Guard omnibus bill, H.R. 9293. The House passed H.R. 9293, including this provision, on September 18, 1973. The Senate Commerce Committee, in its consideration of H.R. 9293 as passed by the House, deleted the provision amending section 657 of title 14. It stated in its report on the bill (S. Rept. 93-770), that the amendment should more properly be included in the Coast Guard's authorization bill for fiscal year 1975. The amendment of the committee is responsive to that statement.

Mr. Speaker, this authorization bill makes the picture much brighter for the Coast Guard than last year. It is testimony to the efforts of the Merchant Marine Committee to improve this vital service and I urge members to support it.

In view of the expiration of their terms

of service and their retirement from the Coast Guard, the committee in its report took the opportunity to commend Adm. Chester R. Bender, commandant, and Vice Adm. Thomas R. Sargent III, vice commandant, for their contributions to the Coast Guard over the last 4 years and, indeed, their entire careers.

It is fitting to say that under their leadership, the Coast Guard has excelled in all areas, with a particular emphasis on significant breakthroughs and activities in the fields of environmental protection and marine safety.

For my own part, Admiral Bender and Admiral Sargent have been of immeasurable assistance to me during my chairmanship of the Coast Guard Subcommittee.

Admiral Bender has had the distinction of leading the Coast Guard during what I consider its most important period in history, a period of change and greatly increased responsibilities.

Admiral Bender successfully phased out Coast Guard participation in the Vietnam conflict. In the process, to help South Vietnam maintain its independence, the Coast Guard trained Vietnamese crews to operate 30 cutters which were transferred to that small nation and are now a vital part of its defense.

Here at home, under Admiral Bender and Admiral Sargent, the Coast Guard assumed new missions associated with environmental protection duties authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. An entirely new organizational element was created, the Office of Marine Environment and Systems, to meet the challenge of protecting our marine environment.

Admiral Bender provided valuable assistance to me in the drafting of key legislation related to marine safety, protection of the environment, and the improvement of the Coast Guard itself.

A major issue which we have faced together, was to decide on the urgently needed new navigation system for the west coast confluence region.

Under the Commandant's leadership, and through the persuasive arguments of the Coast Guard, the Department of Transportation, and eventually the administration, has decided to choose the Loran-C system for the important job of providing guidance to our ships and oil tankers off the west coast. This is a subject of familiarity to Admiral Sargent, who distinguished himself as the commander of "Operation Tight Rein," the Coast Guard operation setting up the vital Loran-C stations in Thailand and Vietnam. For this he was awarded the legion of merit.

Under Admiral Bender and Admiral Sargent, the High Seas Oil Intervention Treaty was implemented by the United States. This is a law which will greatly assist nations in the case of a major collision or grounding off our coast. The Coast Guard will now be able to take whatever action it deems necessary to prevent catastrophic spills and major oil pollution to our coastlines.

Another law which went into effect under Admiral Bender is what we have called "the Women in the Coast Guard bill." The law allows for the full integration of women into the Coast Guard Re-

serve. It allows females to both train and serve on active and inactive duty as an integral and equal part of the Coast Guard team.

Admiral Bender and Admiral Sargent led the Coast Guard in their assignment to represent the United States in an historical International Oil Pollution Treaty Convention. As the alternate chairman of the U.S. delegation, the commandant led the United States in participating in this convention, which will eventually result in the cleanup of our oceans and the prevention of pollution from oil tankers and other ships in future decades.

I wish to congratulate Admiral Bender and Admiral Sargent for distinguishing themselves with such admirable careers.

It is with pride that we on the committee applaud their accomplishments, and with sadness that we see them leave their careers with the Coast Guard.

I wish them happiness in their retirement, and good health to enjoy the many pursuits they have postponed for so many years while serving their country so well.

They are both men of the highest integrity.

They exemplify dedication and loyalty to the United States of America.

And, above all, they are both gentlemen.

The Congress, the country, and surely their colleagues will miss them.

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

Mr. Speaker, I concur with the remarks of my colleague from New York (Mr. MURPHY). The authorization for rescue aircraft, capital improvements, navigational aids, shore side improvements and facilities in this bill are entirely justified by the increasing duties of the Coast Guard in their policing of oil pollution and their new duties of harbor vessel traffic control, and in the anticipated broad fishery controls which may come about, hopefully, in the near future.

I believe indeed right, and justifiable the expenditures authorized in this legislation.

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

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13595, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and other expenditures that are essential to the performance of the statutory responsibilities of the Coast Guard.

The authorization bill for fiscal year 1975 continues an effort begun last year to modernize the Coast Guard's fleet of smaller vessels, including buoy tenders and inshore rescue boats. The replacement program for large ocean-going high-endurance cutters has been virtually completed. With this legislation, the Coast Guard will begin the procurement of fixed-wing medium range search and rescue aircraft to replace its fleet of overage amphibians. As the committee report indicates, the Coast Guard has now determined to seek competitive bids for these aircraft rather than pursue the single-source procurement which was decided upon prior to the submission of this legislation.

The bulk of the funds authorized in this bill will be used for the upgrading of a variety of shore facilities at sites throughout the United States, and for the continued modernization and expansion of various navigational systems, including the vessel traffic control system for Valdez, Alaska, and the beginning of the Loran C program for the west coast coastal confluence region. These systems will, of course, greatly reduce the risk of collision or grounding in conjunction with the movement of oil from Alaska upon completion of the trans-Alaska pipeline.

The two amendments adopted by the committee are entirely justified. The first authorized completion of phase I of the New York Harbor Area Vessel Traffic Control System. The second amendment authorizes the Coast Guard to provide schooling for dependent children in areas where it is determined by the Secretary of Transportation that schools are not available or are unable to provide adequately for the education of dependent children of coastguardsmen. This latter amendment was originally passed by the House as a provision of the Coast Guard omnibus bill, H.R. 9293, but was deleted by the other body on the basis that it was more appropriate to this authorization bill. The need for the provision is self-evident. Coast Guard personnel are stationed in remote areas outside the continental United States. The authority granted here simply tracts the authority of the Secretary of Defense with regard to military dependents.

While as noted in the committee report, the budget for fiscal year 1975 represents a significant increase over last year, the general trend of Coast Guard funding for the past 5 years has not reflected the growth in responsibilities given our maritime law-enforcement agency. In almost every session of the Congress, we have enacted legislation which has expanded to some degree the Coast Guard's role in environmental protection, maritime safety, or enforcement of essentially criminal statutes.

Within the next few days, we will be considering legislation to authorize the construction of deepwater ports in the high seas off the coasts of the United States. The enactment of that much-needed legislation will again expand the role of the Coast Guard. It will be required to establish and patrol safety zones and to regulate the movement of very large tankers in the vicinity of these deepwater port facilities.

Other legislation which appears to be gaining momentum in the House calls for the establishment of a 200-mile interim fisheries zone pending the outcome of the ongoing Law of the Sea Conference. Should this legislation become law within the year, or as a result of the Law of the Sea Conference in 2 to 3 years, our fisheries jurisdiction will inevitably be substantially expanded.

Very little is being done today to anticipate the shift from a 12-mile zone to one in the vicinity of 200 miles. The establishment of the 200-mile fishery zone will mean that Coast Guard aircraft will be able to patrol effectively only a fraction of the time that they are now able to patrol on a flight that requires them

to only go out 12 miles from shore before beginning their surveillance. Likewise, when foreign vessels are discovered fishing illegally within this expanded zone of jurisdiction, the response time for a Coast Guard cutter to intercept a foreign fishing vessel will be greatly extended. A 200-mile fishing zone around the United States and Alaska will bring many thousands of square miles of ocean within U.S. regulatory jurisdiction.

A fishery zone that is not effectively patrolled will be violated. There is every indication today that, when foreign fishing vessel masters believe they can enter our 12-mile zone due to a relaxation of surveillance, they will do so, particularly at night. The Coast Guard's fleet of ships and aircraft, current and projected over the next 5 years, is simply inadequate to this task. If the Coast Guard is to effectively patrol an expanded fisheries zone, it will be compelled to curtail other essential activities. Something will have to give.

The administration in the Law of the Sea Conference is supporting the so-called species approach, which insofar as coastal fisheries are concerned is tantamount to a 200-mile zone. It is difficult to understand, therefore, why the Office of Management and Budget has failed to grasp the discrepancy between the U.S. policy on the Law of the Sea and its policy with respect to Coast Guard funding. This failure will result in our inability to enforce that policy should it be adopted in the Law of the Sea Conference.

I hope that the increase in this year's budget and authorization marks a departure from the past, and that we will begin to rapidly build up the Coast Guard's capability to carry out all its responsibilities to the fullest, including the certain expansion of our fisheries jurisdiction.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. Young).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 13595, and I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues and of the chairman of the committee.

I can truthfully say that this legislation is truly hallmark legislation. This is important legislation, concerning the Coast Guard and the need for a strong surveillance group in order to protect our fisheries and also to provide the necessary navigational requirements for the importation of oils from Alaska to the South 48, oils coming through the Valdez area.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that this is a very, very important piece of legislation, which is especially needed in Alaska and, of course, across the other coastal States.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge Members to support H.R. 13595, the Coast Guard authorization bill for fiscal year 1975,

which would authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and the construction of shore and offshore installations. This bill also authorizes appropriations for bridge alterations and for an end-year strength for active-duty personnel for the Coast Guard.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee increased the original amount of the bill of \$120,900,000 by \$1,100,000 to a total of \$122,000,000. The total authorization in the bill for acquisition, construction and improvements—A. C. & I.—is broken down as follows:

First, \$22,676,000—for procurement, renovation and increasing the capability of vessels.

Second, \$17,793,000—for procurement of eight replacement fixed-wing medium-range search aircraft.

Third, \$74,731,000—for development and establishment of Coast Guard installations and facilities.

Fourth, \$6,800,000—for the cost of bridge alterations.

Fifth, \$37,748—for end-year strength for active-duty personnel for fiscal year 1975.

Mr. Speaker, the original Coast Guard fiscal year 1975 preview estimate was in a total of \$182,351,000. The Department's request to OMB totaled \$140,000,000, and the final total in the President's budget was \$114,100,000, not including the bridge monies in the amount of \$6,800,000, as provided under the Truman Hobbs Act. The committee amendment raised the total to \$122,000,000—a scant 1-percent increase.

I would point out, as I did last year, Mr. Speaker, that I share the concerns of the other members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee over the rather paltry sums that have been provided to the Coast Guard, year after year, by the administration. Again, as in the past, the original request of the Coast Guard was drastically cut this time by \$42 million by the Department of Transportation, and \$26 million by the Office of Management and Budget.

I have known the leadership of the Coast Guard for many years, and I feel that they do not engage in the usual agency puffery normally associated with budgets submitted to Congress or to their own departments, for that matter.

I should think everyone knows that by now.

If they indicated a need for \$182 million, I am sure that need was more than adequately justified. To trim budgets may be prudent in many cases, but I think the Coast Guard is the exception to the rule. By now, everyone in this body is aware of the increased responsibilities given to the Coast Guard by the Congress.

When we consider the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Ports and Waters Safety Act of 1972 alone, we must realize the scope of the new missions that have been given to this service. The increases in private boating and the incursions in our offshore waters by foreign fishing fleets, international drug runners, illegal aliens, and the increase in pollution potential severely strain a service already pushed to its limits. Add

to this the possibility of extending our offshore limits in the years immediately ahead, and it is easy to see that this service will have to at least double its capabilities by 1980.

I would refer more specifically to one major area of Coast Guard activity, and that is the field of pollution control in U.S. rivers and harbors, in our coastal waters, and indeed in the oceans of the world. The Coast Guard has taken the lead in developing the most stringent pollution control standards in the history of the maritime world.

Since last year, it has made giant steps forward in bringing the international maritime community through its work with the International Maritime Consultative Organization to a point where action may be taken that will result in clean oceans by the early 1980s. The basis for this program, however, lies in a strict enforcement scheme, and the U.S. Coast Guard will be charged to a great extent with carrying out that enforcement policy. And so it is that this authorization bill for the first time in many years calls for an increased end-year strength for active duty personnel. The bulk of this increase in personnel will be utilized in pollution control efforts.

I take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the House Merchant Marine Coast Guard and Navigation Subcommittee, JOHN M. MURPHY, who, since he became chairman, has for the last 2 years aggressively and assiduously dug into the details of the Coast Guard authorization legislation.

Last year, under his leadership, the committee discovered plans to close down important radio-navigational aids for the Nation's airlines and merchant fleets far in advance of the time needed for those industries to change over to new systems.

That decision was immediately reversed by the Department of Transportation.

Congressman MURPHY then uncovered the indecision that existed in certain areas of the administration relative to the selection of a national navigational aid for the west coast and for the replacement of important radio aids to the Nation's defense needs in the Mediterranean area of the world.

His work has resulted this year in forthright steps being taken by the administration in these areas; including the selection of a much-needed radio-navigation system for the coastal confluence region of the west coast. This will have great benefits to the United States when the oil tankers with Alaskan crude oil begin to ply the waters between Alaska and the west coast of the United States.

Mammoth ships carrying millions of barrels of crude oil will be passing in narrow sea lanes and crisscrossing the close-in Pacific area and converging on U.S. ports. But they will be kept at a safe distance from each other by the long-range navigational system that was finally approved by the administration—much to the credit of the Coast Guard Subcommittee.

In this year's authorization bill, nearly

\$18 million was authorized for the initial purchase of much-needed medium range search aircraft. Again, aggressive committee investigations led by Chairman MURPHY found that the Coast Guard and the Department of Transportation had utilized a so-called sole-source procurement. The result eliminated from consideration many other candidate aircraft which might have proven better for the Coast Guard's needs, and constituted a saving to the American taxpayer. As a result of his energetic investigation of this situation, the Coast Guard has now recommended that the purchase of these aircraft be opened to a two-step competitive bid process, which, in my judgment, better meets the conditions of fair play and the intent of the Federal procurement regulations.

For handling of the above matters, I would personally like to thank the chairman of the Coast Guard Committee for his intense interest in the work of the subcommittee and in the success he has had thus far in calling to the attention of the Congress and to the administration the needs of the Coast Guard. I am sure that his continuing efforts over the past year have been in part responsible for the 38-percent increase in funds requested by the administration.

Surely the \$23 million for the Loran-C programs fall into this category.

I have highlighted only a few of the many important areas covered by this Coast Guard authorization bill.

The chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee (Mr. MURPHY) and my colleagues will discuss in greater detail some of the other equally important provisions. I merely wanted to point out that the role of the Coast Guard in the 1970s has become a matter of increasing awareness in the Congress and on the part of the American public.

Needless to say, in order to discharge its varied and challenging duties, the Coast Guard must have the necessary equipment and the kind of emoluments necessary to attract the competent young people needed to carry out these duties. This has become especially so in the draft free environment. I am convinced that this bill, while representing an increase over last year's authorization of a significant amount, still represents the minimum amount of funds needed by the Coast Guard. I urge Members to approve its adoption.

There are majority and minority members of our Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee present, who will now speak in behalf of this bill.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for her gracious remarks concerning my efforts as chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee. In turn, I would point out that Mr. SULLIVAN's active support of my work and that of the subcommittee has played a great role in any success we have had in trying to make the Coast Guard an ever better service and in trying to obtain for it the modern equipment and the necessary legislative tools to help it perform better.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Could the gentleman tell me how much, if anything, was appropriated to the Coast Guard in the supplemental appropriation bill of last year?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Except for retired pay supplements there was nothing in the supplemental for the Coast Guard last year related to A.C. & I.

Mr. GROSS. I note an item of \$6 million for housing to construct 106 units, which seems to figure out to about \$56,000 per unit. Is it customary to expend that amount of money on individual units of housing?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I think the gentleman would find they are not all individual units of housing. Many are multiunit housing projects.

Mr. GROSS. They would be on Coast Guard property, I assume.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Yes; some would be on Government property. One of the problems the Coast Guard has is that it is forced into very primitive and remote areas where the local market cannot supply housing. It is just not available and, therefore, we must construct housing for the Coast Guard families in these areas and in a few cases land must be purchased. That is the type of think we are speaking of.

Mr. GROSS. Houses built on federally owned land at a cost of \$50,000 plus per unit seems to me to be rather high, but perhaps I am behind the times.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Well, the cost of housing, as we are all well aware, is very high on a national norm, but when you have to take materials in to Kodiak, Alaska—

Mr. GROSS. Is that where this housing is to be constructed?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. This housing is virtually to be constructed on a worldwide basis. I will give the gentleman the justification as outlined to the Coast Guard Committee during our hearings:

REASON FOR REQUEST AND PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING FACILITY

In 1972, a survey indicated that 4,187 of 18,696 married Coast Guardsmen were inadequately housed. DOD adequacy standards, which include distance from duty station and cost, as well as the character of the adjacent community, were used in evaluating survey data. The primary thrust of the housing program continues to be the provision of adequate quarters for enlisted personnel and junior officers. Consonant with DOD provisions, and subject to OMB restriction on size and configuration, not more than one set of quarters for flag officers will be programmed in any given year.

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF REPLACEMENT FACILITY

There will be approximately 106 additional units of housing at various locations. The final selection of sites and exact number of units subject to progress in land acquisition, market conditions, in some cases, status of DOD projects and availability of excess housing from other agencies. Where feasible, joint construction with other Government agencies and renovation of acquired excess housing has been and will continue to be undertaken in order to reduce costs.

Mr. GROSS. But these are not all that type of units. They are not all to be built in high-cost areas. Is that not true?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. The Coast Guard would not build most of them in high-cost areas. However, some would be in remote areas.

Mr. GROSS. Taking into account that site acquisition costs are nonexistent this would mean it would be in the neighborhood of \$60,000 per unit and more in some areas.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. As I have just read, there are certain land acquisition costs involved but I can assure my colleague from many years of active duty with the Department of Defense that the quarters we provide for our officers and our enlisted men are not luxury quarters by any standards.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for H.R. 13595, the Coast Guard authorization measure now before us.

I would also like to commend the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for the concern which they have expressed in the increased and vital role of our Nation's Coast Guard. Their growing responsibilities in maritime safety and environmental protection programs make it absolutely essential that our Coast Guard receives appropriations commensurate with the task which they face.

The authorization which we are considering today will permit additional modernization of older Coast Guard ships and improvement of present navigational systems and vessels. I am pleased to note that the budget, quite properly, reflects a significant increase over fiscal 1974 levels. As the volume of shipping increases, and we are assured that it will, so does the danger of additional pollution of our coastal waters. As vessels increase in size and number, we face the likelihood of serious maritime accidents. As more and more Americans take to our oceans and bays in small boats, the necessity for additional Coast Guard resources, both in personnel and in equipment, becomes apparent.

I trust that there will be a continuing awareness on our part that the Coast Guard receives the congressional support and concern it needs to maintain and improve its essential services to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 13595.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13595, as amended.

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

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to clause 3 of rule XXVII, and the prior announcement made by the Chair, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

Does the gentleman from California withdraw his point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I do.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may have

5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just under consideration, H.R. 13595.

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

There was no objection.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2844) to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as amended, to provide for collection of special recreation use fees at additional campgrounds, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2844

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a), is further amended as follows:

(a) The heading of the section is revised to read:

"ADMISSION AND USE FEES; ESTABLISHMENT AND REGULATIONS".

(b) The second sentence of section 4(a) is amended to read: "No admission fees of any kind shall be charged or imposed for entrance into any other federally owned areas which are operated and maintained by a Federal agency and used for outdoor recreation purposes."

(c) Subsection (a) (1) is revised to read:

"(1) For admission into any such designated area, an annual admission permit (to be known as the Golden Eagle Passport) shall be available, for a fee of not more than \$10. The permittee and any person accompanying him in a single, private, noncommercial vehicle, or alternatively, the permittee and his spouse, children, and parents accompanying him where entry to the area is by any means other than private, noncommercial vehicle, shall be entitled to general admission into any area designated pursuant to this subsection. The annual permit shall be valid during the calendar year for which the annual fee is paid. The annual permit shall not authorize any uses for which additional fees are charged pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) of this section. The annual permit shall be nontransferable and the unlawful use thereof shall be punishable in accordance with regulations established pursuant to subsection (e). The annual permit shall be available for purchase at any such designated area."

(d) Subsection (a) (2) is revised by deleting in the first sentence "or who enter such an area by means other than by private, noncommercial vehicle".

(e) Subsection (a) (4) is amended by revising the first two sentences to read: "The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish procedures providing for the issuance of a lifetime admission permit (to be known as the 'Golden Age Passport') to any citizen of, or person domiciled in, the United States sixty-two years of age or older applying for such permit. Such permit shall be nontransferable, shall be issued without charge, and shall entitle the permittee and any person accompanying him in a single, private, noncommercial vehicle, or alternatively, the permittee and his spouse and children accompanying him where entry to the area is by any means other than private, noncommercial vehicle, to general admission into any area designated pursuant to this subsection."

(f) In subsection (b) the first paragraph is revised to read:

"(b) RECREATION USE FEES.—Each Federal agency developing, administering, providing or furnishing at Federal expense, specialized outdoor recreation sites, facilities, equipment, or services shall, in accordance with this subsection and subsection (d) of this section, provide for the collection of daily recreation use fees at the place of use or any reasonably convenient location: *Provided*, That in no event shall there be a charge by any such agency for the use, either singly or in any combination, of drinking water, wayside exhibits, roads, overlook sites, visitors' centers, scenic drives, toilet facilities, picnic tables, or boat ramps: *Provided, however*, That a fee shall be charged for boat launching facilities only where specialized facilities or services such as mechanical or hydraulic boat lifts or facilities are provided: *And provided further*, That in no event shall there be a charge for the use of any campground not having the following—tent or trailer spaces, drinking water, access road, refuse containers, toilet facilities, personal collection of the fee by an employee or agent of the Federal agency operating the facility, reasonable visitor protection, and simple devices for containing a campfire (where campfires are permitted). At each lake or reservoir under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, where camping is permitted, such agency shall provide at least one primitive campground, containing designated campsites, sanitary facilities, and vehicular access, where no charge shall be imposed. Any Golden Age passport permittee shall be entitled upon presentation of such permit to utilize such special recreation facilities at a rate of 50 per centum of the established use fee."

(g) In subsection (b) paragraph "(1)" is deleted; the paragraph designation "2" is redesignated as subsection "(c) RECREATION PERMITS.—"; and subsequent subsections are redesignated accordingly.

(h) In new subsection (d) the second sentence is revised to read: "Clear notice that a fee has been established pursuant to this section shall be prominently posted at each area and at appropriate locations therein and shall be included in publications distributed at such areas."

(i) In new subsection (e) the first sentence is revised to read: "In accordance with the provisions of this section, the heads of appropriate departments and agencies may prescribe rules and regulations for areas under their administration for the collection of any fee established pursuant to this section."

(j) In new subsection (f) the first sentence is revised to read as follows:

"(f) Except as otherwise provided by law or as may be required by lawful contracts entered into prior to September 3, 1964, providing that revenues collected at particular Federal areas shall be credited to specific purposes, all fees which are collected by any Federal agency shall be covered into a special account in the Treasury of the United States to be administered in conjunction with, but separate from, the revenues in the Land and Water Conservation Fund: *Provided*, That the head of any Federal agency, under such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, may contract with any public or private entity to provide visitor reservation services; and any such contract may provide that the contractor shall be permitted to deduct a commission to be fixed by the agency head from the amount charged the public for providing such services and to remit the net proceeds therefrom to the contracting agency."

Sec. 2. Section 6(e)(1) of title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601), is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Whenever a State provides that the owner of a single-family residence may, at his option, elect to retain a right of use and occupancy for not less than six months from the date of acquisition of such residence and such owner elects to retain such a right, such owner shall be deemed to have waived any benefits under sections 203, 204, 205, and 206 of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1894) and for the purposes of those sections such owner shall not be considered a displaced person as defined in section 101(6) of that Act."

Sec. 3. Section 9 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-10a), is further amended by deleting in the first sentence "section 6(a)(1)" and substituting "section 7(a)(1)".

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas Mr. SKUBITZ will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, S. 2844, as amended, and recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, attempts to resolve once and for all the controversy over the collection of admission, camping, and other fees at various federally operated outdoor recreation areas throughout the country. While all of the questions addressed by this bill are not limited to this issue, that is the principle issue which it confronts.

OBJECTIVE OF AND NEED FOR S. 2844

As approved by the other body and recommended by the committee, this legislation makes absolutely no change with respect to admission fees. Under existing laws, admission fees may only be collected at designated units of the national park system and at national recreation areas under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service. No entrance or admission fees are authorized to be collected at any lake or reservoir operated by the Corps of Army Engineers. Likewise, nothing in this bill will permit the collection of fees for access to any such lake or reservoir.

What S. 2844 does attempt to do is to establish reasonable guidelines for charges for other facilities and services provided for the enjoyment and convenience of visitors at federally operated outdoor recreation areas. It does not require or permit charges to be imposed for facilities which are essential to public health and safety or for facilities which are needed in order to properly maintain and preserve the natural and recreational values of a particular area. The bill specifically provides that no charges may be imposed for:

Drinking water or toilet facilities; Wayside exhibits, roads, scenic drives, or visitor centers, picnic tables; or Nonmechanical boat launching ramps.

Now, Mr. Speaker, most people seem to agree that a reasonable fee should be collected for the use of campsites provided by agencies of the Federal Government.

First. Because there is a considerable Federal expense for the development, operation and maintenance of individual campsites provided for the benefit and exclusive use of a particular person or group of persons.

Second. Because providing such facilities free of charge places a significant competitive burden on comparable State, local, and private facilities for which charges must be imposed in order to meet the cost of providing those campgrounds.

Third. Because nearly all of the moneys collected are to be reinvested in better facilities and outdoor recreation programs for the benefit of the visiting public.

Of course, the committee recognizes that there should be no charge for primitive campgrounds as long as they provide only the minimum facilities outlined in the bill. As amended by the committee, the bill specifies that no charges may be imposed for the use of a campsite unless it includes all of the following facilities and services:

Designated tent or trailer spaces,
Drinking water;
Access roads;
Refuse containers;
Toilet facilities;
Campfire facilities;
Reasonable visitor protection; and
Personal fee collection by an employee or agent (including reservation services) of the Federal agency involved.

I hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that the committee amended S. 2844 to require that at least one free, primitive campground should be provided at each lake or reservoir where campgrounds are provided and operated by the Corps of Army Engineers.

EFFECT OF S. 2844 ON PUBLIC LAW 93-81

Last year, when the House considered legislation on this subject, it considered a bill reported by the Public Works Committee which would have affected only recreation facilities at Corps of Army Engineers projects. After the bill was approved by the House, it was rewritten by the other body and ultimately enacted. The result was to virtually eliminate campground fees at all areas regardless of the Federal agency involved. This will cause a loss of revenues totaling more than \$12 million annually which would be used by the collecting agencies to enhance their outdoor recreation programs. It is also causing a considerable competitive hardship for public and private entities which are providing public campgrounds for which they must impose a charge.

While S. 2844 will preserve the concept of requiring certain minimum facilities to be provided before a charge may be imposed, its requirements are less rigid than Public Law 93-81 and will permit fees to be collected at numerous campgrounds where fees may not otherwise be imposed. Unless S. 2844 or comparable legislation is enacted, the collection of camping fees at most federally operated campgrounds will not be possible.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the product of 2 days of public hearings by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation. It was carefully considered by the Committee on Interior and In-

sular Affairs. During those deliberations, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. JONES) sponsored several constructive amendments which were adopted by the committee. This legislation, as recommended, constitutes a reasonable and fair effort to satisfy a difficult problem. It is my pleasure to recommend its approval by the Members of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As chief sponsor of the legislation H.R. 6717, which became Public Law 93-81, after it had been amended by the Senate substantially, I would appreciate the opportunity to pose a question to the distinguished chairman of the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee.

As initially introduced and prior to a considerable amending process by committees of both bodies of Congress, my legislation at that time sought to protect the continued free access by citizens to federally administered recreation areas, specifically including the following: Access to or use of water areas, undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives, or nonmechanical boat-launching ramps. This, basically, is the policy set forth pursuant to section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968.

My question is this: If enacted, would S. 2844 as it has now been amended by the House, carry out such a purpose to make sure that if an American taxpayer is charged for using federally owned and operated recreation sites he would receive a quid pro quo, or value received for that dollar he has paid for access?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I can state to the gentleman, as I just pointed out in my statement, there will be no charge imposed for many of the facilities which are needed at public recreation areas. There is to be no charge whatsoever for ordinary daytime facilities. Free access to all public waters would be continued. There can be no charge for driving on scenic drives or roads. Emphasis is being put on the exclusive use of a facility in which the Government has a substantial investment. The No. 1 example would be a developed campground. A mechanical or hydraulic boat-launching facility would also be subject to charge.

Some of the language in the bill is very similar to section 210 of the Flood Control Act, which the gentleman referred to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just to make legislative history, I wonder if S. 2844, if enacted, would uphold the congressional precedents in the Flood Control Acts for the past several

years, in fact, since 1944, which reaffirm the principle of free access to inland public waters?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. The gentleman from Arkansas is correct. There would be free access to all inland public waters.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) as well as the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SKUBITZ).

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of our Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), a question in regard to the personal collection of fees. I would point out that the requirement that there be a "personal collection of fees" does not mean that there has to be an "eye-to-eye" transaction. If the fees are collected through the reservation system, by mail, for example, that would satisfy the requirement. Likewise, in more remote areas, "personal collection" would be satisfied by a roving ranger who would see to it that uniform collection would be assured.

I wonder if the gentleman could give me clarification on that, as to whether that is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I think the gentleman's statements are correct. The act will be complied with if the fees are to be collected through the reservation system as the gentleman mentioned. I think they would be complied with in the larger campgrounds if the fees are collected as people are entering. In the more remote areas, the roving or traveling employees could come around from time to time to see that the collection of fees is uniform, that would be sufficient compliance. We want everyone to be treated alike at a particular campground even where a roving employee collects the fees.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. This works well in our operation of our State park system in California and I hope it would be adequate in the national park system.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman with whom we worked to get the arrangements to take care of the problems raised by the gentleman from Arkansas. This is a very good bill with which all of us can live. I wholeheartedly support the bill and recommend its passage.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman and I compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma for his constructive contributions during our consideration of the bill in the committee.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I lend my support to the legislation before us, S.

2844, a bill amending the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, with a principal provision reinstating the system of user fee charges for campgrounds and other specially developed facilities.

Earlier practice under the Land and Water Conservation Fund law involved the collection of user fees by the various Federal agencies which operated developed campgrounds. Last year, an amendment of this law was enacted which specified in detail what types of developed facilities must be provided if campground user fees are to be charged. So detailed and specific was this list that almost no Federal campgrounds met the rigid new standard. Consequently, campground user fee charges were almost totally disbanded over night by the Federal agencies.

This has proven to be most unfortunate, and it is this principal problem which the bill before us is designed to correct. As a result of the current inability to charge fees, total revenue loss to the Federal agencies is estimated at over \$12 million a year. The most important aspect of this situation is that the current law permits these revenues to be appropriated to the collecting agencies for use in furthering outdoor recreation programs, much of which has been used to support campground operations. Hence, restoration of fee charges would help in some measure to finance the upkeep and improvement of the campgrounds from which the fees are collected. The agencies testified that most of the camping public has become accustomed to and supportive of the nominal user fees which have come to be charged for campgrounds. There apparently has been some exception to this ready acceptance of fee charges at some Corps of Engineers facilities, however, and this bill provides a minor exception, and provision of some free campsites in that instance.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to note that the reinstitution of campground user fee charges restores some important indirect assistance to the private campground operator, whose complementary campground developments have provided a much needed and welcome relief for the overdemand pressures which have mounted on the all-to-few Federal facilities. Like any business operation, private campground operators must charge their customers in order to stay in business. With free public campgrounds nearby, the private operator is often the last place campers seek, and the overdemand pressure is unwelcomingly strong on the Federal sites as well as deflating to the private campground business. This bill before us, by reinstituting nominal Federal campground user fee charges, will assist both Federal and private campground operations.

One further point, Federal witnesses testified that vandalism in campground areas seems to be much reduced under the fee charge system than is the case for free campgrounds. I guess that people psychologically feel that they are under more obligation to care for a purchased commodity, than they do for free goods.

Mr. Speaker, there are other more minor modifications of the existing law which are made by the bill before us,

but many are technical and perfecting in nature; the reinstitution of campground user fees is the heart of the bill.

I think this legislation is deserving of the support of the Members of this body. The Senate-passed bill is substantially identical to this House version. The law is urgently needed so that the program can get underway for the upcoming camping season, and I urge my colleagues to join with me in favor of passing the bill.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support of S. 2844. This bill is designed to correct some overkill action by the Congress last year when we undertook to delineate in too great detail, the criteria which Federal campgrounds must meet in order for user fees to be charged.

Among other items, we specified that showers must be available in reasonable proximity to the campsites. Perhaps our subconscious was showing that we felt camping was becoming an all too dirty sport or pastime. At any rate, there are today very few Federal campgrounds which provide such luxury—and I am not sure that they should.

Consequently, the law passed last year, virtually wiped out the campground user fee business for most Federal campgrounds—almost completely so for national park and national forest campgrounds. This means an annual revenue loss of over \$12 million, and since this income is usually reinvested in campground operation and maintenance, and related outdoor recreation enhancement measures by its availability for appropriation to the collecting agencies, most of the camping public does not seem to object to the nominal user fee charges.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill so that we can restore the system of user fee charges which has worked so successfully in the past.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, S. 2844, amendment to the land and water conservation fund, is before us for consideration today. I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of this provision which would serve to remove inadequacies in the present administration of the land and water conservation fund.

Mr. Speaker, the land and water conservation fund is an important, though small, source of Federal moneys that has played a valuable part in preserving unspoiled pieces of America for the use and recreation of its people. The land and water conservation fund does not require Federal Treasury moneys, but is instead funded with moneys returned from sales and rentals and royalties generated by private use and consumption of the public's lands and resources.

It is an important concept. Our colleague from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) has introduced legislation, H.R. 13952, to increase the size of the fund through contributions from oil and gas leases on public lands. As Representative SEIBERLING has said, the land and water conservation fund presents an opportunity to "convert a natural resource that is being depleted—the oil lease or coal sale,

et cetera—into a natural resource that will not be depleted"—the park or preserve or recreation area, et cetera—and which can be enjoyed as a fair return for the sale of the public's resources.

The fund is not an outright Federal gift, but instead is matched by the States or local municipalities so that, cooperatively, the purchase of parklands or streams and lakes can be accomplished.

Although this has proven to be an effective stimulus to local self-help, the small amount of money budgeted for the fund has proven to be much too little. This year only \$71 million has been budgeted by the National Park Service for the fund—a paltry amount when compared to the \$400 million required to fund all the projects currently authorized by Congress. When a single park can cost \$30 to \$40 million, \$71 million clearly is not enough.

The idea of putting "parks where the people are," as President Nixon pledged to do, has been aided by the land and water conservation fund. Previously, American parks, and particularly national parks, were often so remote and inaccessible that they served next to no one. The fund has enabled urban areas to preserve lands threatened with development so that city dwellers and suburbanites can enjoy parks and recreation facilities without having to drive 2 or more days to reach them. This is perhaps the greatest potential of the fund—providing land and natural areas within reasonable distances of all Americans—no matter where they live.

But if the budget level for the fund is not increased significantly, lands suitable for "parks for the people" will be gobbled up by developers and speculators before they can be preserved.

The land and water conservation fund has helped admirably with the initial steps toward creation of a Cuyahoga Valley National Historical Park and Recreation Area in a relatively untouched river valley between Cleveland and Akron, Ohio. The State of Ohio, matching money from the fund, has purchased several thousand acres of property in this beautiful valley area. These lands will be added to the parklands proposed to H.R. 7077, a bill I have sponsored with Congressman SEIBERLING and Congressman REGULA, along with 45 other House Members. This bill would create the national park through the procedures of the National Park Service.

Although the fund primarily serves the cause of relatively small parks, it is unfortunately not suited to large parks where the State-Federal purchasing arrangement tends to lead to a protracted incremental acquisition schedule. In a park of 20,000 acres, like the proposed Cuyahoga Valley National Park, such an extended timetable can lead to enormous rises in costs since inflation and land speculation are given time to affect land prices. It is for that reason that H.R. 7077 was introduced—to guarantee a relatively speedy and efficient purchase of parklands that saves all levels of Government money while quickly preserving lands that otherwise are threatened with inevitable urban encroachment. For example, it is estimated that a purchase of a 20,000-acre Cuyahoga Valley park by the fund arrangement could take up to 20

years, thus allowing prices to nearly double. This would result in each purchasing party—State and Federal—paying alone what it would cost the National Park Service, by itself, today.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for its work in reporting to the House S. 2844, as amended. I am aware of the revenue problems which have been generated by the strict interpretation of Public Law 93-81, particularly in curtailing severely the number of campsites for which user fees may be charged by Federal agencies.

It was the intent of Congress to limit use fee authority to facilities which involved substantial Federal investment and regular maintenance, while safeguarding for taxpayer enjoyment use of those facilities which virtually all visitors might reasonably expect to utilize—such as roads, trails, overlooks, visitor centers, wayside exhibits or picnic areas.

Due primarily to campground fee criteria spelled out in Public Law 93-81, the scope of which was broadened by Senate action to include not only Corps of Engineers facilities but all National Park Service and Forest Service sites as well, the total revenue loss has been estimated in the neighborhood of \$12 million per year. The language of S. 2844, as amended, redefines the list of permissible use fee and overnight camping charges to establish a more reasonable "fee test," while seeking to continue the restriction of authority to collect fees to specialized sites, facilities, equipment, or services.

S. 2844, as amended, through establishment of a more balanced fee system on Federal recreation lands, should rectify a revenue loss which is decreasing funds available in the land and water conservation fund. This fund relates directly to the amount of money available for the future operation and maintenance of Federal recreation areas.

The House committee has added to the Senate-passed language in S. 2844 a requirement that the Corps of Engineers provide at least one "primitive" campsite for which no charge may be imposed at each lake or reservoir where it operates other campgrounds. In so doing, the existence of some free camping grounds is guaranteed to the taxpayer.

S. 2844 as amended would also effect constructive changes in the Golden Eagle Passport program to clarify ambiguities in the existing law and would insure that the Golden Age Passport serves as a lifetime, rather than annual, permit for our Nation's senior citizens.

In my judgment, this legislation offers a sound basis for the Federal recreation fee system, one which will be equitable for the taxpayer and Federal Government alike; and one which will protect the long-term interests of both in the maintenance and continued development of recreation areas. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

As chief sponsor of the legislation (H.R. 6717) which became Public Law 93-81, I would appreciate the opportunity to pose a question to the distinguished chairman of the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee.

As initially introduced and prior to a considerable amending process by com-

mittees of both bodies of Congress, my legislation sought to protect the continued free access by citizens to federally administered recreation areas, specifically including the following: Access to or use of water areas, undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives, or nonmechanical boat launching ramps. This, basically, is the policy set forth pursuant to section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968.

If enacted, would S. 2844 carry out such a purpose to make sure that if an American taxpayer is charged for using federally owned and operated recreation sites he receives a quid pro quo? And would S. 2844, if enacted, uphold the congressional precedents in the Flood Control Acts of several past years (since 1944) which reaffirm the principle of free access to inland public waters?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2844) to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as amended, to provide for collection of special recreation-use fees at additional campgrounds, and for other purposes, as amended.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill (S. 2844) just considered.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to clause 3, rule XXVII, the Chair will now put the question on each motion, on which further proceedings were postponed, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S.J. Res. 40 (de novo).

S. 3373 (de novo).

H.R. 13595 (de novo).

S. 2844, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic votes after the first such vote in this series.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCES

The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing

the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40), as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAs) that the suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40), as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 147, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

YEAS—223

Abdnor	Gettys	O'Neill
Abzug	Gialmo	Owens
Adams	Gibbons	Passman
Addabbo	Ginn	Patten
Andrews, N.C.	Gonzalez	Pepper
Andrews, N. Dak.	Grasso	Perkins
Ashley	Gray	Peyser
Aspin	Green, Pa.	Pickle
Bafalis	Griffiths	Powell, Ohio
Barrett	Grover	Preyer
Bergland	Gunter	Price, Ill.
Bevill	Guyer	Pritchard
Blatnik	Hamilton	Quile
Boggs	Hammer-	Quillen
Boland	schmidt	Randall
Bolling	Hanley	Rangel
Brademas	Hanrahan	Rees
Bray	Hansen, Idaho	Regula
Breaux	Hansen, Wash.	Reuss
Breckinridge	Harrington	Riegle
Brinkley	Hechler, W. Va.	Rinaldo
Brooks	Heckler, Mass.	Rodino
Broomfield	Heinz	Roe
Brozman	Helstoski	Roncalio, Wyo.
Brown, Mich.	Hillis	Rooney, Pa.
Buchanan	Hollifield	Rose
Burke, Mass.	Holtzman	Rosenthal
Butler	Horton	Rostenkowski
Carney, Ohio	Johnson, Calif.	Roush
Carter	Johnson, Pa.	Ruppe
Cederberg	Jones, Ala.	St Germain
Chamberlain	Jones, N.C.	Sandman
Chisholm	Jones, Okla.	Sarasin
Clay	Jordan	Sarbanes
Cleveland	Karth	Schroeder
Cohen	Kastenmeier	Selberling
Collins, Ill.	Kazen	Shipley
Conable	Kluczynski	Sikes
Conte	Koch	Slack
Conyers	Landrum	Slack
Corman	Leggett	Smith, Iowa
Cotter	Lehman	Staggers
Coughlin	Long, La.	Stanton,
Cronin	Long, Md.	J. William
Daniel, Dan	Lukens	Stanton,
Davis, Ga.	McCollister	James V.
de la Garza	McCormack	Steed
Dellenback	McDade	Steele
Denholm	McFall	Steiger, Wis.
Dent	McKinney	Stephens
Derwinski	Madden	Stokes
Dingell	Mann	Stratton
Donohue	Mathias, Calif.	Stuckey
Drinan	Mathis, Ga.	Studds
du Pont	Matsunaga	Symington
Eckhardt	Melcher	Taylor, N.C.
Edwards, Calif.	Mezvisinsky	Thomson, Wis.
Ellberg	Millis	Thone
Esch	Minish	Thornton
Eshleman	Mink	Tiernen
Evans, Colo.	Mitchell, Md.	Towell, Nev.
Fascell	Mitchell, N.Y.	Traxler
Findley	Molloy	Treen
Fish	Moorhead, Pa.	Udall
Flood	Morgan	Vander Veen
Flowers	Mosher	Vanik
Foley	Moss	Vigorito
Forsythe	Murphy, Ill.	Walsh
Fountain	Murphy, N.Y.	Wright
Frelinghuysen	Murtha	Yatron
Frenzel	Myers	Young, Ga.
Frey	Natcher	Young, Ill.
Freohlich	Nedzi	Young, Tex.
Fulton	Nichols	Zablocki
Gaydos	Nix	Zwach
	O'Hara	

NAYS—147

Alexander	Gross	Patman
Annunzio	Gubser	Pettis
Archer	Haley	Pike
Arends	Harsha	Rallsback
Armstrong	Hastings	Rarick
Ashbrook	Hays	Rhodes
Baker	Hébert	Roberts
Bauman	Henderson	Robinson, Va.
Beard	Hicks	Robison, N.Y.
Bennett	Hogan	Rogers
Biaggi	Holt	Roncallo, N.Y.
Blackburn	Hosmer	Roy
Bowen	Hudnut	Ruth
Brown, Ohio	Hungate	Satterfield
Broyhill, N.C.	Hunt	Scherle
Broyhill, Va.	Ichord	Schneebell
Burgener	Jarman	Sebelius
Burleson, Tex.	Johnson, Colo.	Shoup
Burlison, Mo.	Kemp	Shriver
Byron	Ketchum	Shuster
Camp	King	Skubitz
Casey, Tex.	Kuykendall	Smith, N.Y.
Chappell	Lagomarsino	Snyder
Clancy	Latta	Spence
Clark	Lent	Steelman
Clawson, Del.	Litton	Steiger, Ariz.
Collier	Lott	Sullivan
Collins, Tex.	Lujan	Symms
Conlan	McClary	Taylor, Mo.
Crane	McEwen	Teague
Daniel, Robert	McKay	Ullman
W. Jr.	Madigan	Veysey
Davis, S.C.	Mahon	Waggoner
Davis, Wis.	Mallary	Wampler
Delaney	Maraziti	Ware
Dennis	Martin, Nebr.	Whitehurst
Devine	Martin, N.C.	Whitten
Downing	Mayne	Williams
Dulski	Michel	Winn
Duncan	Milford	Wolff
Edwards, Ala.	Miller	Wyatt
Erlenborn	Minshall, Ohio	Wyder
Evins, Tenn.	Mizell	Wyllie
Fisher	Montgomery	Wyman
Flynt	Moorhead,	Yates
Fuqua	Calif.	Young, Alaska
Gilman	Nelsen	Young, Fla.
Goldwater	Obey	Young, S.C.
Goodling	O'Brien	Zion
Green, Oreg.	Parris	

NOT VOTING—63

Anderson, Calif.	Dorn	Reid
Anderson, Ill.	Ford	Rooney, N.Y.
Badillo	Fraser	Rousselot
Bell	Gude	Roybal
Biester	Hanna	Runnels
Bingham	Hawkins	Ryan
Brasco	Hinshaw	Stark
Brown, Calif.	Howard	Stubblefield
Burke, Calif.	Huber	Talcott
Burke, Fla.	Hutchinson	Thompson, N.J.
Burton	Jones, Tenn.	Van Deerlin
Carey, N.Y.	Kyros	Vander Jagt
Clausen,	Landgrebe	Waldie
Don H.	McCloskey	Whalen
Cochran	McSpadden	White
Culver	Macdonald	Widnall
Daniels	Mazzoli	Wiggins
Dominick V.	Meeds	Wilson, Bob
Danielson	Metcalfe	Wilson,
Dellums	Moakley	Charles H.,
Dickinson	Poage	Calif.
Diggs	Podell	Wilson,
	Price, Tex.	Charles, Tex.

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Biester and Mr. Gude for, with Mr. Price of Texas against.
Mr. Whalen and Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Rousselot against.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey and Mr. Dominick V. Daniels for, with Mr. Runnels against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Moakley.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. White.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Dickinson.

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Carey of New York.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Cochran.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Huber.
Mr. Stark with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Dellums with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Meeds.
Mr. Podell with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Wiggins.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b)(3), rule XXVII, the Chair announces he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on all the additional motions to suspend the rule on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill (S. 3373).

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAs) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 3373.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 13595), as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 13595, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 365, nays, 0, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

YEAS—365

Abdnor	Arends	Beard
Abzug	Armstrong	Bennett
Adams	Ashbrook	Bergland
Addabbo	Ashley	Bevill
Alexander	Aspin	Biaggi
Andrews, N.C.	Bafalis	Blackburn
Andrews,	Baker	Blatnik
N. Dak.	Barrett	Boggs
Annunzio	Bauman	Boland

Bolling	Gross	Nichols
Bowen	Grover	Nix
Brademas	Gubser	Obey
Bray	Gunter	O'Brien
Breaux	Guyser	O'Hara
Breckinridge	Haley	O'Neill
Brinkley	Hamilton	Owens
Brooks	Hammer-	Parris
Broomfield	schmidt	Passman
Brotzman	Hanley	Patman
Brown, Mich.	Hanrahan	Patten
Brown, Ohio	Hansen, Idaho	Pepper
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Wash.	Perkins
Broyhill, Va.	Harrington	Pettis
Buchanan	Harsha	Peyser
Burgener	Hastings	Pickle
Burke, Mass.	Hébert	Pike
Burleson, Tex.	Hechler, W. Va.	Poage
Burlison, Mo.	Heckler, Mass.	Powell, Ohio
Butler	Heinz	Preyer
Byron	Helstoski	Price, Ill.
Camp	Henderson	Pritchard
Carney, Ohio	Hicks	Quile
Carter	Hillis	Quillen
Casey, Tex.	Hogan	Rallsback
Chamberlain	Holifield	Randall
Chappell	Holt	Rangel
Chisholm	Holtzman	Rarick
Clancy	Horton	Rees
Clark	Hosmer	Regula
Clawson, Del.	Hudnut	Reuss
Clay	Hungate	Rhodes
Cleveland	Hunt	Rlegle
Cohen	Ichord	Rinaldo
Collier	Jarman	Roberts
Collins, Ill.	Johnson, Calif.	Robinson, Va.
Collins, Tex.	Johnson, Colo.	Robison, N.Y.
Conable	Johnson, Pa.	Rodino
Conlan	Jones, N.C.	Roe
Conte	Jones, Okla.	Rogers
Conyers	Jordan	Roncallo, Wyo.
Corman	Karth	Roncallo, N.Y.
Cotter	Kastenmeier	Rooney, Pa.
Coughlin	Kazen	Rose
Crane	Kemp	Rosenthal
Cronin	Ketchum	Rostenkowski
Daniel, Dan	King	Roush
Daniel, Robert	Kluczynski	Roy
W., Jr.	Koch	Ruppe
Davis, Ga.	Lagomarsino	Ruth
Davis, S.C.	Landrum	St Germain
Davis, Wis.	Latta	Sandman
de la Garza	Leggett	Sarasin
Delaney	Lehman	Sarbanes
Dellenback	Lent	Satterfield
Denholm	Litton	Scherle
Dennis	Long, Md.	Schneebell
Dent	Lott	Schroeder
Derwinski	Lujan	Sebelius
Devine	Lukens	Selberling
Dingell	McClary	Shipley
Donohue	McCollister	Shoup
Downing	McCormack	Shriver
Drinan	McDade	Shuster
Dulski	McEwen	Sikes
Duncan	McFall	Sisk
du Pont	McKay	Skubitz
Eckhardt	McKinney	Slack
Edwards, Ala.	Madden	Smith, Iowa
Edwards, Calif.	Madigan	Smith, N.Y.
Ellberg	Mahon	Snyder
Erlenborn	Mallary	Spence
Esch	Mann	Staggers
Eshleman	Maraziti	Stanton,
Evans, Colo.	Martin, Nebr.	J. William
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, N.C.	Stanton,
Fascell	Mathias, Calif.	James V.
Findley	Mathis, Ga.	Steele
Fish	Matsunaga	Steelman
Fisher	Mayne	Steiger, Ariz.
Flood	Melcher	Steiger, Wis.
Flowers	Mezvisinsky	Stephens
Flynt	Michel	Stokes
Foley	Milford	Stratton
Ford	Miller	Stuckey
Forsythe	Mills	Studds
Fountain	Minish	Sullivan
Frelinghuysen	Mink	Symington
Frenzel	Minshall, Ohio	Symms
Frey	Mitchell, Md.	Taylor, Mo.
Freohlich	Mitchell, N.Y.	Taylor, N.C.
Fulton	Mizell	Teague
Fuqua	Mollohan	Thomson, Wis.
Gaydos	Montgomery	Thone
Gettys	Moorhead,	Thornton
Gialmo	Calif.	Tiernan
Gibbons	Moorhead, Pa.	Towell, Nev.
Gilman	Morgan	Traxler
Ginn	Mosher	Treen
Goldwater	Moss	Udall
Gonzalez	Murphy, Ill.	Ullman
Goodling	Murphy, N.Y.	Vander Veen
Grasso	Murtha	Vanik
Gray	Myers	Veysey
Green, Oreg.	Natcher	Vigorito
Green, Pa.	Nedzi	Waggoner
Griffiths	Nelsen	Walsh

Wampler
Ware
White
Whitehurst
Williams
Winn
Wolff
Wright

Wyatt
Wylder
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.

Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, S.C.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—68

Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Archer
Badillo
Bell
Biester
Bingham
Brasco
Brown, Calif.
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Fla.
Burton
Carey, N.Y.
Cederberg
Clausen,
Don H.
Cochran
Culver
Daniels,
Dominick V.
Danielson
Dellums
Dickinson
Diggs

Dorn
Fraser
Gude
Hanna
Hawkins
Hays
Hinshaw
Howard
Huber
Hutchinson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Tenn.
Kuykendall
Kyros
Landgrebe
Long, La.
McCloskey
McSpadden
Macdonald
Mazzoli
Meeds
Metcalf
Moakley
Podell
Price, Tex.

Reid
Rooney, N.Y.
Rousselot
Roybal
Runnels
Ryan
Stark
Steele
Stubblefield
Talcott
Thompson, N.J.
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Waldie
Whalen
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.,
Calif.
Wilson,
Charles, Tex.

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Dominick V. Daniels with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Dellums with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Meeds.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Biester.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Metcalf with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Huber.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Stark with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Cochran.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Burke of California with Mr. Moakley.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Runnels.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Kyros.
Mr. Vander Jagt with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Whalen with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Widnall with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Bob Wilson with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas.
Mr. Cederberg with Mr. Archer.
Mr. Gude with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) to suspend the rules and

pass the Senate bill, S. 2844, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 355, nays 10, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

YEAS—355

Abdnor
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Armstrong
Ashbrook
Aspin
Bafalis
Baker
Barrett
Bauman
Beard
Bennett
Bergland
Biaggi
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowen
Brademas
Bray
Breau
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Butler
Byron
Carney, Ohio
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del.
Clay
Cleveland
Cohen
Collier
Collins, Ill.
Conable
Conlan
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Crane
Cronin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert
W. Jr.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Drinan
Duski
Duncan
du Pont
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellberg

Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford
Forsythe
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Gialmo
Gibbons
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Goodling
Grasso
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gunter
Guyer
Haley
Hamilton
Hammer
Hansley
Hanrahan
Hansen, Idaho
Harrington
Harsha
Hastings
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hogan
Holifield
Holt
Holtzman
Horton
Hosmer
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Ketchum
King
Kluczyński
Koch
Kuykendall
Lagomarsino
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Litton
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lott
Lujan

Luken
McClary
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKinney
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mallory
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Melcher
Mezvinisky
Michel
Milford
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall, Ohio
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Molohan
Montgomery
Moorhead,
Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Owens
Parris
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Powell, Ohio
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Pritchard
Quile
Quillen
Rallsback
Rangel
Rarick
Rees
Regula
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rinaldo
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncallo, Wyo.
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ruppe
Ruth

St Germain
Sandman
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Scherle
Schneebell
Schroeder
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Shuster
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Spence
Staggers
Stanton
J. William
Stanton,
James V.

Steed
Steele
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stuckey
Studds
Sullivan
Symington
Symms
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Teague
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Tiernan
Towell, Nev.
Traxler
Treen
Udall
Ullman
Vander Veen
Vanik

NAYS—10

Bevill
Burleson, Tex.
Camp
Collins, Tex.

Gonzalez
Johnson, Pa.
Randall
Roberts

NOT VOTING—68

Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Ashley
Badillo
Bell
Biester
Bingham
Brasco
Brown, Calif.
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Fla.
Burton
Carey, N.Y.
Clausen,
Don H.
Cochran
Culver
Daniels,
Dominick V.
Danielson
Dellums
Dickinson
Diggs

Dorn
Findley
Fraser
Gray
Gude
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hawkins
Hinshaw
Howard
Huber
Hutchinson
Jones, Tenn.
Kyros
Landgrebe
McCloskey
McSpadden
Macdonald
Mazzoli
Meeds
Metcalf
Moakley
Peyser
Podell
Price, Tex.

Reid
Rooney, N.Y.
Rousselot
Roybal
Runnels
Ryan
Stark
Stubblefield
Talcott
Thompson, N.J.
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Waldie
Whalen
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.,
Calif.
Wilson,
Charles, Tex.
Winn

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Dominick V. Daniels with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Dellums with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Meeds.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Biester.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Metcalf with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Huber.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. Stark with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Cochran.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Moakley.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Runnels.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Kyros.
Mr. Vander Jagt with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Whalen with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Widnall with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Bob Wilson with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas.
 Mr. Arends with Mr. Ashley.
 Mr. Gude with Mr. Findley.
 Mr. Gray with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Peyser with Mr. Winn.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill S. 3373, sale and distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 12565, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12565) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1974 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize construction at certain installations, 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 24, 1974.)

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the conference report (Report 93-1064) has been printed and available to the Members since Saturday, May 25, 1974, and is also available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 28, page 16545, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement of the managers.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference action on H.R. 12565, the Department of Defense authorization for supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1974, and urge the concurrence of the House in the conference report.

By way of explanation of the conference action, I will briefly review the request made by the Department and the

action ultimately recommended in this conference report.

The administration's fiscal year 1974 supplemental request requiring authorization for appropriations for the Department of Defense requested new authorizations of \$1,257,455,000. The amount approved by the House on April 4, 1974, was \$1,142,049,000. The amount approved by the Senate on May 6, 1974, was \$415,474,000 in the form of a total authorization for appropriations plus an additional transfer authority of \$155.8 million under which incremental defense costs related to the Middle East War would be funded from the \$2.2 billion provided as "emergency security assistance for Israel" already provided.

The net difference between the two bills was \$726,575,000. The resolution of differences by the House and Senate conference results in a new total of \$769,049,000. Therefore, the new total in the bill is \$373,000,000 less than the House figure of \$1,142,049,000, and \$353,575,000 higher than the Senate figure of \$415,474,000.

Details concerning the conference action have been made available to the Members, both in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the printed copies of the report, available as House document No. 93-1064. However, I will briefly review the major actions taken by the conferees as reflected in the conference report.

The military assistance service funded—MASF—program for South Vietnam was a matter in conference as a result of a Senate amendment which would have prohibited the utilization of any unobligated funds available in the military assistance service funded program for South Vietnam after the date of enactment of the bill. The section was included by the Senate to hold the Department of Defense to the previously approved \$1,126 billion ceiling for military aid to South Vietnam for fiscal year 1974, and to prevent the obligation of \$266 million which would have been available if the reported obligations for fiscal year 1974 had been subject to adjustment.

The House/Senate conferees agreed that no accounting change would be permitted to the Department involving the \$266 million in question and emphasized, in the conference report, their agreement that the accounting procedures observed by the Department in respect to the utilization of fiscal year 1974 MASF funds would remain unchanged.

Stated another way, the conferees clearly stipulated that the statutory ceiling of \$1.126 billion enacted in the fiscal year 1974 appropriation remains unaltered and shall not be circumvented by an accounting adjustment.

The conferees also agreed to defer action for military construction at Diego Garcia until the matter can be reviewed by the Senate in connection with the Department's fiscal year 1975 military construction request.

The conferees agreed that this action would be without prejudice to the merits of the departmental request. One of the

basic objections of the Senate was the inclusion of this request in a supplemental bill.

The conferees also agreed to delete a Senate provision which would have required the transfer of military assistance program—MAP—funds in the amount of \$155.8 million to military procurement accounts to defray the increased costs of new equipment to be procured by the departments as a result of the transfer of military equipment to Israel.

The House conferees pointed out that the new equipment procured by the departments to replace equipment transferred to Israel was in almost every instance, qualitatively superior to that transferred to Israel and justified the additional expenditure of departmental funds. However, the conferees pointed out that this action taken by them should not be construed as establishing a policy for the future whereby the Department of Defense appropriation accounts were to absorb the incremental costs of transactions involving grants or sales of equipment to other countries.

SUMMARY

As I had previously indicated, the new total of the bill as agreed upon by your conferees is \$769,049,000. This figure is \$373 million less than the figure in the House bill, and \$353,575,000 more than the authorization originally passed by the Senate.

The conference report, therefore, represents a reasonable compromise of the two bodies and I recommend its approval.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and urge its unanimous approval by the House.

The conferees met on May 20 and May 22 to resolve these differences so as to enable the Appropriations Committees of both the House and Senate to go forward with their final mark-up of the Department's supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1974.

I will not attempt to review the individual actions taken by the conferees since they are thoroughly explained in both the conference report and have been reviewed by our chairman (Mr. HÉBERT).

As in every conference, there is give and take. We did not get all we wanted; nor did the Senate get all they wanted. However, reasonable men can arrive at a compromise, and that compromise is reflected in this conference report.

I urge its unanimous approval.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

The yeas and nays were refused.

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

Mr. THONE. 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. The Chair will count. One hundred ninety-three Members are present, not a quorum.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 354, nays 14, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

YEAS—354

Abdnor	Dulski	Kluczynski
Adams	Duncan	Koch
Addabbo	du Pont	Lagomarsino
Alexander	Eckhardt	Landrum
Andrews, N.C.	Edwards, Ala.	Latta
Andrews, N. Dak.	Ellberg	Leggett
Annunzio	Erlenborn	Lehman
Archer	Esch	Lent
Arends	Eshleman	Litton
Armstrong	Evans, Colo.	Long, La.
Ashbrook	Evins, Tenn.	Long, Md.
Ashley	Fascell	Lott
Aspin	Findley	Lujan
Bafalis	Fish	Luken
Baker	Fisher	McClary
Bauman	Flood	McCollister
Beard	Flowers	McCormack
Bennett	Flynt	McDade
Bergland	Foley	McEwen
Beyll	Ford	McFall
Biaggi	Forsythe	McKay
Blackburn	Fountain	McKinney
Blatnik	Frelinghuysen	Madden
Boggs	Frenzel	Madigan
Boland	Frey	Mahon
Bolling	Froehlich	Mallory
Bowen	Fulton	Mann
Brademas	Fuqua	Maraziti
Bray	Gaydos	Martin, Nebr.
Breaux	Gettys	Martin, N.C.
Breckinridge	Glaime	Mathias, Calif.
Brinkley	Gibbons	Mathis, Ga.
Brooks	Gilman	Matsunaga
Broomfield	Ginn	Mayne
Brotzman	Goldwater	Melcher
Brown, Mich.	Gonzalez	Mezvinsky
Brown, Ohio	Goodling	Michel
Broyhill, N.C.	Grasso	Milford
Broyhill, Va.	Gray	Miller
Buchanan	Green, Oreg.	Mills
Burgener	Green, Pa.	Minish
Burke, Mass.	Griffiths	Mink
Burleson, Tex.	Gross	Minshall, Ohio
Burlison, Mo.	Grover	Mitchell, N.Y.
Butler	Gubser	Mizell
Camp	Gunter	Montgomery
Carney, Ohio	Guyer	Moorhead, Pa.
Carter	Haley	Calif.
Casey, Tex.	Hamilton	Moorhead, Pa.
Cederberg	Hammer-	Morgan
Chamberlain	schmidt	Mosher
Chappell	Hanley	Moss
Chisholm	Hanrahan	Murphy, Ill.
Clancy	Hansen, Idaho	Murphy, N.Y.
Clark	Hansen, Wash.	Murtha
Clawson, Del.	Harsha	Myers
Cleveland	Hastings	Natcher
Cohen	Hays	Nedzi
Collier	Hebert	Nelsen
Collins, Ill.	Hechler, W. Va.	Nichols
Collins, Tex.	Heckler, Mass.	Nix
Conable	Heinz	Obey
Conlan	Henderson	O'Brien
Conte	Hicks	O'Hara
Corman	Hillis	O'Neill
Cotter	Hogan	Owens
Coughlin	Holifield	Parris
Crane	Holt	Passman
Cronin	Horton	Patten
Daniel, Dan	Hosmer	Pepper
Daniel, Robert	Hudnut	Perkins
W., Jr.	Hungate	Pettis
Davis, Ga.	Hunt	Peyser
Davis, S.C.	Ichord	Pickle
Davis, Wis.	Jarman	Pike
de la Garza	Johnson, Calif.	Poage
Deaney	Johnson, Colo.	Powell, Ohio
Dellenback	Johnson, Pa.	Preyer
Denholm	Jones, Ala.	Price, Ill.
Dennis	Jones, N.C.	Pritchard
Dent	Jones, Okla.	Quile
Derwinski	Jordan	Quillen
Devine	Karth	Rallsback
Dingell	Kazen	Randall
Donohue	Kemp	Rarick
Downing	Ketchum	Rees
	King	Regula

Reuss	Sisk
Rhodes	Skubitz
Rinaldo	Slack
Roberts	Smith, Iowa
Robinson, Va.	Smith, N.Y.
Robison, N.Y.	Snyder
Rodino	Spence
Roe	Staggers
Rogers	Stanton
Roncallo, Wyo.	J. William
Roncallo, N.Y.	Stanton
Rooney, Pa.	James V.
Rose	Steed
Rosenthal	Steele
Rostenkowski	Steelman
Roush	Steiger, Ariz.
Roy	Steiger, Wis.
Ruppe	Stephens
Ruth	Stratton
St Germain	Stuckey
Sandman	Studds
Sarasin	Sullivan
Sarbanes	Symington
Satterfield	Symms
Scherle	Taylor, Mo.
Schneebeli	Taylor, N.C.
Sebelius	Teague
Seiberling	Thomson, Wis.
Shipley	Thone
Shoup	Thornton
Shriver	Tiernan
Shuster	Towell, Nev.
Sikes	Traxler

NAYS—14

Abzug	Harrington
Clay	Helstoski
Conyers	Holtzman
Drinan	Kastenmeier
Edwards, Calif.	Mitchell, Md.

NOT VOTING—65

Anderson, Calif.	Diggs	Price, Tex.
Anderson, Ill.	Dorn	Reid
Badillo	Fraser	Rooney, N.Y.
Barrett	Gude	Rousselot
Bell	Hanna	Roybal
Blester	Hawkins	Runnels
Bingham	Hinshaw	Ryan
Brasco	Howard	Stark
Brown, Calif.	Huber	Stubblefield
Burke, Calif.	Hutchinson	Talcott
Burke, Fla.	Jones, Tenn.	Thompson, N.J.
Burton	Kuykendall	Van Deerlin
Byron	Kyros	Vander Jagt
Carey, N.Y.	Landgrebe	Waldie
Clausen	McCloskey	Whalen
Clausen, Don H.	McSpadden	Widnall
Cochran	Macdonald	Wiggins
Culver	Mazzoli	Wilson, Bob
Daniels	Meeds	Wilson
Dominick V.	Metcalfe	Charles H., Calif.
Danielson	Moakley	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Dellums	Mollohan	
Dickinson	Patman	
	Podell	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Stark against.

Mr. Dominick V. Daniels for, with Mr. Roybal against.

Mr. Kyros for, with Mr. Dellums against.

Mr. Howard for, with Mr. Bingham against.

Mr. Byron for, with Mr. Badillo against.

Mr. Brasco for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Podell for, with Mr. Waldie against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Reid.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Runnels.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Patman.

Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. Meeds with Mr. Metcalfe.

Mr. Moakley with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Cochran.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Bell.

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Culver.
Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Dick-
inson.

Mr. Burton with Mr. Blester.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Huber.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Rousselot with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Vander Jagt with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Whalen with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Bob Wilson with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Widnall with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14013, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14013) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, 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 Texas?

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I make a point of order against the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against consideration of this conference report at this time for the reason that it contains appropriations which were authorized in the conference report which we just voted upon a few moments ago and which is on legislation that has not been signed into law by the President, and, therefore, this conference report will effectively make appropriations which are not authorized in law.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, we have considered in the House the second supplemental appropriation bill, and the items that are contained in this conference report were included in the bill as it passed the House.

We received a rule from the Committee on Rules making it possible for the Defense appropriations to be considered in the supplemental appropriation bill. The rule was adopted; it was agreed to by the Committee on Rules, and it was agreed to by the House.

Therefore, I do not believe the point of order is valid.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard further on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with section 138, title X, of the United States Code. It states as follows:

No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year to or for the use of any armed force or obligated or expended for (1) procurement of aircraft,

And so on—and I shall delete the next few sentences.

unless funds therefor have been specifically authorized by law.

I am informed it is not possible to make a point of order against an amendment which is brought back in disagreement with the Senate. I am also informed it is not possible to make a point of order against a situation where the conference report accepted a figure which was lower than that passed by the Senate.

But I point out that amendment No. 17 is a situation where the conference report agrees upon a figure for procurement which is in excess of the Senate figure.

I would like to point out further, Mr. Speaker, that I recognize full well that there are people who can suffer if this point of order is sustained because of the fact that there are wages and salaries involved in this bill. It is not my desire to deny these people the right to be paid, but it is my desire to make the point that we are gradually eroding the legislative process here in the House so that authorizations by the authorizing committees are coming to mean less and less and less and less. I think we either ought to abolish the authorizing committees or we ought to see to it that we certainly pass the authorizations and they are enacted into law before we pass the appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, so that no one may be denied his salary, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California withdraws his point of order.

Is there objection to the request of gentleman from Texas that the statement be read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of May 29, 1974.)

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us provides \$9.3 billion in new budget authority. This is a reduction of \$1.8 billion below the budget request and \$489 million above the House bill but \$344 million below the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, on the fiscal year 1974 second supplemental bill there were 169 Senate amendments that the House conferees had to resolve.

The major changes in the conference report over the House bill consist of an indefinite appropriation of \$530 million for court ordered retroactive pay increases which the House did not consider. In other words, the Committee on Appropriations had no discretion in the

matter; it had to provide this additional pay as ruled by the court. The cost of this is estimated to be \$530 million.

There is an additional amount in the conference report of \$50 million for food stamps, \$32 million for disaster relief, \$20 million for flood control, \$12 million for emergency food and medical services, and \$29 million for railroad interim operating assistance.

For manpower administration the conference report provides \$2.2 billion, which is \$217 million above the House figure. The conference total includes \$620 million for public service employment instead of \$500 million as proposed by the House and \$305 million for summer youth employment programs instead of \$208 million as proposed by the House.

The conference report also provides \$12 million for the Follow Through program and \$8 million for the bilingual education program.

A budget rescission of \$1.2 billion for grants to States for public assistance was made in view of the overestimate of the administration. This was acceptable.

Now, with respect to defense, a short time ago upon the motion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. HÉBERT, the House approved the authorization bill for the military procurement portion of this appropriation.

The conference report before you is in consonance with the authorization conference report. We were careful, wherever possible, not to provide for the funding programs that had not been authorized. We do not believe that the Committee on Appropriations should provide the funding for programs which have not been authorized.

We did have a rule waiving points of order, to make it possible to consider the appropriation bill in the House for the military part of this legislation for which authorization had not been enacted. At that time the authorization bill had passed the House and passed the other body, but it had not been settled in conference.

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

Mr. MAHON. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT).

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

The reason I asked the gentleman to yield is merely to reemphasize what the gentleman has stated on his own volition, and that is to be positive that in the reconstruction of the appropriations after the conference of the authorizing committees, the Committee on Appropriations met again and deleted the appropriation that was not authorized in the compromise of the authorizing body. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his remarks.

There were some differences in the House version of the authorization bill, and the Senate version of the authorization bill. And in a tentative agreement, not a final agreement, in the conference between the House and the Senate on the pending appropriation bill we agreed on certain differences.

After the authorization conference report was finally agreed to by the conference committees of the Committees on Armed Services of the House and the Senate, it developed that certain modifications had to be made in certain details in the appropriation bill.

As the gentleman from Louisiana points out, adjustments were made, and they were for the most part not highly significant, to make sure that wherever possible no money is provided in the appropriation bill which has not been previously authorized or agreed to in the conference report which was adopted just a few moments ago by the House.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, and I should say further that the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations have worked together for the defense and security of this Nation for many years. We have great respect for the members on the Committee on Armed Services and great respect for the staff of the Committee on Armed Services. I think it is in the interest of our Nation that we work together for the defense and the security of the United States. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT) for his statesmanlike approach to this problem.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I assure the gentleman of the cooperation of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The conference report is almost \$490 million more than the bill as approved by the House. Can the gentleman from Texas very briefly state what constitutes the additional \$490 million?

Mr. MAHON. The committee, in accordance with a court decision and a budget estimate submitted by the Executive, recommended that certain retroactive pay payments be made to employees of the Government. This one item alone causes the conference agreement to be over the House version of the bill. This is an estimated indefinite appropriation of \$530 million.

Then there was \$50 million added in the Senate for food stamps.

Then there was \$32 million additional for disaster relief, \$20 million for flood control resulting from more recent developments with respect to damage from disasters, \$12 million for emergency food and medical services, and \$29 million for railroad interim operating assistance.

Then in manpower, the conference report provides \$2.2 billion, which is \$217 million above the House bill.

That is where one of the big increases was made. The report totals include \$620 million for public service employment. As the gentleman knows, there is a lot of concern about unemployment, and there was a considerable increase in public service employment. The House figure was a half billion dollars; the Senate figure was \$620 million. Also there were \$305 million for summer youth employment programs instead of \$208 million as proposed by the House. These are some of the major increases over the House bill.

Of course, there were certain decreases made in the Senate version of the bill and the conference agreement is some \$489 million over the House bill. The largest increase however, as I indicated earlier, was the \$530 million for retroactive pay costs associated with the court decision.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. LEGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I understand this supplemental coming along now on the 4th day of June, the funds in this supplemental must be obligated by the end of the fiscal year; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. No. The funds in this bill do not necessarily have to be obligated by the end of the fiscal year. Certain funds would have to be, but some of the funds in this bill would not have to be obligated by the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. LEGGETT. If the gentleman will yield further, let me ask this: In the military procurement area of defense, where I am interested, the Department of Defense made a request of some \$1,007,000,000 here 3 or 4 months ago in their supplemental request. Our House Committee on Armed Services approved \$999.3 million, and now in the authorization in the conference report just completed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, there was approved \$655 million. As I calculated the items in this bill, we have some \$424.9 million so we have a \$200 million difference, \$225 million, in the procurement account alone between the bill that we just passed and this bill. It affects items like Air Force airplanes, where the Air Force requested \$445 million worth of line items. We approved substantially that amount in our committee. The gentleman's bill would approve \$107.7 million for the Air Force aircraft.

My question is: What have we approved in that request for \$107.7 million? Does the gentleman know what the line items requested by the Air Force are that are approved or in this conference report? Can we just give discretion to the Department of Defense to pick out of the \$107 million of the authorization in the conference report what they choose to fund?

Mr. MAHON. In the various paragraphs of the bill we provide funds for certain programs, and it is true that some reductions were made below the budget requests. They all are line items, and the Department of Defense will have no difficulty in interpreting the action of the conference.

Mr. LEGGETT. If the gentleman would further yield, on page 10 of his report I will refer to amendment No. 18 reported in technical disagreement:

The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate \$107,700,000 instead of \$294,000,000 as proposed by the House—

Which was the last time they had a shot at this—

and \$244,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Then in the balance of the gentleman's paragraph in that section he does not give any inkling as to where that \$190 million is going to come from in the item. I am wondering if he has another report maybe that spells this out.

Mr. MAHON. The House report, the Senate report, and the conference report together, I think, make it abundantly clear as to the intent of the Congress with respect to the military items.

Mr. LEGGETT. I should hope that the record could in some way be embellished so that we could get some kind of lead as to exactly what we are appropriating here, because, very frankly, I am in the dark and I am sure that a great number of other Members are in the dark on this.

Mr. MAHON. I will be glad to insert in the RECORD specific details with respect to all of these items so that there will be no doubt about what the action will be:

AMENDMENT NO. 18

Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	Request	Authorization conference report	Appropriation conference report
A-7D flight simulator	\$5,000,000	0	0
F-111F flight simulator	8,100,000	0	0
C-130H aircraft	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Aircraft modifications:			
B-52	8,800,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
FB-111	3,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
A-7	1,000,000	500,000	500,000
F1RF-4	42,600,000	38,700,000	10,800,000
F-106	200,000	0	0
F-111	19,100,000	16,500,000	2,000,000
C-5A	8,700,000	7,800,000	2,000,000
C-135	600,000	0	0
C-141	42,600,000	31,000,000	0
CRAF	18,500,000	0	0
Aircraft spares and repair parts	153,500,000	37,300,000	37,300,000
Common ground equipment	1,500,000	1,500,000	600,000
Other production charges	101,000,000	14,700,000	14,700,000
Total	445,000,000	187,800,000	107,700,000

Mr. LEGGETT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DAN DANIEL. My Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) will take the floor in order that I may propound a question?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, referring to amendments 38 to 43, was it the intent of the conferees to provide for the employment services \$41 million of the \$81 million being considered for the overall program?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, that is correct, \$41 million.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the gentleman on the other side, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Michel) if that is his understanding?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I refer the gentleman specifically to language in the report in which we discuss this subject, and there will be later on in the proceedings a motion to recede and concur with Senate amendments that would take care of the matter the gentleman is interested in.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. I thank the gentleman very much, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has adequately explained the conference report and I find no reason to repeat him.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I have one further observation and that is with respect to the action of Congress on the budget for fiscal year 1974.

Overall, for fiscal 1974 the Congress has considered budget requests for appropriation bill items totalling about \$182.5 billion. In its action on such appropriation bills, the House has reduced requests for new budget—obligational—authority by about \$5.1 billion. Senate action on the appropriation bills thus far has resulted in decreases amounting to about \$4.1 billion in budget authority. In final actions in connection with these appropriation bills, the Congress has reduced requests by an amount aggregating some \$5.1 billion. However, in nonappropriation bills—that is, legislative measures otherwise—the Congress has taken action or inaction which has the net effect of increasing new budget—obligational—authority by some \$5.5 billion for the fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Speaker, your House conferees did, in my opinion, a good job, and I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material, I insert at this time certain tables on budget estimates and House, Senate, and conference action on items in the bill and also a more detailed explanation of the defense items in the conference report:

SUMMARY TABLE BY CHAPTERS AND TITLES
COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED

Chapter No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference Action Compared with—									
						Budget estimates	House bill	Senate bill							
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS															
I.....	Agriculture—Environmental and consumer protection; New budget (obligational) authority..... By transfer.....	\$575,650,000 (15,000,000)	\$560,230,000	\$616,641,000	\$613,891,000	+\$38,241,000 (-15,000,000)	+\$53,661,000	-\$2,750,000							
II.....	Defense: New budget (obligational) authority.....	3,412,741,000	2,327,412,000	2,330,112,000	2,139,312,000	-1,273,429,000	-188,100,000	-190,800,000							
III.....	District of Columbia: Federal funds: New budget (obligational) authority..... District of Columbia funds: New (obligational) authority.....	2,550,000 (12,134,400)		2,550,000		-2,550,000		-2,550,000							
IV.....	Foreign operations: New budget (obligational) authority.....	(12,092,400)	(12,092,400)	(12,134,400)	(12,134,400)		(+42,000)								
V.....	Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science, and Veterans: New budget (obligational) authority.....	54,000,000	49,000,000	15,250,000	49,250,000	-4,750,000	+250,000	+34,000,000							
VI.....	Interior and related agencies: New budget (obligational) authority.....	460,974,000	179,345,000	279,345,000	211,945,000	-249,029,000	+32,600,000	-67,400,000							
VII.....	Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare: New budget (obligational) authority..... By transfer..... Trust funds limitation.....	162,955,000 1,285,335,000 (111,766,000)	159,749,000 1,289,202,000 (111,766,000)	159,899,000 1,423,440,000 (107,766,000)	159,849,000 1,354,206,000 (107,766,000)	-3,106,000 +68,871,000 (-4,000,000)	+100,000 +65,004,000 (-4,000,000)	-50,000 -69,234,000 (-226,340,000)							
VIII.....	Legislative branch: New Budget (obligational) authority: 1974..... 1973..... Total.....	5,900,805 300,000 6,200,805	2,516,500 300,000	5,941,355	5,941,355	+40,550 -300,000 -259,450	+3,424,855 -300,000								
(IX).....	Military construction: New Budget (obligational) authority.....	29,000,000	29,000,000			-29,000,000	-29,000,000								
IX.....	Public works: New budget (obligational) authority.....	107,700,000	87,000,000	107,000,000	107,000,000	-700,000	+20,000,000								
X.....	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary: New budget (obligational) authority..... By transfer..... Liquidation of Contract Authority.....	50,556,000 (5,000,000) (23,000,000)	38,938,000 (5,000,000)	47,874,000 (5,000,000)	42,493,000 (5,000,000)	-8,063,000 (-4,000,000)	+3,555,000	-5,381,000							
XI.....	Transportation: New budget (obligational) authority..... By transfer.....	176,782,000 (7,500,000)	99,754,000	163,984,000 (8,218,000)	139,340,000 (8,218,000)	-37,442,000 (+8,218,000)	+39,586,000 (+718,000)	-24,644,000							
XII.....	Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government: New budget (obligational) authority.....	604,357,000	568,964,000	562,478,000	582,478,000	-21,879,000	+13,514,000	+20,000,000							
XIII.....	Claims and judgments: New budget (obligational) authority.....	20,977,448	20,977,448	20,977,448	20,977,448										
Total, title I—General Supplementals: New budget (obligational) authority: 1974..... 1973..... Total..... By transfer..... Increase in limitation..... Liquidation of contract authority..... District of Columbia funds (NOA).....									6,949,478,253 300,000 6,949,778,253 (20,000,000) (111,766,000) (23,000,000) (12,134,400)	5,412,087,948 300,000 5,412,387,948 (12,500,000) (111,766,000) (23,000,000) (12,092,400)	5,735,491,803 5,735,491,803 5,735,491,803 (239,558,000) (107,766,000) (23,000,000) (12,134,400)	5,426,682,803 5,426,682,803 5,426,682,803 (13,218,000) (107,766,000) (23,000,000) (12,134,400)	-1,522,795,450 -300,000 -1,523,095,450 (-6,782,000) (-4,000,000) (-500,000)	+14,594,855 -300,000 +14,294,855 (-718,000) (-837,000) (-837,000) (+42,000)	-308,809,000 -308,809,000 -308,809,000 (-226,340,000)
TITLE II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS															
Title II, regular increased pay costs: New budget (obligational) authority..... By transfer..... Increase in limitation..... Liquidation of contract authority.....									3,620,751,824 (62,963,600) (19,602,000) (6,000,000)	3,399,274,095 (56,397,800) (15,021,000) (5,500,000)	3,380,443,595 (55,560,800) (15,373,000) (5,500,000)	3,344,791,595 (55,560,800) (15,373,000) (5,500,000)	-275,960,229 (-7,402,800) (-4,229,000) (-500,000)	-54,482,500 (-837,000) (+352,000)	-35,652,000
Title III, fiscal year 1973 retroactive pay costs: New budget (obligational) authority, Titles II & III: Definite..... Indefinite..... Total..... By transfer..... Increase in limitation..... Liquidation of contract authority.....									1,530,000,000 3,620,751,824 1,530,000,000 4,150,751,824 (62,963,600) (19,602,000) (6,000,000)	3,399,274,095 (56,397,800) (15,021,000) (5,500,000) 3,399,274,095 (56,397,800) (15,021,000) (5,500,000)	3,380,443,595 3,380,443,595 1,530,000,000 3,910,443,595 (55,560,800) (15,373,000) (5,500,000)	3,344,791,595 3,344,791,595 1,530,000,000 3,874,791,595 (55,560,800) (15,373,000) (5,500,000)	-275,960,229 -275,960,229 +530,000,000 -275,960,229 (-7,402,800) (-4,229,000) (-500,000)	+475,517,500 -54,482,500 +530,000,000 +475,517,500 (-837,000) (-837,000)	-35,652,000
Grand total—Titles I, II, III: New budget (obligational) authority: 1974..... Definite..... Indefinite..... Total, 1974..... Total, 1973..... Grand total..... By transfer..... Increase in limitation..... Liquidation of Contract Authority.....									10,570,230,077 1,530,000,000 11,100,230,077 300,000 11,100,530,077 (82,963,600) (131,368,000) (29,000,000)	8,811,362,043 8,811,362,043 8,811,362,043 300,000 8,811,662,043 (68,897,800) (126,787,000) (28,500,000)	9,115,935,398 1,530,000,000 9,645,935,398 9,645,935,398 9,645,935,398 (295,118,800) (123,139,000) (28,500,000)	8,771,474,398 1,530,000,000 9,301,474,398 9,301,474,398 9,301,474,398 (68,778,800) (123,139,000) (28,500,000)	-1,798,755,679 +530,000,000 -1,798,755,679 -300,000 -1,799,055,679 (-14,184,800) (-822,900) (-500,000)	-39,887,645 +530,000,000 +490,112,355 -300,000 +489,812,355 (-119,000) (-364,800)	-344,461,000

¹ An indefinite appropriation title III.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL, FISCAL YEAR 1974—COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

Department or activity	Budget estimates	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with		
					Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—DEFENSE ITEMS							
CHAPTER II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY							
Military personnel							
Military personnel, Army.....	\$40,200,000	\$40,200,000	\$40,200,000	\$40,200,000			
Military personnel, Navy.....	26,500,000	20,300,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	—\$10,500,000	—\$4,300,000	
Military personnel, Marine Corps.....	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000			
Military personnel, Air Force.....	53,300,000	50,800,000	50,800,000	50,800,000	—2,500,000		
Reserve personnel, Army.....	600,000				—600,000		
Reserve personnel, Air Force.....	200,000				—200,000		
Retired military personnel							
Retired pay, Defense.....	468,800,000	468,800,000	468,800,000	468,800,000			
Operation and maintenance							
Operation and maintenance, Army.....	209,040,000	116,147,000	116,147,000	116,147,000	—92,893,000		
Operation and maintenance, Navy.....	359,600,000	242,475,000	341,675,000	309,175,000	—50,425,000	+66,700,000	—\$32,500,000
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps.....	16,800,000	13,400,000	13,400,000	13,400,000	—3,400,000		
Operation and maintenance, Air Force.....	291,850,000	224,650,000	261,350,000	251,350,000	—40,500,000	+26,700,000	—10,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies.....	830,000	830,000	830,000	830,000			
Operation and maintenance, Navy Reserve.....	30,000,000	17,700,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	—9,000,000	+3,300,000	
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve.....	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000			
Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	7,000,000	7,000,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	+2,500,000	+2,500,000	
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard.....	3,210,000	780,000	780,000	780,000	—2,430,000		
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard.....	16,000,000	14,000,000	22,300,000	22,300,000	+6,300,000	+8,300,000	
Procurement							
Aircraft procurement, Army.....	22,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	—6,000,000		
Missile procurement, Army.....	84,400,000	76,600,000	76,600,000	76,600,000	—7,800,000		
Procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army.....	121,800,000	71,100,000	58,600,000	71,100,000	—50,700,000		+12,500,000
Procurement of ammunition, Army.....	268,000,000	200,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	—118,000,000	—50,000,000	
Other procurement, Army.....	56,700,000	45,500,000	35,500,000	35,500,000	—21,200,000	—10,000,000	
Aircraft procurement, Navy.....	219,200,000	153,700,000	113,000,000	95,000,000	—124,200,000	—58,700,000	—18,000,000
Weapons procurement, Navy.....	28,600,000				—28,600,000		
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy.....	24,800,000		24,800,000	24,800,000		+24,800,000	
Other procurement, Navy.....	224,200,000	108,300,000	93,300,000	100,800,000	—123,400,000	—7,500,000	+7,500,000
Procurement, Marine Corps.....	40,700,000	33,800,000	33,800,000	33,800,000	—6,900,000		
Aircraft procurement, Air Force.....	445,000,000	294,000,000	244,400,000	107,700,000	—337,300,000	—186,300,000	—136,700,000
Missile procurement, Air Force.....	39,000,000		27,000,000	11,400,000	—27,600,000	+11,400,000	—15,600,000
Other procurement, Air Force.....	197,700,000	97,400,000	86,200,000	82,400,000	—115,300,000	—15,000,000	—3,800,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation							
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army.....	19,145,000				—19,145,000		
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy.....	29,300,000				—29,300,000		
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force.....	54,300,000	5,800,000		5,800,000	—48,500,000		+5,800,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense agencies.....	5,836,000				—5,836,000		
Total, chapter II: New budget (obligational) authority.....	3,412,741,000	2,327,412,000	2,330,112,000	2,139,312,000	—1,273,429,000	—188,100,000	—190,800,000
TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS— DEFENSE							
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE— MILITARY							
Military personnel							
Military personnel, Army.....	611,650,000	595,850,000	585,850,000	585,850,000	—25,800,000	—10,000,000	
Military personnel, Navy.....	432,150,000	384,650,000	308,650,000	308,650,000	—123,500,000	—76,000,000	
Military personnel, Marine Corps.....	121,434,000	113,834,000	113,834,000	113,834,000	—7,600,000		
Military personnel, Air Force.....	571,250,000	564,950,000	564,950,000	564,950,000	—6,300,000		
Reserve personnel, Army.....	41,092,000	36,092,000	23,092,000	23,092,000	—18,000,000	—13,000,000	
Reserve personnel, Navy.....	13,897,000	11,197,000	11,197,000	11,197,000	—2,700,000		
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps.....	3,827,000	1,527,000	2,827,000	1,527,000	—2,300,000		—1,300,000
Reserve personnel, Air Force.....	9,885,000	6,885,000	6,885,000	6,885,000	—3,000,000		
National Guard personnel, Army.....	51,600,000	51,600,000	69,600,000	69,600,000	+18,000,000	+18,000,000	
National Guard personnel, Air Force.....	14,583,000	7,583,000	14,583,000	7,583,000	—7,000,000		—7,000,000
Operation and maintenance							
Operation and maintenance, Army.....	274,160,000	260,400,000	260,400,000	260,400,000	—13,760,000		
Operation and maintenance, Navy.....	201,500,000	191,000,000	191,000,000	191,000,000	—10,500,000		
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps.....	14,200,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	—700,000		
Operation and maintenance, Air Force.....	163,150,000	155,000,000	155,000,000	155,000,000	—8,150,000		
Operation and maintenance, Defense Agencies.....	92,750,000	88,000,000	88,000,000	88,000,000	—4,750,000		
Operation and maintenance, Army Reserve.....	10,790,000	10,200,000	10,200,000	10,200,000	—590,000		
Operation and maintenance, Navy Reserve.....	3,500,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	—200,000		
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve.....	50,000	48,000	48,000	48,000	—2,000		
Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	8,120,000	7,700,000	7,700,000	7,700,000	—420,000		
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard.....	21,870,000	20,800,000	20,800,000	20,800,000	—1,070,000		
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard.....	17,250,000	16,375,000	16,375,000	16,375,000	—875,000		
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army.....	11,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	—1,000		
Court of Military Appeals, Defense.....	53,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	—3,000		
Research, development, test, and evaluation							
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army.....	35,898,000	17,930,000	35,898,000	26,914,000	—8,984,000	+8,984,000	—8,984,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy.....	38,528,000	19,243,000	38,528,000	28,885,000	—9,643,000	+9,642,000	—9,643,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force.....	29,466,000	14,721,000	29,466,000	22,093,000	—7,373,000	+7,372,000	—7,373,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense Agencies.....	5,016,000	2,506,000	5,016,000	3,761,000	—1,255,000	+1,255,000	—1,255,000
Total, Department of Defense—Military new budget (obligational) authority.....	2,787,680,000	2,594,951,000	2,576,759,000	2,541,204,000	—246,476,000	—53,747,000	—35,555,000
Total, titles I and II, Department of Defense.....	6,200,421,000	4,922,363,000	4,906,871,000	4,680,516,000	—1,519,905,000	—241,847,000	—226,355,000

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to prolong these proceedings but I believe I am the only member of the conference committee who did not sign the conference report, and will probably vote against the adoption of the conference report, simply because there are some very big, significant increases over and above the budget for admittedly some popular programs for some, but I just want to register my own grave concern here for the manner in which we are blithely going along our way exceeding the budget time after time, day after day and where it will all end only Heaven knows.

In several of the items for which I am somewhat responsible as a member of the HEW Appropriation Subcommittee, this conference report comes back to you \$120 million over the budget in the Comprehensive Employment Training Act. We are \$250 million over the budget in the emergency employment program.

We are several million over the budget for summer youth employment, but I think the small increase here can very well be justified.

In a closely related program, there is \$17 million in his bill for the summer youth recreation and transportation program. The conference report includes additional funds for the prevention of lead-based paint poisoning, for bilingual education and for the Follow Through program.

While there are a host of other items we could discuss at length, Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the time, but let me conclude mentioning that we have \$4.5 million to fund the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act and \$12.5 million for emergency food and medical services, bringing that program up to \$25 million for this fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a whopping big appropriations bill, \$9.3 billion, which is the largest supplemental I can recall all during my 18 years' service here in the House. As I said at the very beginning, I am very concerned about these big increases over the budget and what it all means when we add them up and close the books at the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, having examined the conference report accompanying H.R. 14013, making supplemental appropriations, I was very pleased to note that under amendment No. 31 the managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides that \$6,213,000 for insect and disease control under the heading "Forest Protection and Utilization, Forest Land Management" which remain available until expended. Certainly this Senate amendment is necessary to assist our Forest Service people in continuing their nonending battle against insect and disease control of our forests.

However, despite the many favorable actions by the conferees I find under amendment No. 162 that the House conferees deleted "language proposed by the Senate which would have prohibited the Export-Import Bank from obligating or expending any funds available under its operating authority until the President made individual Presidential determinations on each transaction which has been

committed or will be committed in Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia, and the U.S.S.R."

I further understand that the managers express hope that new legislation regarding extension of the Export-Import Bank beyond June 30, 1974, would address the matter of establishing strict guidelines for national interest determinations with regard to the conduct of Export-Import Bank business with various Communist countries.

However, the inference is that support for the conference report deleting this prohibition is support for the President's action in granting Export-Import Bank credits at 6 percent to Communist countries, including Russia. I can only assume that there are funds in the supplemental appropriation bill to perform such controversial loans and, while I support many features of the report, I find I must cast my people's vote "no" because of the Export-Import Bank loan activities.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that on page 20 of the supplemental appropriations conference report the conferees have addressed themselves to the recurring reports that the Department of Transportation may be attempting to force abandonment of certain rail lines in the Northeast as a condition for the railroads receiving cash assistance under the terms of the Regional Railroad Reorganization Act of 1973—Public Law 93-236.

This reported policy is of serious concern to me and to the citizens of the First District of Maryland where the Penn Central has been repeatedly attempting to cut off existing rail service. The curtailing of rail service, as the conferees note in their report, is contrary to section 213(a) of the act, and I hope that the Secretary of Transportation will take note of the conferees position on this matter.

As a further explanation of the grave concern that I and many other Members have regarding DOT's actions in this area, I include at this point in my remarks a copy of a letter written by A. Grey Staples, Jr., public counsel of the Interstate Commerce Commission to Senator CLIFFORD CASE of New Jersey as well as a letter I have written to Secretary Brinegar.

The letters follow:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1974.

HON. CLIFFORD CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: You have requested the opinion of the Rail Services Planning Office on certain matters pertaining to the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 ("Act"). Your inquiry pertains to: (1) the existing procedures for abandonment of rail lines by railroads in reorganization under Section 304(f) of the Act before the effective date of the "final system plan" and (2) the authority of the Secretary of the Department of Transportation to condition the payment of emergency assistance funds to a railroad in bankruptcy under Section 213 of the Act, upon the railroads' undertaking the abandonment of certain lines.

Section 304(f) of the Act requires railroads in reorganization desiring discontinuance of service or abandonment of any line after the date of enactment of the Act to do so in accordance with the provisions of the Act "unless it is authorized to do so by the Association and unless no affected State or local

or regional transportation authority reasonably opposes such action."

We interpret this section to allow the continuance of abandonment proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission and state regulatory agencies subject to the veto of the Association and state, local or regional transportation authorities until the effective date of the "final system plan." At that time, such matters will be treated under the procedures found in Section 304(a), (b) and (c).

Some have suggested that this provision grants the Association the exclusive authority in addition to those powers granted to it in Section 202, to permit bankrupt railroads to discontinue service within the region prior to the adoption of the final system plan. Such an interpretation implies that Congress intended to abrogate all existing procedural safeguards and standards with respect to railroad abandonment and give the Association the plenary power to make such determinations with no definition of standards or procedures, save for the reasonable opposition of certain transportation authorities. No private party, shipper or passenger would be given any right to be heard or to present evidence.

We find the more logical interpretation of the provision of the Act, based on the context of the Act and its legislative history, to be a simple modification of existing Interstate Commerce Commission and state regulatory agency procedures that give organizations concerned with reorganization planning the opportunity to stop any abandonment that would conflict with their ultimate designs for railroad operation.

Therefore, under our interpretation of the Act, no railroad in reorganization may abandon any line or service prior to the implementation of the final system plan unless: (1) the line or service has been approved for abandonment under normal ICC abandonment procedures; (2) the Association has authorized such abandonment; and (3) no State, local or regional transportation authority has expressed a reasonable opposition to the abandonment.

With respect to the emergency assistance funds authorized by Section 213 of the Act, these funds are intended to keep the railroads in reorganization operating until the implementation of the final system plan. The Secretary of the Department of Transportation is authorized to make such payments "upon such reasonable terms and conditions" as he might establish as long as the recipients agree to maintain service "at a level no less than that in effect on the date of enactment" of the Act.

The Secretary can and should insure the proper use and accounting of such funds by establishing terms and conditions on their payment. This provision does not, however, contemplate the Secretary's using the funds to enforce compliance by the recipient with the Secretary's preconceived notions of an appropriate railroad system. Indeed, for the Secretary to request abandonment as a *quid pro quo* for the payment of emergency assistance funds contradicts Congress' expressed intention in the last phrase of Section 213(a) that the recipient maintain services existing on the date of enactment of the Act.

We believe that the above interpretations of the Act comport with Congressional intent and adequately protect the public interest prior to the adoption of the "final system plan." Please rest assured that the Public Counsel's Office will take appropriate measures to assure that these interpretations are adequately represented throughout the rail reorganization process.

Very truly yours,

A. GREY STAPLES, JR.,
Public Counsel.

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 4, 1974.

HON. CLAUDE S. BRINEGAR,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY BRINEGAR: I am writing be-

cause of my concern over the question of the Department of Transportation's position on track abandonment in exchange for federal rail subsidies. I have read the letter which Mr. A. Grey Staples of the I.C.C. wrote to Senator Clifford Case on this matter. He confidently stated that the Department of Transportation has not, and is not about to make any deals with bankrupt railroads for abandonment of track in exchange for subsidies. Unfortunately, Mr. Staples was speaking for the I.C.C. and not for the Secretary of Transportation.

The fear of abandonments in my district is a real one which results from the actions of the Penn Central Railroad. It is currently instituting slow-downs and reductions in service to the Delmarva Peninsula area of Maryland. This fear has been allowed to grow, because the U.S. Department of Transportation has failed to take a hard line on such current reductions of service.

I believe that it is absolutely necessary for you to affirm the position taken by the I.C.C. in its letter of May 3, 1974 to Senator Case. Furthermore, I request that you take immediate steps to end the Penn Central's curtailment of freight service to the Delmarva area and require the Penn Central to restore the service recently cut from the schedule. This is in keeping with the intent and letter of the recently passed Northeast Railroad Act which forbids such abandonments.

I have enclosed for your review a copy of a letter from the Salisbury, Maryland area Chamber of Commerce, which lists the service that has been terminated, and expresses the doubt the people have about both the government and the Penn Central Railroad's position on the issue of track abandonment.

If you have any questions regarding these matters, or if you would like to discuss them in more detail, please don't hesitate to call on me. I hope I may have a quick response to this letter in view of the urgency of the situation in my district.

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT E. BAUMAN,
Member of Congress.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to clarify certain issues raised in Senate Report 93-814, which accompanied H.R. 14013—Second Supplemental Appropriation bill, 1974—as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and to clearly point out that there is nothing in the House bill, nothing in the Senate bill, and nothing in the conference report—and hence nothing in the law—to prohibit or delay establishment, under contract with U.S. commercial air carriers, of a worldwide air shuttle system for the transportation of all official overseas travelers as unanimously recommended in House Report 93-599.

The jurisdiction of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations is quite clear. They have authority over the "Appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government." However, while the Appropriation Committees

have authority to report appropriations, "the power to report legislation relating thereto belongs to other committees." Yet, within Senate Report 93-814, on pages 113 and 114 under the heading "Proposed International Air Shuttle," we have an attempt by certain members of the other body to legislate through a report no less. Had they attempted to place restrictive language, such as contained in the Senate report, in the Senate version of H.R. 14013, the language undoubtedly would have been stricken from the bill during committee or floor action on the bill under Senate rule XVI which reads as follows:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

RULE XVI: AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS

2. The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any restriction on the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law if such restriction is to take effect or cease to be effective upon the happening of a contingency, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any such restriction, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, any attempted "back-door" legislation through Senate Report 93-814 is clearly an intrusion into the jurisdiction of the Committees on Government Operations and other House and Senate committees. It is clear that the Committee on Government Operations, on which I serve as chairman of its Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, has jurisdiction over studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency and also has legislative jurisdiction over the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

Under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the General Services Administrator is specifically assigned the statutory authority to prescribe policies and methods of procurement of transportation services for all executive agencies of Government. The Administrator also has the statutory right to actually procure such services for the use of the executive agencies and to delegate and authorize successive redelegations of authorities vested in him by the act to the head of any other Federal agency.

The economy and efficiency of overseas transportation of Government officials and their dependents traveling on official business has been carefully studied during the past 3 years by the For-

eign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, the General Service Administration, the Department of Defense, and the major using agencies. The members of the House Committee on Government Operations—by unanimous vote—concluded in House Report 93-599 that, under the existing legislative authority contained in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the air transportation system used by the Department of Defense for the past 14 years—whereby military and civilian employees of DOD and their dependents traveling on official travel orders, are transported in plane load groups by U.S. commercial air carriers under contracts with the Government—should be expanded to include all of the Government's official travelers. The General Services Administrator completely concurred in this view and, on November 7, 1973, delegated authority to the Secretary of Defense to initiate and operate a "charter system to accommodate civil agency international traffic." DOD's Military Airlift Command was quick to respond—detailed operating procedures were developed by January 1974. However, before the expanded DOD airlift system could be put into operation, orders were issued by the Executive Office of the President to withhold implementation of the planned expansion of the DOD airlift system pending further advice from the Executive Office.

Mr. Speaker, detailed comparisons of total costs involved in transporting official travelers to points in northern Europe by use of regularly scheduled services and by use of plane load charters—under contracts with U.S. commercial air carriers—clearly show potential savings for the American taxpayer of some \$5 million yearly. Expansion of the system to a worldwide operation would undoubtedly result in savings of some \$20 to \$30 million per year—each and every year.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there are no real legal problems involved in the proposed expansion of the DOD airlift system to include all Government travelers; DOD has fully worked out the operating details; the expanded DOD airlift system would have no relevant impact on our balance of payments; and the potential savings are very real.

It should be clearly understood that there is nothing in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1974, as finally passed by both the House and Senate, to preclude the executive branch from moving forward on the proposed international air shuttle.

The cost comparison referred to follows:

ILLUSTRATIVE COST COMPARISON, SCHEDULED AIR SERVICE VERSUS CHARTERED AIR SHUTTLE SERVICE
EUROPEAN AREA ONLY¹

Routing—Washington, D.C.					Transportation costs per passenger ²			1972 traffic ³		Additional indirect costs				
To	Frequency	Departure	Arrival	Flight number	Category Z	Economy class	Shuttle	Category Z	Civil	Transportation costs	Per diem ⁴	Productive time ⁵	Revenue loss ⁶	Net savings
London:														
Scheduled	Daily	2100 IAD	0900 LHR	PA 106	\$157	\$295.00		6,817	919	\$1,341,374				
Shuttle	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday	1700 IAD	0730 LGW	Shuttle			\$79.00		7,736	611,144				
Cost reduction										730,230	\$11,604	0	0	\$718,626

Footnote at end of table.

To	Frequency	Routing—Washington, D.C.			Transportation costs per passenger ²			1972 traffic ³		Transportation costs	Additional indirect costs			Net savings					
		Departure	Arrival	Flight number	Category Z	Economy class	Shuttle	Category Z	Civil		Per diem ⁴	Productive time ⁵	Revenue loss ⁶						
Dublin:																			
Scheduled.....	Daily.....	1917 DCA.....	2049 JFK.....	NA 70.....	7	\$197	\$268.00	21	45	\$16,782									
		2145 JFK.....	0900 SNN.....	TW 876.....															
		0950 SNN.....	1025 DUB.....	EI 104.....									13.00						
Shuttle.....	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday.....	1700 IAD.....	0730 LGW.....	Shuttle.....			\$79.00		66	7,933									
		LGW.....	LHR.....	Ground traffic.....			1.20												
		0935 LHR.....	1040 DUB.....	EI 153.....			40.00												
Cost reduction.....										8,849	\$99	0	\$8776	\$7,974					
Paris:																			
Scheduled.....	Daily.....	1930 IAD.....	0810 PRF.....	TW 890.....	7	202	311.00	1,024	1,044	531,532									
Shuttle.....	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday.....	1700 IAD.....	0730 LGW.....	Shuttle.....									79.00		2,068	256,432			
		0800 LGW.....	0850 LBG.....	BR 882.....									45.00						
Cost reduction.....										275,100	—9,823	0	28,188	256,735					
Brussels:																			
Scheduled.....	Daily.....	0700 BAL.....	0750 JFK.....	AL 558.....	165	311.00		2,910	373	596,153									
		1000 JFK.....	2335 BRU.....	PA 100.....															
Shuttle.....	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday.....	1700 IAD.....	0730 LGW.....	Shuttle.....									79.00		3,283	434,013			
		LGW.....	LHR.....	Grd. Trf.....			1.20												
		0935 LHR.....	1030 BRU.....	SN 602.....			52.00												
Cost reduction.....										162,140	—15,595	—\$114,905	104,793	187,847					
Amsterdam:																			
Scheduled.....	Daily.....	2100 IAD.....	9000 LHR.....	PA 106.....	164	311.00		1,209	227	268,873									
		1025 LHR.....	1125 AMS.....	PA 56.....															
Shuttle.....	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday.....	1700 IAD.....	0730 LGW.....	Shuttle.....									79.00		1,436	185,531			
		LGW.....	LHR.....	Grd. Trf.....			1.20												
		1025 LHR.....	1125 AMS.....	PA 56.....			49.00												
Cost reduction.....										83,342	2,154	0	1,034	80,154					
Copenhagen:																			
Scheduled.....	Daily.....	2100 IAD.....	0900 LHR.....	PA 106.....	234	333.00		251	95	90,369									
		1045 LHR.....	1230 CPH.....	PA 54.....															
Shuttle.....	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday.....	1700 IAD.....	0730 LGW.....	Shuttle.....									79.00		346	68,923			
		LGW.....	LHR.....	Grd. Trf.....			1.20												
		1045 LHR.....	1230 CPH.....	PA 54.....			119.00												
Cost reduction.....										21,446	519	0	249	20,678					
Oslo:																			
Scheduled.....	Daily, except Tuesday, Sunday, Wednesday, Friday, Monday, Thursday, Saturday.....	1655 DCA.....	1750 JFK.....	NA 451.....	234	333.00		446	81	131,337									
		1940 JFK.....	0945 OSL.....	PA 76.....															
		1940 JFK.....	1125 OSL.....	PA 76.....															
Shuttle.....	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday.....	1700 IAD.....	0730 LGW.....	Shuttle.....			79.00		527	129,958									
		Rest stop.....		Ground traffic.....			2.60												
	Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday.....	1045 LHR.....	1230 CPH.....	PA 54.....			119.00												
		1420 CPH.....	1520 OSL.....	SK 602.....			46.00												
Cost reduction.....										1,379	18,840	18,445	15,367	—51,273					
Stockholm:																			
Scheduled.....	Tuesday, Friday.....	1655 DCA.....	1750 JFK.....	NA 451.....		357.00			159	56,763									
	Tuesday.....	1940 JFK.....	1015 ARN.....	PA 76.....															
	Friday.....	1940 JFK.....	1130 ARN.....	PA 76.....															
Shuttle.....	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday.....	1700 IAD.....	0730 LGW.....	Shuttle.....			79.00		159	42,930									
		Rest stop.....		Ground traffic.....			2.60												
	Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday.....	1045 LHR.....	1230 CPH.....	PA 54.....			119.00												
		1420 CPH.....	1530 ARN.....	SK 558.....			46.00												
Cost reduction.....										13,833	5,684	5,565	4,636	—2,052					
Helsinki:																			
Scheduled.....	Tuesday, Friday.....	1655 DCA.....	1750 JFK.....	NA 451.....		357.00			55	22,303									
	Tuesday.....	1940 JFK.....	1015 ARN.....	PA 76.....															
	Friday.....	1940 JFK.....	1130 ARN.....	PA 76.....															
	Wednesday, Saturday.....	Rest stop.....		Ground traffic.....			5.50												
		0710 ARN.....	0900 HEL.....	SK 730.....			43.00												
Shuttle.....	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday.....	1700 IAD.....	0730 LGW.....	Shuttle.....			79.00		55	15,433									
		Rest stop.....		Ground traffic.....			2.60												
	Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday.....	1045 LHR.....	1230 CPH.....	PA 54.....			119.00												
		1440 CPH.....	1755 HEL.....	AY 814.....			80.00												
Cost reduction.....										6,870	—159	0	1,307	5,742					

ILLUSTRATIVE COST COMPARISON, SCHEDULED AIR SERVICE VERSUS CHARTERED AIR SHUTTLE SERVICE—Continued

EUROPEAN AREA ONLY—Continued

To	Frequency	Routing—Washington, D.C.			Transportation costs per passenger ²			1972 traffic ³		Additional indirect costs				Net savings
		Departure	Arrival	Flight number	Category Z	Economy class	Shuttle	Category Z	Civil	Transportation costs	Per diem ⁴	Productive time ⁵	Revenue loss ⁶	
Frankfurt:														
Scheduled	Daily	1830 IAD	0735 FRA	TW 734	\$172	\$333.00		9,446	973	\$1,948,721				
Shuttle	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday	1700 IAD	1130 FRA	Shuttle			\$87.00	10,419		906,453				
Cost reduction										1,042,268	-\$49,491	0	0	\$1,091,759
Luxembourg:														
Scheduled	Daily	1830 IAD	0735 FRA	TW 734		333.00			18	6,480				
		0925 FRA	1010 LUX	LG 302		27.00								
Shuttle	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday	1700 IAD	1130 FRA	Shuttle			87.00		18	2,052				
		1230 FRA	1320 LUX	LG 306			27.00							
Cost reduction										4,428	—58	0	0	4,486
Geneva:														
Scheduled	Daily	1655 DC	1750 JFK	NA 451	172	333.00		66	513	182,181				
		1930 JFK	0925 GVA	TW 832										
Shuttle	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday	1700 IAD	1130 FRA	Shuttle			87.00		579	79,323				
		Rest stop		Grd Trf.			1.00							
		0930 FRA	1030 GVA	LH 240			49.00							
Cost reduction										102,858	21,567	\$20,265	\$17,370	43,656
Prague:														
Scheduled	Sunday, Thursday	2100 IAD	0900 LHR	PA 106		350.00			55	19,250				
		1200 LHR	1335 PRG	1PA 102										
Shuttle	do	1700 IAD	0730 LGW	Shuttle			79.00		55	10,846				
		LGW	LHR	Grd. Trf.			1.20							
		1020 LHR	1335 PRG	PA 102										
		1020 LHR	1335 PRG	PA 102			117.00							
Cost reduction										8,404	82	0	40	8,282
Warsaw:														
Scheduled	Wednesday	2100 IAD	0900 LHR	PA 106		367.00			202	75,952				
		1020 LHR	1410 WAW	PA 102										
Shuttle	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday	1700 IAD	1130 FRA	Shuttle			87.00		202	35,148				
		Rest stop		G d. Trf.			1.00							
	Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday	0850 FRA	1020 WAW	PA 46			86.00							
Cost reduction										40,804	8,484	0	121	32,199
Moscow:														
Scheduled	Sunday	2100 IAD	0900 LHR	PA 106		455.00			337	154,211				
		Rest stop		Ground traffic		2.60								
Shuttle	Tuesday, Sunday	1020 LHR	1555 SVO	PA 102			79.00		337	111,412				
		1700 IAD	0730 LGW	Shuttle			2.60							
		Rest stop		Ground traffic										
	Tuesday	1020 LHR	1555 SVO	PA 102			249.00							
Cost reduction										42,799	505	0	0	42,294
Vienna:														
Scheduled	Daily	1430 IAD	1545 JFK	BN 104		363.00			211	76,593				
		1800 JFK	0855 VIE	PA 92										
Shuttle	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday	1700 IAD	1130 FRA	Shuttle			87.00		211	30,595				
		1240 FRA	1355 VIE	LH 252			58.00							
Cost reduction										45,998	—686	7,385	7,343	31,956
Budapest:														
Scheduled	Tuesday, Saturday	2100 IAD	0900 LHR	PA 106		399.00			72	28,728				
		1020 LHR	1410 BUD	PA 102										
Shuttle	Tuesday	1700 IAD	0730 LGW	Shuttle			79.00		72	16,070				
		LGW	LHR	Ground traffic			1.20							
		1020 LHR	1410 BUD	PA 102			143.00							
Cost reduction										12,658	108	0	52	12,498
Belgrade:														
Scheduled	Monday, Wednesday, Thursday	1430 IAD	1545 JFK	BN 104		399.00			495	197,505				
		1800 JFK	0945 BEG	PA 44										
Shuttle	Thursday, Saturday	1700 IAD	0730 LGW	Shuttle			79.00		495	118,107				
		Rest stop		Grd. Trf.			2.60							
		1020 LHR	1425 BEG	PA 102			157.00							
Cost reduction										79,398	17,696	17,325	772	43,605

Routing—Washington, D.C.					Transportation costs per passenger ²			1972 traffic ³			Additional indirect costs			Net savings
To	Frequency	Departure	Arrival	Flight number	Category Z	Economy class	Shuttle	Category Z	Civil	Transportation costs	Per diem ⁴	Production time ⁵	Revenue loss ⁶	
Bucharest:														
Scheduled	Friday	2100 IAD	0900 LHR	PA 106		\$446.00			73	\$32,558				
		1020 LHR	1710 OTP	PA 102										
Shuttle	Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday	1700 IAD	0900 LGW	Shuttle			\$79.00		73	20,966				
		LGW	LHR	Grd. Trf.			1.20							
		1020 LHR	1710 OTP	PA 102			207.00							
Cost reduction										11,592	\$109	0	\$53	\$11,430
Total, scheduled service										5,777,665				
Total, shuttle service										3,083,269				
Total cost reduction, 1 way										2,694,396	11,619	—\$45,920	182,101	2,546,596
Total cost reduction, round trip										5,388,792				5,093,192

¹ Source: Official airline guide—January 1974 edition Pan Am and TWA advance summer schedules. Shuttle service schedule from GSA.

² Category Z from CAB Tariff No. 207—effective Jan. 15, 1974. Economy class service: Official airline guide—January 1974 edition—Y times 5 months plus Y times 4 months plus YH times 3 months plus 7 percent (4-1.74 increase) divided by 12.

³ Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, May 23, 1973, Appendix J, p. 57.

⁴ Source: Department of State, per diem supplements No. 115 and 116, effective Apr. 14, 1974. Overstated to the extent that certain dependents do not receive full per diem.

⁵ Substantially overstated, State Department officials estimate that two-thirds of the Government's "Permanent change of station" travelers are dependents who naturally do not receive salary payments. Salary rate used—\$70 per day—is neither accepted nor rejected as truly representative but is used to be compatible with the rate used in Pan Am's presentation.

⁶ Theoretical view advanced by Pan American officials which is neither accepted nor rejected but included solely to make this presentation compatible with Pan Am's presentation. Amounts shown equal 60 percent of additional expenditures on foreign carriers.

⁷ No direct category Z service. Routing via London then foreign flag to destination.

PER DIEM COMPUTATIONS

Destination	Scheduled	Shuttle
London	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
Dublin	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
Paris	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
Brussels	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
Amsterdam	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
Copenhagen	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
Oslo	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
		1 at 39.
Stockholm	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
		1 at 39.
Helsinki	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
	1 at 39.	1 at 39.
Frankfurt	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
Luxembourg	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
Geneva	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
		1 at 42.
Prague	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
Warsaw	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
		1 at 42.
Moscow	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
	1 at 39.	1 at 39.
Vienna	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
Budapest	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
Belgrade	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.
		1 at 39.
Bucharest	1/4 at 25	1/4 at 25.
	1/4 at 6	1/4 at 6.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken and the Speak-

er announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. 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 339, nays 27, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]

YEAS—339

Abzug	Byron	Duncan
Adams	Camp	du Pont
Addabbo	Carney, Ohio	Eckhardt
Alexander	Carter	Edwards, Ala.
Anderson, Ill.	Casey, Tex.	Ellberg
Andrews, N.C.	Cederberg	Erlenborn
	Chamberlain	Esch
	Chappell	Eshleman
Annunzio	Chisholm	Evans, Colo.
Arendo	Clancy	Evins, Tenn.
Armstrong	Clark	Fascell
Aspin	Clawson, Del	Findley
Baker	Clay	Flah
Bauman	Cleveland	Fisher
Bennett	Cohen	Flood
Bergland	Collier	Flowers
Bevill	Collins, Ill.	Foley
	Conable	Ford
Blaggi	Conte	Forsythe
Blatnik	Conyers	Fountain
Boggs	Corman	Frelinghuysen
Boland	Cotter	Frenzel
Bolling	Coughlin	Frey
Bowen	Cronin	Fröhlich
Brademas	Daniel, Dan	Fulton
Bray	Daniel, Robert	Fuqua
Breaux	W. Jr.	Gaydos
Breckinridge	Davis, Ga.	Gettys
Brinkley	Davis, S.C.	Gialmo
Brooks	Davis, Wis.	Gibbons
Broomfield	de la Garza	Gilman
Brotzman	Delaney	Ginn
Brown, Mich.	Dellenback	Goldwater
Brown, Ohio	Denholm	Gonzalez
Broyhill, N.C.	Dennis	Grasso
Broyhill, Va.	Buchanan	Gray
Burgener	Burgener	Green, Oreg.
Burke, Mass.	Burke, Mass.	Green, Pa.
Burleson, Tex.	Burleson, Tex.	Griffiths
Burlison, Mo.	Burlison, Mo.	Gubser
Butler	Butler	Gunter

Guyer	McEwen	Rangel
Haley	McFall	Rees
Hamilton	McKay	Regula
Hammer	McKinney	Reuss
Hammer	Madden	Riegle
Hanley	Madigan	Rinaldo
Hanrahan	Mahon	Roberts
Hansen, Idaho	Mallary	Robinson, Va.
Hansen, Wash.	Mann	Robison, N.Y.
Harrington	Maraziti	Rodino
Harsha	Martin, Nebr.	Roe
Hastings	Mathias, Calif.	Rogers
Hays	Mathis, Ga.	Roncallo, Wyo.
Hébert	Matsunaga	Roncallo, N.Y.
Hechler, W. Va.	Mayne	Rooney, Pa.
Heckler, Mass.	Melcher	Rose
Heinz	Mezvisinsky	Rosenthal
Helstoski	Milford	Rostenkowski
Hicks	Mills	Roush
Hillis	Minish	Roy
Hogan	Mink	Ruppe
Holifield	Minshall, Ohio	Ruth
Holt	Mitchell, Md.	St Germain
Holtzman	Mitchell, N.Y.	Sarasin
Horton	Montgomery	Sarbanes
Hosmer	Moorhead,	Scherle
Hudnut	Calif.	Sebelius
Hungate	Moorhead, Pa.	Seiberling
Hunt	Morgan	Shipley
Jarman	Mosher	Shoup
Johnson, Calif.	Moss	Shriver
Johnson, Colo.	Murphy, Ill.	Sikes
Johnson, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.	Sisk
Jones, Ala.	Murtha	Skubitz
Jones, N.C.	Myers	Slack
Jones, Okla.	Natcher	Smith, Iowa
Jones, Tenn.	Nedzi	Smith, N.Y.
Jordan	Nelsen	Snyder
Karh	Nichols	Spence
Kastenmeier	Nix	Staggers
Kazen	Obey	Stanton
Kemp	O'Brien	J. William
Ketchum	O'Hara	Stanton
King	O'Neill	James V.
Kluczynski	Owens	Steed
Koch	Passman	Steele
Kuykendall	Patman	Steelman
Lagomarsino	Patten	Steiger, Wis.
Landrum	Pepper	Stephens
Latta	Perkins	Stokes
Leggett	Pettis	Stratton
Lehman	Peyser	Stuckey
Lent	Pickle	Studds
Litton	Pike	Sullivan
Long, La.	Poage	Symington
Long, Md.	Powell, Ohio	Taylor, Mo.
Lott	Preyer	Taylor, N.C.
Lujan	Price, Ill.	Teague
Lukens	Pritchard	Thomson, Wis.
McClary	Quie	Thone
McCollister	Quillen	Thornton
McCormack	Rallsback	Tiernan
McDade	Randall	Towell, Nev.

Traxler	Ware	Wyman
Treen	White	Yates
Udall	Whitehurst	Yatron
Ullman	Whitten	Young, Alaska
Vander Veen	Williams	Young, Ga.
Vanik	Winn	Young, Ill.
Veysey	Wolff	Young, S.C.
Vigorito	Wright	Young, Tex.
Waggonner	Wyatt	Zablocki
Walsh	Wydler	Zion
Wampler	Wylie	Zwach

NAYS—27

Archer	Edwards, Calif.	Mizell
Ashbrook	Flynt	Rarick
Bafalis	Gooding	Satterfield
Beard	Gross	Schneebell
Blackburn	Grover	Schroeder
Collins, Tex.	Ichord	Shuster
Conlan	Martin, N.C.	Steiger, Ariz.
Crane	Michel	Symms
Devine	Miller	Young, Fla.

NOT VOTING—67

Abdnor	Dingell	Rhodes
Anderson,	Dorn	Rooney, N.Y.
Calif.	Fraser	Rousselot
Ashley	Gude	Roybal
Badillo	Hanna	Runnels
Barrett	Hawkins	Ryan
Bell	Henderson	Sandman
Blester	Hinshaw	Stark
Bingham	Howard	Stubblefield
Brasco	Huber	Talcott
Brown, Calif.	Hutchinson	Thompson, N.J.
Burke, Calif.	Kyros	Van Deerlin
Burke, Fla.	Landgrebe	Vander Jagt
Burton	McCloskey	Waldie
Carey, N.Y.	McSpadden	Whalen
Clausen,	Macdonald	Widnall
Don H.	Mazzoli	Wiggins
Cochran	Meeds	Wilson, Bob
Culver	Metcalfe	Wilson,
Daniels,	Moakley	Charles H.,
Dominick V.	Mollohan	Calif.
Danielson	Parris	Wilson,
Dellums	Podell	Charles, Tex.
Dickinson	Price, Tex.	
Diggs	Reid	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. McSpadden.
 Mr. Dominick V. Daniels with Mr. Dorn.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Moakley.
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Brown of California.
 Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Dingell.
 Mr. Kyros with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Rousselot.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Waldie.
 Mr. Burton with Mr. Blester.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Huber.
 Mr. Ryan with Mr. Burke of Florida.
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Gude.
 Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
 Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Reid.
 Mr. Dellums with Mr. Podell.
 Mr. Culver with Mr. Cochran.
 Mr. Roybal with Mr. Landgrebe.
 Mr. Stark with Mr. Parris.
 Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Dickinson.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Hutchinson.
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Hinshaw.
 Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Ashley.
 Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Price of Texas.
 Mr. Fraser with Mr. McCloskey.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Sandman.
 Mr. Henderson with Mr. Talcott.
 Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. Vander Jagt.
 Mr. Meeds with Mr. Whalen.
 Mr. Danielson with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas.
 Mr. Badillo with Mr. Wiggins.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement. The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: on Page 2, line 8, insert: "Provided, That the Animal and

Plant Health Inspection Service is authorized to establish and operate an English language school at Tuxtla Gutierrez, Chiapas, Mexico, or to contract therefor without regard to the provisions of Revised Statutes, section 3648, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), for children of employees of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service engaged in the Mexican-American Screwworm Program."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: On page 3, line 7, strikeout "\$20,000,000" and insert "and to implement the provisions of section 5 of Public Law 93-251, \$26,161,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "and to implement the provisions of section 5 of Public Law 93-251, \$23,661,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: On page 5, line 17, insert: "Provided, That not less than ninety-two flying units shall be maintained during fiscal year 1974."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: On page 6, line 24, strike out "\$153,700,000" and insert: "\$113,000,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$95,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: On page 7, line 1, insert:

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy", \$24,800,000, to remain available for obligation until June 30, 1978.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: On page 7, line 20, strike out "\$294,000,000" and insert "\$244,400,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$107,700,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: On page 7, line 22, insert:

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Missile Procurement, Air Force", \$27,000,000, to remain available for obligation until June 30, 1976.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$11,400,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: On page 8, line 3, strike out "\$97,400,000" and insert "\$86,200,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$82,400,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: On page 10, line 15 insert:

DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE

Public Law 93-240 is amended as follows, at title IV, section entitled Disaster Relief Assistance, by striking "Sahel region" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "drought-stricken nations" and by striking the colon and inserting the words "to remain available until expended."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: On page 11, line 1, insert:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount to enable the Secretary of State to increase the contribution of the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross, \$250,000: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available only upon enactment into law of authorizing legislation.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement. The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: On page 11, line 13, insert "to remain available until expended."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29: on page 12, line 1, insert:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEDERAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION
DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount to carry out the functions of the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-606, as amended, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1973), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 2 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

FEDERAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION
DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount to carry out the functions of the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-606, as amended, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1973), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, \$32,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement. The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: On page 14, after line 6, insert: "of which \$6,213,000 for insect and disease control shall remain available until expended."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 33: On page 14, line 19, insert:

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

INDIAN EDUCATION

Notwithstanding any regulation of the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, amounts for part A and part C appropriated under this head in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1974, shall remain available for allocation as provided by law in response to applications received on or before May 30, 1974.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

INDIAN EDUCATION

Notwithstanding any regulation of the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, amounts for part A appropriated under this head in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1974, shall remain available for allocation as provided by law to local educational agencies in Alaska in response to applications received on or before May 30, 1974.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 17, line 6, insert: "changes in a State law".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 17, line 8, insert: "or increased salary costs resulting from State salary compensation plans embracing employees of the State generally over those upon which the State's basic grant was based."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 18, line 12, insert: "Provided further, That funds previously appropriated for training programs as authorized by the Emergency Medical Services Systems Act of 1973 shall remain available until September 30, 1974."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 19, line 10, insert:

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Elementary and secondary education", \$40,000,000, to be derived only by transfer from funds appropriated by Public Law 93-192 which were authorized by the enacting clause of said Act to be withheld from obligation and expenditure, of which \$20,000,000 shall be for grants pursuant to Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to remain available until December 31, 1974, and \$20,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 222 (a) (2) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Elementary and secondary education", \$20,000,000, of which \$8,000,000 shall be for grants pursuant to title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to remain available until December 31, 1974, and \$12,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 222(a) (2) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 49: Page 19, line 20, insert:

HIGHER EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Higher education", for carrying out section 705 of the Higher Education Act, \$400,000, to remain available through June 30, 1975, and to be derived only by transfer from funds appropriated by Public Law 93-192 which were authorized by the enacting clause of said Act to be withheld from obligation and expenditure.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of

the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

HIGHER EDUCATION

For carrying out section 705(a)(2)(c) of the Higher Education Act without regard to other provisions of said Act, \$250,000, to remain available through June 30, 1975.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 20, line 16, insert: "Provided, That \$2,000,000 of the \$269,400,000 is appropriated by Public Law 93-25 for title IV, part E of the Higher Education Act of 1965, shall be available until June 30, 1974, for carrying out section 207 of the National Defense Education Act".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 20, line 20, insert: "Provided further, That any amounts appropriated for basic opportunity grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, in excess of the amounts required to meet the payment schedule announced for the academic year 1973-1974, shall remain available for payments under the payment schedule announced for the academic year 1974-1975".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 55: Page 21, line 1, insert: "Provided further, That funds appropriated by Public Law 93-192 for grants to States for State student incentives shall remain available until June 30, 1975, as authorized by section 415 A(b)(3) of the Higher Education Act."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 60: Page 21, line 18, insert: "of which \$2,000,000 to remain available until expended shall be for facilities construction as authorized by section 301."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede

from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$1,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 66: Page 23, line 1, insert: "to remain available until December 31, 1974."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 69, page 23, line 15, insert:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Economic Opportunity Program", \$19,500,000, of which \$12,500,000 shall be for the Emergency Food and Medical Services program as authorized by section 222(a)(5) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and \$7,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1974, shall be available for the Legal Services program as authorized by section 222(a)(3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Economic Opportunity Program", \$12,500,000 for the Emergency Food and Medical Services program as authorized by section 222(a)(5) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, before the Clerk reports the next amendment in disagreement, inasmuch as amendments Nos. 70 through 78 relate solely to housekeeping operations of the other body in which, by practice, the House concurs without intervention, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 70 through 78, inclusive, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and considered en bloc.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. Speaker, we are drawing close to the end of consideration of the second supplemental appropriation or, better stated, deficiency appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1974. I am hopeful we will have no further deficiency appropriation bills for fiscal year 1974, or will we, I would ask the distinguished chairman,

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON?)

Mr. MAHON. I hope not.

Mr. GROSS. So we go through this process year after year, although it was never designed that the Congress would fall into this procedure of having two and sometimes three deficiency appropriation bills in a fiscal year.

What we are seeing here now makes some of the committees of the Congress look pretty good. In other words, instead of stating in the regular appropriation bills the money that in many cases those who were in charge of the appropriation knew would be required, the amount is held down and the House is sold on the siren song that it has held down spending. Then come these deficiency appropriation bills, and the original claims to economy and fiscal sanity go up in smoke.

It was never contemplated that it would ever develop into this kind of a situation whereby Congress would completely ignore the Antideficiency Act which provides in a broad way that there would be deficiency appropriations only for protection of life, limb, or property.

I am not surprised that the people of this country, slowly catching up with the manipulations of Congress, including deficiency appropriation bills, rates Congress at 21 percent in the scale of respected institutions.

I had hoped to live to see the day when we would have a deficiency appropriation bill in Congress only as the result of a disaster, or an overwhelming emergency crisis. But here we are. This, I hope, will be the last deficiency appropriation bill that I will see as a Member of Congress, and I hope that the Congresses of the future—at least, the House of Representatives—will do everything within its power to put a stop to the deficiency appropriation business.

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

Mr. GROSS. Of course I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I share the gentleman's lack of zest for deficiency and supplemental appropriations, but it may be said that much of the money in this bill, almost \$4 billion, is for increased Pay Act costs resulting from actions of Congress and, to some extent, the actions of courts. This is more or less uncontrollable. It has been the practice for years not to provide funds for the pay increases until late in the fiscal year because it is always hoped that the departments can absorb some of these increased costs.

Also, I think it should be pointed out that in the manpower field, where some \$2.2 billion is involved, we did not have an authorization when the regular bill was ready last year. The Committee on Appropriations was powerless so the manpower items were deferred. There was no secret about it. After the authorizing legislation was available, we put the money in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. With every respect for my friend, the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Com-

mittee on Appropriations, I am sure that excuses for deficiency appropriation bills can be conjured up in season and out, month by month, year after year, but that still does not change the fact that we ought not to be indulging ourselves and the people in luxury of deficiency appropriations two or three times per year.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his warning and for his concern. I share the view that I hope the time will come when we will have no deficiency or supplemental appropriations. I wish we could get away from this practice, but it is impossible to do it under the circumstances.

When the Congress passes an authorization bill for some worthy project such as emergency health care, or some such things, they want an appropriation the next day instead of the next Congress. So we are confronted with a very difficult situation.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I must say to my friend, the gentleman from Texas, that the Committee on Appropriations does not always wait for authorization bills. It has been appropriating increasingly in recent years without any authorization whatsoever, although the committee knows that that is not proper legislative procedure according to the rules of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is a watchdog and one of the most able Members I have observed in my 40 years in Congress. He has done a good job watching the situation. A point of order always would lie when appropriations are offered that are not backed up by authorizations.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, except in the event—and the Committee on Appropriations has resorted to this practice quite frequently in recent years—of going through the Committee on Rules and obtaining rules waiving points of order.

Mr. MAHON. That is right, doing it not for any other purpose but to enable our system to operate, because we have to wait and wait and wait. For example, on the authorization bill for the defense items in the bill before us for this fiscal year which ends June 30, the request was sent up by the President the first of February. Finally the authorization was approved—today, the fourth day of June. We just did the best we could with a difficult situation.

I would say further to my good friend that, generally speaking, the Committee on Appropriations waits until an authorization bill has passed the House before we seek a rule waiving points of order against the lack of authorization.

Our system will collapse unless we can find a way to pass the necessary legislation, and sometimes the authorizations just do not come in a timely fashion. We

want to do everything we reasonably can to make our system work.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to prolong this. Simply let me say to the gentleman that there is enough blame to go around to a lot of places with respect to the procedure the House indulges itself and which all too often makes a mockery of orderly legislative procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report Senate amendments Nos. 70 through 78 in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments Nos. 70 through 78, beginning on page 24, line 3, insert:

(70) SENATE

(71) SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

(72) OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For an additional amount for "Office of the Secretary", \$13,965: *Provided*, That effective May 1, 1974, the Secretary may appoint and fix the compensation of an auditor, Public Records Office, at not to exceed \$14,535 per annum; a secretary, Public Records Office, at not to exceed \$11,970 per annum; a clerk, Public Records Office, at not to exceed \$10,830 per annum; five technical assistants, Public Records Office, at not to exceed \$11,685 per annum each in lieu of three technical assistants, Public Records Office, at not to exceed such rate; a messenger, stationery room, at not to exceed \$10,545 per annum; four messengers, stationery room, at not to exceed \$9,690 per annum each in lieu of three messengers, stationery room, at not to exceed such rate; and the Secretary may fix the per annum compensation of the Assistant Keeper of Stationery at not to exceed \$21,660 in lieu of \$19,665, and the per annum compensation of the chief clerk, stationery room, at not to exceed \$15,390 in lieu of \$14,535.

(73) OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

For an additional amount for "Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper", \$5,890: *Provided*, That effective May 1, 1974, the Sergeant at Arms may appoint and fix the compensation of a composer at not to exceed \$13,110 per annum and two composer technicians at not to exceed \$11,115 per annum each.

(74) CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

(75) INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

For an additional amount for "Inquiries and Investigations", \$2,000,000.

(76) MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

For an additional amount of "Miscellaneous Items", \$1,205,000.

Senate amendments Nos. 77 and 78, beginning on page 26, line 10, insert:

(77) SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For an additional amount for "Senate Office Buildings", \$200,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any buildings in Square 724 in the District of Columbia, acquired under authority of Public Law 92-607, occupied by the Senate, shall be subject to the provisions of the Act of June 8, 1942 (40 U.S.C. 174 (c) and (d)) and the Act of July 31, 1946, as amended (40 U.S.C. 193a-193m, 212a, and 212b).

(78) ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY AS A SITE FOR PARKING FACILITIES FOR THE UNITED STATES SENATE

The fifth proviso under this head in the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1973 (86 Stat. 1511), is amended by inserting after the

words "purposes or" and before the words "to lease" a comma and the following language: "without regard to section 3617 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 484) and section 3709, of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5 and 6a-1)."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 70 through 78 inclusive, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 80: On page 28, line 12, insert:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Funds available to the Library of Congress may be expended to provide additional parking facilities for Library of Congress employees in an area or areas in the District of Columbia outside the limits of the Library of Congress grounds, and to provide for transportation of such employees to and from such area or areas of the Library of Congress grounds without regard to the limitations imposed by 31 U.S.C. 638a(c)(2).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 87: On page 30, line 21, insert:

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For an additional amount for "Contributions to international organizations", \$2,287,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "\$1,200,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 91: On page 32, above line 1, insert: "Provided, That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment

of the Senate numbered 31 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 92: On page 33, line 3, insert:

THE JUDICIARY

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

REPRESENTATION BY COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL AND OPERATION OF DEFENDER ORGANIZATIONS

For an additional amount for "Representation by Court-Appointed Counsel and Operations of Defender Organizations", to be available for the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed by judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals or by judges of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, \$2,000,000, of which not to exceed \$800,000 shall be available for the liquidation of obligations incurred in the prior year.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 106: On page 39, line 6, insert: "Provided, That funds appropriated to the United States Secret Service shall be available to provide protection to the immediate family of the Vice President of the United States."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 112: On page 41, line 2, insert:

SENATE

"Salaries, officers and employees", \$1,000,000;

"Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate", \$21,365;

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

"Senate policy committees", \$45,330;

"Inquiries and investigations", \$1,067,975;

"Folding documents", \$6,635;

"Miscellaneous items", \$1,545;

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 123: On page 49, line 12, insert: ", to remain available until expended;".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 124: On page 49, line 20, insert: ", to remain available until expended;".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 125: On page 50, to line 4, insert: ", to remain available until expended;".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 126: On page 50, line 10, insert: "(126), "to remain available until expended;".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 127: Page 50, line 12, insert: "(127), "to remain available until expended;".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 163: On page 70, line 13, insert:

TITLE III—FISCAL YEAR 1973 RETROACTIVE PAY COSTS

SEC. 301. For costs in the fiscal year 1973 arising out of pay increases granted by or pursuant to the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970 and the Act of December 16, 1967 (81 Stat. 649), for any branch of the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia, to be available immediately, such amounts as may be neces-

sary, to be determined as hereinafter provided in this title, but no appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization may be increased pursuant to the provisions of this title in an amount in excess of the cost of such appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization related to increased compensation pursuant to such statutes.

SEC. 302. Whenever any officer referred to in section 303 of this title shall determine that he has exhausted the possibilities of meeting the cost of pay increases, first, through the use of the unobligated balances of the fiscal year 1973 appropriations, funds, limitations, or authorizations properly chargeable with the costs in fiscal year 1973, which are hereby restored and made available for this purpose, and secondly, through the use of the corresponding appropriations, funds, limitations, or authorizations for the fiscal year 1974, he shall certify the additional amount required to meet such costs for each appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization under his administrative control, and the amounts so certified shall be added to the pertinent appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization for the fiscal year 1974: *Provided*, That any certification made under the authority of this section by an officer in or under the executive branch of the Federal Government shall be valid only when approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 303. For the purposes of the certifications authorized by section 302 of this title, the following officers shall be deemed to have administrative control of appropriations, funds, limitations, or authorizations available within their respective organization units—

(a) The legislative branch:

The Clerk of the House;

The Secretary of the Senate;

The Librarian of Congress;

The Architect of the Capitol;

The Public Printer;

The Comptroller General of the United States;

The Chief Judge of the United States Tax Court;

The chairman of any commission in or under the legislative branch.

(b) For the Judiciary:

The Administrative Officer of the United States Courts;

The Marshal of the Supreme Court.

(c) For the executive branch:

The head of each department, agency, or corporation in or under the executive branch.

(d) For the municipal government of the District of Columbia:

The Commissioner of the District of Columbia;

SEC. 304. Obligations or expenditures incurred for pay increases and related costs pursuant to this title, shall not be regarded or reported as violations of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

SEC. 305. (a) Amounts made available by this title shall be derived from the same source as the appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization to which such amounts are added.

(b) Appropriations made pursuant to this title shall be recorded on the books of the Government as of June 30, 1974: *Provided*, That no appropriation made by this title shall be warranted after August 15, 1974.

(c) A complete report of the appropriations made by or pursuant to this title shall be made not later than September 15, 1974, by the officers described in section 303 to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, who shall compile and transmit to the Congress a consolidated report not later than October 15, 1974.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

TITLE III—FISCAL YEAR 1973 RETROACTIVE PAY COSTS

Sec. 301. For costs arising from the fiscal year 1973 pay increases granted by or pursuant to the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970 and the Act of December 16, 1967 (81 Stat. 649), for any branch of the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia, to be available immediately, such amounts as may be necessary, to be determined as hereinafter provided in this title, but no appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization may be increased pursuant to the provisions of this title in an amount in excess of the cost to such appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization related to increased compensation pursuant to such statutes.

Sec. 302. Whenever any officer referred to in section 303 of this title shall determine that he has exhausted the possibilities of meeting the cost of pay increases, first, through the use of the unobligated balances of the fiscal year 1973 appropriations, funds, limitations, or authorizations properly chargeable with the costs in fiscal year 1973, which are hereby restored and made available for this purpose, and, secondly, through the use of the corresponding appropriations, funds, limitations, or authorizations for the fiscal year 1974, he shall certify the additional amount required to meet such costs for each appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization under his administrative control, and with respect to retired pay he shall certify the additional amount required for the fiscal year 1974 costs resulting from such pay increases in fiscal year 1973, and the amounts so certified shall be added to the pertinent appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization for the fiscal year 1974: *Provided*, That any certification made under the authority of this section by an officer in or under the executive branch of the Federal Government shall be valid only when approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Sec. 303. For the purposes of the certifications authorized by section 302 of this title, the following officers shall be deemed to have administrative control of appropriations, funds, limitations, or authorizations available within their respective organization units—

- (a) The legislative branch:
 - The Clerk of the House;
 - The Secretary of the Senate;
 - The Librarian of Congress;
 - The Architect of the Capitol;
 - The Public Printer;
 - The Comptroller General of the United States;
 - The Chief Judge of the United States Tax Court;
 - The chairman of any commission in or under the legislative branch.
- (b) For the Judiciary:
 - The Administrative Officer of the United States Courts;
 - The Marshal of the Supreme Court.
- (c) For the executive branch:
 - The head of each department, agency, or corporation in or under the executive branch.
- (d) For the municipal government of the District of Columbia:
 - The Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 304. Obligations or expenditures incurred for pay increases and related costs pursuant to this title, shall not be regarded or reported as violations of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

Sec. 305. (a) Amounts made available by this title shall be derived from the same source as the appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization to which such amounts are added.

(b) Appropriations made pursuant to this title shall be recorded on the books of the Government as of June 30, 1974: *Provided*, That no appropriation made by this title shall be warranted after August 15, 1974.

(c) A complete report of the appropriations made by or pursuant to this title shall be made not later than September 15, 1974, by the officers described in section 303 to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, who shall compile and transmit to the Congress a consolidated report not later than October 15, 1974.

Sec. 306. With respect to the application of Executive Order Numbered 11691 of December 15, 1972, as amended by Executive Order Numbered 11777 of April 12, 1974, relating to the change from January 1, 1973, to October 1, 1972, as the effective date for certain adjustments of rates of pay of certain statutory pay systems, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the administration of and in accordance with section 5 of the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1952-53; Public Law 91-656), with respect to each employee or former employee who was on the employment rolls of the House for any period occurring on or after October 1, 1972, and ending at the close of December 31, 1972, whose pay was disbursed in such period by the Clerk of the House, may make adjustments in the rate of pay of such employee or former employee for such period who was then on the employment rolls of the House, if, in the determination of the Clerk, the pay fixing authority governing the adjustment of pay under such Executive Order Numbered 11691, as in effect on January 1, 1973, has changed.

Mr. MAHON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read, and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the last amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 169: Page 74, line 14, strike out "305." and insert "405."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

Sec. 405. None of the funds herein appropriated may be obligated or expended to finance directly or indirectly combat activities by United States military forces in or over or from off the shores of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia.

Sec. 406. Appropriations and authority provided in this Act shall be available from June 1, 1974, and all obligations incurred in anticipation of the appropriations and authority provided in this Act are hereby ratified and confirmed if otherwise in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

SALT II AGREEMENT

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, it was just over 2 years ago that President Nixon sat down in Moscow beside Leonid Brezhnev for the signing of the interim agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union for the limitation of strategic offensive weapons, better known as the SALT agreement. It was, indeed, a commendable occasion on the part of President Nixon because it was the first time that any U.S. President had ever been able to negotiate anything of any consequence with the Russians.

On June 12, 1972, the President referred the agreement to the Congress for its consideration, and after extensive debate in both House and Senate a joint resolution was signed into law on September 30, 1972. Three days later President Nixon and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko finalized approval of the agreement in a ceremony at the White House.

That event led to the so-called détente, during which the world's two strongest nations have come closer than ever before to resolving some of the differences which separate them. But the military confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union persists, and it appears, in retrospect, that some of the provisions of that agreement were not in the best interests of the United States.

The administration is now in the process of trying to negotiate another SALT agreement: One which would serve to broaden the provisions of SALT I, and the President is scheduled to travel to Moscow again later this month. One item on the agenda will be the signing of SALT II, if such a compromise is achieved by the negotiators prior to that time. I, for one, commend the President for his effort to establish common ground for negotiation between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

But in the last few weeks a handful of Senators and Congressmen from both sides of the aisle have tried their best to cloud the President's effort. They have used the shallow argument that the President's position has been weakened by the Watergate affair. They believe that he may enter into an agreement not in the best interests of the United States. They think that he should call off the trip. In short, they have said that the President should not conduct foreign policy and, in so doing, they have conducted foreign policy themselves. The one sure way to avoid any progress is to take their advice and to cancel the trip.

The Constitution gives the President the sole right to enter into treaties with foreign nations and it gives the Congress the responsibility to ratify them or to reject them if it finds cause. So, let it be.

A President knows that a treaty will be thoroughly scrutinized by the Congress prior to ratification. This alone provides incentive for a President, especially one whose party is in the minority in Congress, to present only a treaty or agreement which encompasses and protects the security interests of the United States or none at all.

So leave him alone. Get off his back. Members of the legislative branch have no right to interfere in the operation of the executive branch. Give the President the due process which he so rightly deserves. Every Member of this Congress should be hoping that the President will return from Moscow with an agreement. I know that every responsible Member is hoping exactly that. After all, it just may be a good agreement. And, if it is not, the Congress still has the last word.

KISSINGER'S ACHIEVEMENTS

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I join those in our country in congratulating the Secretary of State, Mr. Kissinger, on achieving peace in the Middle East; however, I do continue to raise questions about the nature of the détente that he has achieved with the Soviet Union.

Accordingly, I am inserting in the RECORD today articles from the Washington Post and the New York Times which point out that the Soviets are deploying a new series of missiles, while at the same time they have stepped up the harassment of people seeking to enter the U.S. Embassy in Moscow.

The question remains in my mind, when does the United States start getting some advantage out of détente? We might further ask when does the good will being generated within the Soviet Union toward the United States begin influencing Soviet actions rather than words?

The two articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, June 3, 1974]

SOVIET DEPLOYMENT OF A-MISSILES SEEN

(By Michael Getler)

It now seems clear, in the view of senior U.S. officials, that the Soviet Union is intent on deploying "significant numbers" of three new long-range, nuclear-tipped missiles now being flight-tested.

It is this assessment that is largely responsible for widespread pessimism within several government agencies about the prospects for putting any major restraints on the continuing nuclear arms race this year.

There is still a possibility, informed sources report, that a new interim agreement that would limit, for the first time, deployment of MIRV-type multiple-warhead missiles can be arranged in principle at the Moscow summit meeting which begins June 27. The maze of technical details would be worked out in the following months.

It is also understood that the Soviet Union has "agreed in principle" to some possible

disparity in the number of these missiles allowed each side.

But the critical question of how big a disparity is acceptable has not been negotiated.

U.S. officials acknowledge that even if such an accord can be reached, the level of permissible MIRV-missile deployment will appear so high that it is virtually certain to trigger criticism that the agreement failed to slow the momentum of the Soviet buildup and this is both dangerous and "cosmetic."

A MIRV agreement would be linked to another agreement to extend for two or three more years the overall interim accord on offensive nuclear weapons that was signed in Moscow in May, 1972, and was to have expired five years later in 1977.

This, too, is the subject of controversy within the government.

Some officials believe that extending the interim agreement until 1979 or 1980 would reinforce a Soviet view that the numerical advantages it was granted on a temporary basis in May, 1972, in the total number of land and submarine-based missiles allowed, should form the basis for a permanent limitation on missile numbers still to be negotiated.

Administration officials concede that at best, the type of new limitations being discussed would be "marginal" in terms of real restraints on the arms race, and then only in the very long term.

But if some Soviet concessions are granted, they feel that a new agreement even at high levels may be defensible, and if so, then it is better than no agreement.

The MIRV agreement would probably run for as long as the extended interim agreement, or possibly longer. But it would be subject to review and thus not permanent.

If there is no dual arrangement on MIRV and extending the interim accord, then indications are that Soviet party chief Leonid I. Brezhnev and President Nixon will issue new expressions of intent to have both strategic arms negotiating teams press ahead to reach a permanent agreement on offensive weaponry by the original 1977 expiration date of the initial accord.

Thus, it appears that no matter what happens at the summit, none of the many new nuclear weapons projects now under development by both countries will be affected. Nor will the deployment of any of these new weapons be affected, at least for several years, if then.

The odds on reaching a MIRV agreement in June are currently rated as less than 50-50.

In part this is because of the technical complexity of the issue, the short period of time left before the summit, and the absence of Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger for the past month.

In addition, there is a school of thought, said to exist among some members of the U.S. delegation to the SALT negotiations, that the Soviets generally interpret the flow of events and attitudes including the balance of military power, as going their way and thus see no need to bend much at the arms talks.

Others contend that Brezhnev, like Nixon, is committed to détente and the continuance of SALT. The extension of the interim agreement allows him to retain the numerical advantages for a longer period, perhaps giving him time to ease pressure from the Soviet rocket force commanders who wield considerable clout in the Soviet bureaucracy.

Still others argue that while Brezhnev may be committed to détente, he has thus far been able to keep all his options open by pursuing the arms race as well, and until the United States really pressures him, he will not slow down the parallel effort.

Kissinger's return Thursday from the Middle East and his apparent ability to wangle agreements could change things. "Intellectually, I'd say there is not enough time," one senior official said. "But Kissinger might pull it off."

Under the May, 1972, interim agreement, the United States basically was allowed the 1,054 land-based ICBMs it now has plus the 41 Polaris and Poseidon submarines that each carry 16 missiles.

The Soviets were allowed the 1,618 land-based ICBMs they had deployed or under construction, plus up to 62 missile subs if they retired roughly 210 of their oldest ICBMs.

The May, 1972, SALT agreement also included a permanent treaty limiting rival antiballistic missile (ABM) systems, which are defensive weapons.

However, the United States, in a unilateral declaration, stressed that unless permanent accords are also reached on offensive weapons, it might withdraw from the ABM treaty if it felt its supreme interests were threatened.

Thus, failure to eventually reach some permanent agreements on offensive weapons could in effect reopen the arms race full-scale, including defensive missile systems.

(The Washington Post reported on Saturday that an American mission of experts has been sent, unannounced, to the Soviet Union to prepare for a potential limited ban on underground nuclear test firings that could be signed at the Moscow summit conference.)

(U.S. officials said that the delegation, now in Moscow, would participate in "exploratory technical talks" on what is known as a partial, or "threshold" underground test ban. If no new SALT agreement is reached in time for the Moscow summit meeting, or if there is only a generalized accord in principle on SALT II, the "threshold" test ban could serve as the central nuclear weapons accomplishment at the summit, even though its effect on the nuclear arms race would be limited.)

The numerical edge granted the Soviets under the 1972 agreements, was viewed as a temporary offset to the greater accuracy of American missiles, the overseas bases for U.S. submarines, and the fact that the U.S. was far ahead in the MIRV technology of putting several warheads on a single missile and guiding each to a separate target.

MIRV stands for multiple independently targetable reentry vehicle, and its development and deployment remain at the heart of the arms race.

The United States already has 410 MIRVed Minuteman and 352 Poseidon missiles deployed out of a planned force of 1,046 MIRVed missiles.

The Russian missiles are all of the single-warhead variety.

But the Soviets are now testing four new replacement missiles with MIRV, and three of them are bigger than existing U.S. missiles—though not yet as accurate. Thus, conceivably the U.S.S.R. could outpace the U.S. arsenal in years to come and possibly threaten to knock out all or most of the U.S. Minuteman missiles in a surprise attack.

Whether the Soviets can achieve the required accuracy and reliability to actually pose such a threat is debatable. But the administration is concerned should it even be "perceived" that Soviet nuclear forces are more powerful than those of the United States.

Because of the indications that the Russians won't settle for less than a roughly equal deployment of MIRV launchers, sources say the levels of an agreement could run close to 1,000 missiles each.

Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger has argued that because the new Soviet replacement missiles are so much bigger than U.S. versions, a deal ought to be based heavily on "throw-weight"—which reflects the amount of warheads and explosive power a missile can hurl at an opponent—rather than just on numbers of missiles.

The Soviets have balked at this. But the apparent willingness of the Russians to accept fewer number of MIRVed missiles than the United States might be a partial acknowledgment of this argument.

Among other concessions the United States reportedly is seeking is an increase in the number of allowable U.S. missile-firing submarines, and Soviet agreement to limit deployment of their largest new missile, the SS-18.

If the United States can achieve these types of agreements, and keep the overall level of Soviet MIRV deployment below that which the United States estimates the Soviet Union could deploy over the next five or six years, then some officials at least think such a pact would be justifiable.

Others contend that the overall levels being discussed probably amount to what the Soviets planned to deploy anyway.

A MIRV agreement at the 1,000-missile level could cause some U.S. reductions as well, especially since the Navy's new Trident MIRV-firing submarine would join the fleet before the end of an extended agreement. This would force retirement of other MIRV missiles rather than the non-MIRVed Polaris subs as previously planned.

The SS-18 is the potential replacement for the large Soviet SS-9 missile. It could carry as many as five relatively large MIRVed warheads, according to U.S. estimates, and thus has long been the weapon of principal concern if deployed in large numbers. There are currently 288 SS-9s and 25 new silos for the SS-18.

The missile has been tested roughly 12 to 15 times, sources say, but only about six of these reportedly have been with MIRVs. The others carried single warheads. This has led to some speculation that the Soviet Union may be willing to limit deployment of the SS-18 to a single-warhead version.

Weapons specialists estimate that it takes about 20 MIRV flight tests to produce high confidence that the system works. Therefore, an agreement to restrain a MIRVed SS-18 deployment could probably be monitored by U.S. test-watchers.

There is also a probability the United States would press to limit the SS-18 deployment to the 25 new silos as replacement for a relative number of older SS-9s.

Restrictions on the S-18 would ease somewhat the threat to Minuteman. But another Soviet missile, the SS-19, though smaller, also has impressed U.S. specialists.

The SS-19 can carry up to six smaller but still powerful MIRVs. But this missile does not yet appear accurate enough to knock out silos. The SS-19, and a similar missile known as the SS-17, have both been flight-tested almost 20 times now. Experts here believe both will be ready for deployment by the end of the year.

The SS-18 is expected to take a little longer.

While the Soviet missile-firing submarine fleet is expanding, sources say the Russians are still far behind the United States in developing and deploying sub-launched MIRV missiles.

This explains, they believe, why the Soviets have declined to accept U.S. proposals to put limits on the number of land-based versus sea-based MIRVs.

The Soviets, it is explained, really have no choice at this point but to deploy their MIRVs on land-based ICBMs. Thus, they reject efforts to split the total.

There is concern that the Soviets will use the interim period to solve their submarine missile problems so as to be in a position to push heavily in that area if no permanent agreement is arrived at when the interim accord expires.

A new MIRV agreement could also raise problems of verification for the United States.

Most officials believe the large SS-18 deployments could be monitored by U.S. satellites.

Similarly, the new SS-19—which is expected to account for the widest deployment—uses normal launch methods. This missile's difference from the SS-11 that it

will replace is considered by most specialists to be sufficient to permit satellites to account for necessary silo modifications.

The SS-17, which is also viewed as a replacement for a smaller part of the 1000-missile SS-11 force, could cause some problems since that missile uses the so-called "cold launch" or "pop-up" technique which enables it to fit more conveniently into the older silos.

This technique pops the missile out of the silo before its rocket engines ignite, saving room in the silo that normally is needed for exhaust gasses to escape.

[From the New York Times, June 1, 1974]

HARASSMENT REPORTED AT U.S. EMBASSY
IN MOSCOW

(By Hedrick Smith)

Moscow, May 31.—Soviet policemen have reportedly tightened controls and stepped up harassment around the American Embassy, intercepting and sometimes holding and interrogating Soviet citizens, Americans and even diplomats trying to enter the embassy.

"There are virtually daily incidents, daily drag-aways," complained one American Embassy official. "This crude treatment is hardly in keeping with the spirit of détente. We consider these denials of access as violations of the Soviet-American consular convention."

Today, gray-uniformed militia guards stopped Arnold Ozolins, an American seaman who came here in 1960 and was forced to take out a Soviet passport as a condition of visiting his elderly mother in Riga.

Mr. Ozolins's wife and family live in Maspeth, Queens and he has been trying in vain to get back to them in America for years. He was stopped and interrogated for about 15 minutes today about entering the embassy, although consular officials consider him an American citizen entitled to free access.

"HELP ME! HELP ME!"

Yesterday, Soviet guards physically blocked Alexander Brenner, scientific counselor of the West German Embassy, when he was going to obtain an American visa. Guards held him while questioning him about whom he was going to see and why. They would not release him until he produced documents showing that he was a diplomat. On Memorial Day, a Rumanian diplomat was turned away by Soviet guards.

Two weeks ago, embassy officers had to go to the rescue of Dean C. Hoxsey, an American Communist, who was being dragged away by four militia men, as he was shouting, "help me! help me! I am an American." After living here since 1957, Mr. Hoxsey said he wanted to return to the United States.

Scores of other cases have not come to light, but Soviet citizens have told American journalists and embassy officials that they have been blocked and forcibly taken away for long interrogations at booths and in cellars of houses within a block of the embassy, some right around the corner.

In many of these cases, Soviet citizens and embassy officials say, the people involved had written invitations from the American consulate inviting them to come to the embassy on consular matters, such as getting in touch with relatives in America, seeking lost relatives, applying for visas or inquiring about possible American citizenship.

In the Soviet Union, such invitations are necessary for access to almost any apartment building where foreigners live or to almost any embassy compound. Without them, Soviet citizens are routinely turned back by guards. Even with them, Soviet citizens report, they are turned back.

"The guards told me I must be crazy trying to go into the American Embassy," one young Russian remarked. "They accused me of picking up my invitation card off the street. They took it away from me and

warned me never to try to go back to the embassy again. They told me that if I tried to contact the embassy again, they would take away my permission to live in Moscow and move me out to Siberia or somewhere."

On some occasions, American diplomats have gone to the Soviet interrogation booths near the embassy to try to gain release of Soviet citizens seized at the embassy entrance. The Soviet militia respond by refusing to permit them entry to the interrogation rooms or any contact with the Soviet citizens, and routinely deny seizure of anyone with embassy business.

"But in some cases we have known in advance who was coming and exactly what time," said one American officer, "and later, we have gotten confirmation that they were intercepted, taken away and interrogated."

The confirmation has come from Soviet citizens who have denied Soviet warnings and who have, after braving the pressures and harassment, managed to gain access to the consulate.

Repeated protests and complaints to the Soviet Foreign Ministry by the embassy, on the basis of the Soviet-American consular convention signed 10 years ago, have been to no avail. The Soviet Foreign Ministry has steadfastly said there is no interference with access to the embassy for those with legitimate business there.

The problem has evidently been aggravated by détente, diplomats believe, because Soviet citizens sometimes assume that with better political and diplomatic relations they can approach the American Embassy more freely.

The Soviet authorities have evidently felt unrestrained in handling the issue with tight, round-the-clock police surveillance and checks at the embassy because neither the White House, Secretary of State Kissinger nor Congress has shown much interest on this issue.

THE MENACE OF INFLATION

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, speaking at the commencement exercises at Illinois College at Jacksonville, Ill., commented among other things on the subject of inflation the following statement:

The gravity of our current inflationary problem can hardly be over-estimated. Except for a brief period at the end of World War II, prices in the United States have of late been rising faster than in any other peacetime period of our history. If past experience is any guide, the future of our country is in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, that is no propagandist on the stump. That is one of the most responsible leaders of the economy of the United States.

What concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is whether we are taking adequate measures to meet the menace of inflation, which Dr. Burns says put in jeopardy the very future of our country. I think that subject imperatively commands the attention of our Congress. I hope we shall rise to the challenge of this menace and be able to tell our constituents back home, who are so gravely concerned about this prospect, that we are trying to do something effectively to curb it.

Mr. Speaker, I include the complete address of Dr. Burns following my remarks here in the body of the Record:

THE MENACE OF INFLATION

(By Arthur F. Burns)

It is a pleasure to be with you today here in the heartland of America. As graduates of this College, you are launching your careers at a challenging but troubled time. Confidence in established institutions, particularly in our government, is at a low ebb. And hopes for the future of our economy have been shaken by the debilitating effects of inflation on the nation's businesses, workers, and consumers.

Inflation is not a new problem for the United States, nor is it confined to our country. Inflationary forces are now rampant in every major industrial nation of the world. Inflation is raging also in the less developed countries, and apparently in socialist countries as well as in those that practice free enterprise.

The gravity of our current inflationary problem can hardly be overestimated. Except for a brief period at the end of World War II, prices in the United States have of late been rising faster than in any other peacetime period of our history. If past experience is any guide, the future of our country is in jeopardy. No country that I know of has been able to maintain widespread economic prosperity once inflation got out of hand. And the unhappy consequences are by no means solely of an economic character. If long continued, inflation at anything like the present rate would threaten the very foundations of our society.

I want to discuss briefly with you today the sources of our inflationary problem, the havoc being wrought in the economy, and the steps that must be taken to regain general price stability and thus strengthen confidence in our nation's future.

A large part of the recent upsurge in prices has been due to special factors. In most years, economic trends of individual nations tend to diverge. But during 1973 a business cycle boom occurred simultaneously in the United States and in every other major industrial country. With production rising rapidly across the world, prices of labor, materials, and finished products were bid up everywhere.

To make matters worse, disappointing crop harvests in a number of countries in 1972 forced a sharp run-up in the prices of food last year. The manipulation of petroleum supplies and prices by oil-exporting countries gave another dramatic push to the general price level last autumn and early this year. The influence of these factors is still being felt in consumer markets.

Recently, our price level has also reacted strongly to the removal of wage and price controls—a painful, but essential adjustment in the return to free markets.

These special factors, however, do not account for all of our inflation. For many years, our economy and that of other nations has had a serious underlying bias toward inflation which has simply been magnified by the special influences that I have mentioned.

Ironically, the roots of that bias lie chiefly in the rising aspirations of people everywhere. We are a nation in a hurry for more and more of what we consider the good things of life. I do not question that yearning. Properly directed, it can be a powerful force for human betterment. Difficulties arise, however, when people in general seek to reach their goals by means of short cuts; and that is what has happened.

Of late, individuals have come to depend less and less on their own initiative, and more on government, to achieve their economic objectives. The public nowadays expects the government to maintain prosperous economic conditions, to limit such declines in employment as may occasionally occur, to ease the burden of job loss or illness or retirement, to sustain the incomes of farmers, homebuilders, and so on. These

are laudable objectives, and we and other nations have moved a considerable distance toward their realization. Unfortunately, in the process of doing so, governmental budgets have gotten out of control, wages and prices have become less responsive to the discipline of market forces, and inflation has emerged as the most dangerous economic ailment of our time.

The awesome imbalance of the Federal budget is probably the contributory factor to inflation that you have heard the most about. In the past five years, total Federal expenditures have increased about 50 per cent. In that time span, the cumulative budget deficit of the Federal government, including government-sponsored enterprises, has totaled more than \$100 billion. In financing this deficit, and also in meeting huge demands for credit by businesses and consumers, tremendous pressures have been placed on our credit mechanisms and the supply of money has grown at a rate inconsistent with price stability.

I am sure that each of you in this graduating class is aware of some of the troublesome consequences of inflation. The prices of virtually everything you buy have been rising and are still going up. For the typical American worker, the increase in weekly earnings during the past year, while sizable in dollars, has been wiped out by inflation. In fact, the real weekly take-home pay of the average worker is now below what it was a year ago. Moreover, the real value of accumulated savings deposits has also declined, and the pressure of rising prices on family budgets has led to a worrisome increase in delinquency rates on home mortgages and consumer loans.

Many consumers have responded to these developments by postponing or cancelling plans for buying homes, autos, and other big-ticket items. Sales of new autos began to decline in the spring of 1973, and so too did sales of furniture and appliances, mobile homes, and newly built dwellings. The weakness in consumer markets, largely engendered by inflation, slowed our economic growth rate last year some months before the effects of the oil shortage began to be felt.

Actually, the sales of some of our nation's leading business firms have been on the wane for a year or more. Their costs, meanwhile, have continued to soar with increasing wage rates and sharply rising prices of materials.

The effect on business profits was ignored for a time because accountants typically reckon the value of inventories—and also the value of machinery and equipment used up in production—at original cost, rather than at current inflated prices. These accounting practices create an illusory element in profits—an element that is not available for distribution to stockholders in view of the need to replace inventories, plant, and equipment at appreciably higher prices. Worse still, the illusory part of profits is subject to the income tax, thus aggravating the deterioration in profits. This result is especially unfortunate because of the shortage of industrial capacity that now exists in key sectors of our economy—particularly in the basic materials area.

By early this year, a confrontation with economic reality could no longer be put off. Major business corporations found that the volume of investible funds generated internally was not increasing fast enough to finance the rising costs of new plant and equipment, or of the materials and supplies needed to rebuild inventories. Businesses began to scramble for borrowed funds at commercial banks and in the public markets for money and capital. Our financial markets have therefore come under severe strain. Interest rates have risen sharply; savings flows have been diverted from mortgage lending institutions; security dealers have experienced losses; prices of common stocks have declined; the liquidity of some enterprises

has been called into question; and tensions of a financial nature have spilled over into international markets.

Concerned as we all are about the economic consequences of inflation, there is even greater reason for concern about the impact on our social and political institutions. We must not risk the social stresses that persistent inflation breeds. Because of its capricious effects on the income and wealth of a nation's families and businesses, inflation inevitably causes disillusionment and discontent. It robs millions of citizens who in their desire to be self-reliant have set aside funds for the education of their children or their own retirement, and it hits many of the poor and elderly especially hard.

In recent weeks, governments have fallen in several major countries, in part because the citizens of those countries had lost confidence in the ability of their leaders to cope with the problem of inflation. Among our own people, the distortions and injustices wrought by inflation have contributed materially to distrust of government officials and of government policies, and even to some loss of confidence in our free enterprise system. Discontent bred by inflation can provoke profoundly disturbing social and political change, as the history of other nations teaches. I do not believe I exaggerate in saying that the ultimate consequence of inflation could well be a significant decline of economic and political freedom for the American people.

There are those who believe that the struggle to curb inflation will not succeed and who conclude that it would be better to adjust to inflation rather than to fight it. On this view, contractual payments of all sorts—wages, salaries, social security benefits, interest on bank loans and deposits, and so on—should be written with escalator clauses so as to minimize the distortions and injustices that inflation normally causes.

This is a well-meaning proposal, but it is neither sound nor practical. For one thing, there are hundreds of billions of dollars of outstanding contracts—on mortgages, public and private bonds, insurance policies, and the like—that as a practical matter could not be renegotiated. Even with regard to new undertakings, the obstacles to achieving satisfactory escalator arrangements in our free and complex economy, where people differ so much in financial sophistication, seem insuperable. More important still, by making it easier for many people to live with inflation, escalator arrangements would gravely weaken the discipline that is needed to conduct business and government affairs prudently and efficiently. Universal escalation, I am therefore convinced, is an illusory and dangerous quest. The responsible course is to fight inflation with all the energy we can muster and with all the weapons at our command.

One essential ingredient in this struggle is continued resistance to swift growth in money and credit. The Federal Reserve System, I assure you, is firmly committed to this task. We intend to encourage sufficient growth in supplies of money and credit to finance orderly economic expansion. But we are not going to be a willing party to the accommodation of rampant inflation.

As this year's experience has again indicated, a serious effort to moderate the growth of money and credit during a period of burgeoning credit demand results in higher interest rates—particularly on short-term loans. Troublesome though this rise in interest rates may be, it must for a time be tolerated. For, if monetary policy sought to prevent a rise in interest rates when credit demands were booming, money and credit would expand explosively, with devastating effects on the price level. Any such policy would in the end be futile, even as far as as interest rates are concerned, because these rates would soon reflect the rise in the price

level and therefore go up all the more. We must not let that happen.

But I cannot emphasize too strongly that monetary policy alone cannot solve our stubborn inflationary problem. We must work simultaneously at lessening the powerful underlying bias toward inflation that stems from excessive total demands on our limited resources. This means, among other things, that the Federal budget has to be handled more responsibly than it has been in the past.

Incredible though it may seem, the Congress has been operating over the years without any semblance of a rational budget plan. The committees that consider spending operate independently of the committees that consider taxes, and appropriations themselves are treated in more than a dozen different bills annually. All of this means that the Federal budget never really gets considered as a whole—a fact which helps explain why it is so often in deficit.

Fortunately, after many years of advocacy by concerned citizens and legislators, this glaring deficiency in the Congressional budget process is about to be remedied. Bills that would integrate spending and taxing decisions have passed both the House and the Senate. This is a most encouraging development, and we may confidently expect final action soon by the Congress on this landmark legislation.

Procedural changes, however, will mean little unless the political will exists to exploit the changes fully. And this can happen only if the American people understand better the nature of the inflation we have been experiencing and demand appropriate action by their elected representatives.

As you leave this hall today, I urge you to give continuing thought and study to the problem of inflation. If it persists, it will affect your personal lives profoundly. Where possible, I urge you to assume a leadership role in getting people everywhere interested in understanding inflation and in doing something about it. In the great "town hall" tradition of America, much can be accomplished if people organize themselves—in their offices, trade unions, factories, social clubs, and churches—to probe beneath the superficial explanations of inflation that are the gossip of everyday life. Productivity councils in local communities and enterprises, established for the purpose of improving efficiency and cutting costs, can be directly helpful in restraining inflation.

While I am on the subject of what individuals can do to be helpful, let me note the need for rediscovery of the art of careful budgeting of family expenditures. In some of our businesses, price competition has atrophied as a mode of economic behavior, in part because many of our families no longer exercise much discipline in their spending. We have become a nation of impulse shoppers, of gadget buyers. We give less thought than we would to choosing among the thousands of commodities and services available in our markets. And many of us no longer practice comparative price shopping—not even for big-ticket items. Careful spending habits are not only in the best interest of every family; they could contribute powerfully to a new emphasis on price competition in consumer markets.

I do not expect that the path back to reasonable price stability can be traveled quickly. Indeed, our government will need to take numerous steps to reduce the inflationary bias of our economy besides those I have emphasized. The forces of competition in labor and product markets need to be strengthened—perhaps by establishing wage and price review boards to minimize abuses of economic power, certainly through more vigorous enforcement of the anti-trust laws, besides elimination of barriers to entry in skilled occupations, reduction of barriers to imports from abroad, and modification of

minimum wage laws to improve job opportunities for teenagers. Impediments to increased production that still remain in farming, construction work, and other industries need to be removed. And greater incentives should be provided for enlarging our capacity to produce industrial materials, energy, and other products in short supply.

But if inflation cannot be ended quickly, neither can it be eliminated without cost. Some industries will inevitably operate for a time at lower rates of production than they would prefer. Government cannot—and should not—try to compensate fully for all such occurrences. Such a policy would involve negating with one hand what was being attempted with the other.

But government does have a proper ameliorative role to play in areas, such as housing, where the incidence of credit restraint has been disproportionately heavy. The special burden that has fallen on homebuilding should be lightened, as is the intent of the housing aids which the Administration recently announced. And my personal judgment is that it would be advisable, too, for government to be prepared, if need be, to expand the roster of public-service jobs. This particular means of easing especially troublesome situations of unemployment will not add permanently to governmental costs. And in any event, it would conflict much less with basic anti-inflation objectives than would the conventional alternative of general monetary or fiscal stimulus. A cut in personal income taxes, for instance, would serve to perpetuate budget deficits. Not only that, it might prove of little aid to the particular industries or localities that are now experiencing economic difficulty. Much the same would be true of a monetary policy that permitted rapid growth of money and credit. There is no justification for such fateful steps at this time.

In concluding, I would simply repeat my central message: there is no easy way out of the inflationary morass into which we have allowed ourselves to sink through negligence and imperfect vision. But I am confident that we will succeed if the American people become more alert to the challenge. I hope that the members of this graduating class will join with other citizens across the country in a great national crusade to put an end to inflation and restore the conditions essential to a stable prosperity—a prosperity whose benefits can be enjoyed by all our people. This objective is within our means and is essential to our nation's future.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES

(Mr. EVANS of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 40 as amended, authorizing a White House Conference on Library and Information Services, and urge its immediate adoption.

In addition to authorizing the White House Conference in 1977, Senate Joint Resolution 40 provides for conferences beforehand in each of the States and territories. These State conferences are particularly important, for they will allow people on the local level to get together, look at their local libraries, and plan for the improvement of local, regional, and statewide library and information service. This would then be done on a national basis at the White

House Conference. The conferences, too, would allow a reexamination of the local, State, and Federal roles in the provision of library service.

Public libraries, elementary and secondary school libraries, college, university, and research libraries, as well as the specialized libraries of industry, Government, hospitals and institutions must all be examined by the public, so that their services can be better designed to meet the needs of all Americans and better coordinated to reach all.

In my own State of Colorado, for example, the libraries are organized into regional library systems designated by the Colorado State Library. Both the Plains and Peaks system which serves a population of some 250,000 with headquarters in Colorado Springs, and the Arkansas Valley system serving over 230,000 persons, with headquarters in Pueblo, provide library service to the people in my district. The two systems include between them 34 public libraries, 69 school districts, 4 State-supported institutions, and 5 college and universities. All of these libraries must work together if they are to adequately meet the diverse library and information needs of Colorado residents. The State conferences, authorized by Senate Joint Resolution 40, will enable the people of Colorado and all the other States to take a new look at their various kinds of libraries and to develop plans for their coordination and improvement, so that equalization of library resources for all citizens can be achieved.

One of the areas I hope will receive considerable attention during the White House conference and the State conferences is the depository library system administered by the U.S. Government Printing Office. The sharp increases in the price of Government publications recently instituted by the Government Printing Office has forced many libraries to begin cutting back on the number of Government publications they are able to purchase from the Government Printing Office. This makes all the more important the depository library system which enables a few designated libraries to receive single copies of Government publications free of charge, so they can be made available to all who may need them.

Describing the effect of the recent steep price increases of government documents, the Denver Public Library has reported it will be required to cut back on the purchase of duplicate copies of government publications it supplies to 18 branch libraries. This in turn, the library notes, will hamper the branch libraries' reference service and restrict access to a large segment of the public. Government publications now provided the branches of Denver Public Library, which are likely candidates for elimination because of the price increases, include such basic documents as the "U.S. Government Organization Manual", "Congressional Directory", "City and County Data Book", "Your Federal Income Tax." Of course, the main library will continue to stock such publications, but those residents of Denver dependent upon the branch libraries will have to go to the main

library or wait for the material to be delivered from the main library to their branch.

The White House Conference on Library and Information Services will call attention to the resources and services available through the Nation's depository libraries, and I would hope, as well, that plans for improvement and extension of the system can be developed so that all Americans will have ready access to U.S. Government publications.

As the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education, my colleague from Indiana (Mr. JOHN BRADEMAs), noted during hearings on the resolution, the White House Conference on Library and Information Services, and the preceding State conferences, can help stimulate a national debate about the value of libraries and information resources in our society, and they will help, too, define the appropriate roles of local, State, and Federal governments in the support of these precious national resources. I concur in that statement, and urge adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 40.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Speaker, for the second year, I would like to take this opportunity to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD part A of my financial disclosure statement.

Although this statement is kept on file with the House Committee on Standards and Conduct, it is not published.

I feel that residents of my district should not have to come to Washington to see this report. I feel, therefore, that the report should appropriately be published in the RECORD.

Today there seems to be a growing public distrust of government and government officials. I hope that making my statement public will in some way contribute to the restoration of faith in our government.

In December of 1972 I placed all my stockholdings in a "blind trust," thus relinquishing all control over their management. The trustee can buy and sell stocks without my knowledge.

The appearance this year of investments not listed in last year's statement results from either action by the trust managers or the growth of investment value to the point where disclosure is required.

I believe the remainder of the following report is self-explanatory:

PART A—U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (WHITE FORM: MEMBERS ONLY)

STATEMENT OF CERTAIN FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND ASSOCIATIONS AS OF DATE OF FILING AND CERTAIN OTHER FINANCIAL DATA COVERING CALENDAR YEAR 1973—FILING REQUIRED BY APRIL 30, 1974, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Name: Robert W. Daniel, Jr., District; Fourth, State: Virginia.

The interest of a spouse or any other party, if constructively controlled by the person reporting, shall be considered to be the

same as the interest of the person reporting.

1. List the name, instrument of ownership, and any position of management held in any business entity doing a substantial business with the Federal Government or subject to Federal regulatory agencies in which the ownership is in excess of \$5,000 fair market value as of the date of filing or from which income of \$1,000 or more was derived during the preceding calendar year. Do not list any time or demand deposit in a financial institution or any debt instrument to any equity instrument.

BUSINESS ENTITY, INSTRUMENT OF OWNERSHIP, AND POSITION OF MANAGEMENT

Brandon Plantation, Proprietorship, Proprietor.

Continental Corporation, Common, None.
Va. Real Estate Investment Trust, Common, None.

General Motors Corp., Common, None.
Union Carbide, Common, None.

Continental Can Co., Common, None.
General Electric Co., Common, None.

Square D Company, Common, None.
National Distillers and Chemical Company, Common, None.

Rockwell International, Common, None.
Kennecott Copper Corporation, Common, None.

Exxon Corporation, Common, None.
Mobil Oil Corporation, Common, None.

Shell Canada Ltd., Class A Common, None.
Shell Oil Company, Common, None.

Standard Oil California, Common, None.
Texaco Incorporated, Common, None.

R. J. Reynolds Industries, Common, None.
Virginia Electric & Power Co., Common, None.

Consolidated Natural Gas Company, Common, None.

American Tel & Tel Company, Common, None.

Chessie System Incorporated, Common, None.

RF & P Railroad, Div. obligations, None.

Southern Railway, Common, None.

International Tel & Tel, Common, None.

Azelia Properties Company III, Limited Partnership, None.

All of the common stocks listed in Part A, Item 1, are held in a blind trust by the First and Merchants National Bank, Richmond, Virginia, as trustee and manager. The trust was established on December 22, 1972.

2. List the name, address and type of practice of any professional organization in which the person reporting, or his spouse, is an officer, director, or partner, or serves in any advisory capacity, from which income of \$1,000 or more was derived during the preceding calendar year: None.

3. List the source of each of the following items received during the preceding calendar year:

(a) Any income from a single source for services rendered (other than from the U.S. Government) exceeding \$5,000 and not reported in section 2 above: None.

(b) Any capital gain from a single source exceeding \$5,000, other than from the sale of a residence occupied by the person reporting. (As reportable to IRS). Brandon Plantation: sale of breeding stock.

(c) Reimbursement for expenditures (other than from the U.S. Government) exceeding \$1,000 in each instance: None.

(d) Sources of honoraria aggregating \$300 or more from a single source. (Name the original source, not a speakers' bureau.) None.

4. List each creditor to whom the person reporting was indebted for a period of 90 consecutive days or more in the preceding calendar year in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000 excluding any indebtedness specifically secured by the pledge of

assets of the person reporting of appropriate value.

First & Merchants National Bank, Richmond, Virginia

Southside Virginia Production Credit Association.

Campaign Moneys are not to be taken into account in this report.

FATHER JACQUES MARQUETTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RUPPE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUPPE, Mr. Speaker, as those who have studied early North American history know, Father Jacques Marquette was a French Jesuit missionary who explored much of the Mississippi River and many of the northern bodies of water in what is today the United States.

He established a mission to St. Ignace on the north shore of the Straits of Mackinac, now part of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. This mission became a center of study and religion in the area.

Subsequently, he and his fellow traveler, Louis Jolliet, were the first white men on the upper Mississippi River and ventured almost as far as the mouth of the Arkansas. On their return journey, they traveled to Chicago, up to the Illinois River, along Lake Michigan, and to Green Bay.

On one of his explorations, Father Marquette died in 1675 near what is today Ludington, Mich. He was buried there, but later a group of Indians brought his remains to St. Ignace where they were placed in the missionary chapel. This burned in 1706, but the gravesite was discovered in 1877, and a marker was placed in 1882.

In 1965, the Congress enacted Public Law 89-187 which established a tercentenary commission to honor Father Marquette and to investigate the suitability of establishing a national monument or memorial to commemorate the historical events associated with his life. The Commission chose St. Ignace, Mich., as a fitting site for this memorial.

It is proper that we erect a national monument to this great missionary and explorer whose wanderings provided man with much of his early knowledge of this land. It is also proper that this memorial be constructed in St. Ignace, Mich., where he is interred. In this light, I am today introducing legislation which, upon enactment, will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with the Governor of Michigan for the design, construction, and operation of a memorial. The Secretary is authorized to give assistance to the State in terms of technical advice and funds, up to \$500,000, for the land acquisition and development to promote public understanding and appreciation of the significant role played by Father Marquette to the history of this country.

This memorial is long overdue. Father Jacques Marquette contributed much to our history. We should properly recognize that contribution.

Thank you.

ERNEST PETINAUD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I was out of the city when Ernest Petinaud, maitre d'hotel of the House of Representatives, retired. I did not, therefore, get a chance to join my distinguished colleagues in the House when they spoke on the floor in tribute to America's most distinguished maitre d'hotel, Ernest Petinaud is one of the few individuals I know who have become a legend in his own lifetime. Few men achieve this stature in life.

I am sure that every Member of Congress has his own favorite story about Ernie which he will always remember. I know that I will always remember how he loved to chide Dan Butler, a candidate for City Council in Washington, D.C., for losing his race because he put his campaign signs in trees. Ernie made a hilarious anecdote of Danny's campaign by admonishing him that "birds don't vote", that "you don't put campaign posters up in trees if you want to get elected." Ernie had a way of making hilarious incidents of this kind double me over in laughter. Dan Butler, to whom he often told this particular anecdote always thought it funnier every time Ernie retold it.

I also shall never forget how Ernie painstakingly made a Congressman's constituents feel so welcome in the House of Representatives' dining room. Many of my constituents are proud, both of the House of Representatives' menu they took home as a souvenir, and the personal autograph they received from this famous maitre d'hotel. Often my constituents will show me their autographed menu with pride.

Ernie made many friends for Congress around the Nation in his own unique, inimitable way. We will miss him here, in the Congress, and we count ourselves as being fortunate in that he cares enough about us to come every now and then to share with us both an anecdote and a fond remembrance of a sincere friend.

THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION— IS IT WORKING FOR OR AGAINST THE AMERICAN FAMILY FARM- ER?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, this Thursday, the House of Representatives will be considering the fiscal year 1975 appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation. Included in the Bureau's appropriation is \$12,355,000 for continuation of the Garrison diversion unit in North Dakota. The committee has provided the Bureau with \$1.8 million more for this project than was originally requested in the President's budget. The Bureau estimates that an additional \$276 million will be needed to complete the Garrison project.

The Garrison diversion unit project is highly questionable. The Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency have pointed out that it will create serious ecological damage. Other bureaus of the Department of the Interior have pointed out serious problems in the project. The General Accounting Office is investigating the project. In a preliminary report to the Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources, the GAO has reported serious cost overruns—overruns which the Bureau has failed to report to the Congress. In addition, the project will almost certainly degrade the quality of water flowing into Canada—a clear violation of the Canadian-American Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. As a result, the Canadian government has lodged very strong protests with the State Department—and the State Department has expressed its concern to the Department of the Interior.

But perhaps the ultimate insult of the Garrison project is the fact that it will hurt the very people it was originally designed to aid. The types of problems created by the Garrison project are well described by a group called United Family Farmers, Inc. This is an organization of small farmers organized in South Dakota to oppose the Oahe irrigation project—a Bureau project estimated to cost a third of a billion dollars. It is similar in many ways to the Garrison project—and it is somewhat dependent on the Garrison project and the environmental problems being created by Garrison.

I would like to quote at this point from portions of the United Family Farmers statement on the Oahe irrigation project:

Our members are farmers and know our land and the water beneath it. The project being proposed did not describe a project that, in our practical experience, could be a success here. What would be the effect of this project on the family farm-based social system? This system of community is something for which we all care deeply, but what we read led us to believe that our system of moderate-sized farms might not survive in the capital-intensive agricultural community that the Bureau wanted to create.

What about our rich wildlife? What about the diverse James River? What would happen to those of us whose land lay in the path of the proposed reservoirs and canals? These questions and many others were not satisfactorily answered by the Bureau.

On its face, the Oahe Project would apparently, complement this by creating and additional 500 family farms. But such hopes are simply not based in truth and experience. Dr. Paul S. Taylor, Professor Emeritus of Economics at the University of California in Berkeley has made a lifelong study of the social and economic effects of reclamation developments, and is considered the premier authority in the field. Dr. Taylor informed us that where reclamation projects are built they do not support the family farm system but instead almost universally tend to cause centralization of land ownership in the hands of the very few, reduce the number of landowners, increase the percentage of indigent persons in surrounding communities, and cause the general dissolution of existing social systems.

In addition, with centralized ownership,

farming methods are intensified greatly, in comparison with the relative harmony that exists between the family farm and the natural environment.

The Reclamation Law does require that irrigation water cannot be delivered to persons holding more than 160 acres of land, and that the excess lands must be sold at pre-project prices. While this law is supposed to protect and promote the family farm, in fact it has been universally unenforced by the Bureau and there exists no reason in fact or experience to believe that the Bureau intends to enforce the law in the case of Oahe.

The United Family Farmers make an excellent point concerning the confusion surrounding the Garrison Diversion Unit—and the way it could adversely affect waterways to the South:

The Garrison Diversion Unit, another water resource project of the Pick-Sloan Program in North Dakota is to pour polluted irrigation return flows into rivers leading into Canada. The Canadian Government has objected to this plan, and have requested that the project be halted. The U.S. State Department has become concerned that our country may stand in violation of the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty, if the Garrison Project is completed. The Bureau of Reclamation has suggested that return flows from the Garrison which were originally planned to be diverted to Canadian bound rivers may now be diverted to the James River. This would considerably compound the dilemma downstream of the James River and the Oahe Unit. At any rate the whole situation appears to be uninvestigated, unplanned, and unresolved.

In addition to the Canadian objection, the Garrison Diversion Project, upon which construction began 5 years ago, has become a public controversy taken up by many citizens of North Dakota, the Council on Environmental Quality, the Environmental Protection Agency, members of the United States Congress and the General Accounting Office. Although construction on the Oahe Project has not begun, the similarities of the history and planning between Garrison Diversion and Oahe lead many to anticipate a repeat of the controversy in South Dakota as a result of similar unresolved social, economic and environmental problems that have become apparent in North Dakota.

The salinity problems which can be created in the North Plains States are well described in the following passage:

Because of these soil characteristics the land in the irrigation area cannot carry off on its own the irrigation water. If no artificial drains were built to carry off the water, the irrigation lands would become a salt lake. To avoid this the Bureau proposes to build underground drains, buried at a depth of nine feet and spaced at average intervals of 620 feet.

While speaking of the Oahe project, the United Family Farmers describe one of the main problems involved in the Garrison diversion unit—understatement, indeed, almost willful misstatement of true costs:

Generally speaking, the Bureau of Reclamation has a history of understating the costs of its projects, relying upon a tolerant Congress to provide the supplemental appropriations necessary to rescue projects from bankruptcy.

One of the most shocking aspects of the Garrison and Oahe projects is that instead of creating hydroelectric power—like many Bureau projects—the projects

are net consumers of energy—and may require increased use of fossil fuel plants in North and South Dakota:

At a time of great energy shortage in this nation this project will compel the region to forego a substantial source of hydroelectric power and replace it with fossil fuel plants.

It is estimated that Garrison will consume 499 million kilowatt-hours of generating ability while Oahe will consume 272 million kilowatt-hours. It is unconscionable to permit such energy waste during this period of long-range energy shortages.

The question naturally arises, Why does the Bureau proceed with these projects? It is not to help the farmers. Following is a statement by UFF as to the economic havoc which projects such as Garrison and Oahe will create for the small farmer:

The taxpayers are to pay for the project and the farmers are expected to make it workable. The fact that the per acre cost for irrigation development on each of 190,000 acres of already productive land will amount to \$1,647, and at the same time project facilities will require 100,000 acres of productive land is distasteful to many voters who expect better efficiency of public subsidized agriculture production. The environmental impact statement indicates that an already established farmer will require a minimum initial investment of \$50,000 to begin irrigation in the project. Whereas the average net farm income of South Dakota farmers is something less than \$10,000, the investment for irrigation is beyond the financial limits of most farmers of the area.

It is submitted that the Oahe Irrigation Project is not wanted by the very people it is meant to benefit—the farmers of central South Dakota. Support for the project is found among bankers, chambers of commerce, equipment sales businesses and the like. Not farmers.

Mr. Speaker, is it time that the Congress and OMB review the need and wisdom of the Bureau's projects.

VENEZUELA INSULT TO CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROSE), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I feel I must call the attention of the House to an unfortunate statement directed against a distinguished and able Member of this House by a supposedly responsible business leader of Venezuela.

A translation of a foreign wire service dispatch carried in Spanish has only now come to my attention, and though I have been unable to determine whether it was picked up and carried at all in our country, it has nevertheless appeared in other parts of the world.

The wire service story reports the response of a leader of the Venezuelan business community to the amendment which I have joined in supporting along with my distinguished colleague, Mr. GUNTER, of Florida, to insist on fair oil prices.

In short, the dispatch quotes a Mr. Reinaldo Cervini, president of the Venezuelan Nationalist Business Or-

ganization, as saying in part, and I quote:

It is regrettable that bastard voices such as that of North American Senator Bill Gunter are trying to impede relations between the peoples through intimidation and threats to the sovereignty and self-determination of the nations.

I trust, hope and believe, Mr. Speaker, that though it is the apparent policy of the State Department to allow Venezuela and other oil producing nations to walk all over American consumers without protest, that our supineness has not yet reached the point where representatives of the interests of foreign governments may routinely and casually refer to distinguished Members of this Congress in public statements in such a contemptuous manner.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Cervini fails to recognize that Congressman GUNTER, far from being a "bastard voice," is a distinguished Member of the House Agriculture Committee. Furthermore, it is proper and, indeed, a responsibility of a U.S. Congressman to speak out on these matters, particularly when public policy on foreign sugar quotas so directly affects the lives of every American.

And I would further suggest that the attitude in general of Venezuela toward the rights of American consumers be kept in mind by our colleagues at the time that Mr. GUNTER offers his amendment to suspend the sugar quota of Venezuela until such time as that country returns to responsible economic policies toward our country with respect to the price of oil.

I include the text of the translated dispatch at this point, Mr. Speaker, to be printed in the body of the RECORD:

(Translation (Spanish))

BASTARD VOICES ARE THE ONES WHO ARE ACCUSING VENEZUELA OF BLACKMAIL

CARACAS, May 24.—It is regrettable that bastard voices such as that of North American Senator Bill Gunter are trying to impede relations between the peoples through intimidation and threats to the sovereignty and self-determination of the nations, the president of the pro-Venezuelan, Venezuelan Nationalist Business Organization stated today in Caracas.

Reinaldo Cervini, president of that entity, with these words replied to the statements made day before yesterday in the United States by Senator Bill Gunter according to which Venezuela is practicing economic blackmail in fixing its petroleum prices.

Those statements are really surprising not so much because of their bastard and cynical content, but because of the ignorance and absolute disdain toward the countries of the third world and their vexation-filled history, Cervini maintains.

Venezuela, just like the rest of the Latin American countries, has a past replete with abuses committed by some governments of that country (U.S.) that I almost venture to assure that they are deeds unknown by the great majority of the North American people, whose most earnest expressions are represented by the spoils of Mexico that offered occasion for the expansion of the United States. The unjust appropriation of the Panama Canal and the unbridled penetration by private enterprises into Central America and in other nations possessing important

mining and petroleum deposits. I emphasize (that the) bastard voices are . . .

(Two)

The President of Pro-Venezuela added that this economic hegemony exercised for so many years on Latin American territory was the main source for developing an aggressive policy of not only economic blackmail, but also political blackmail, which is what Congressman Bill Gunter is endeavoring to keep. But one mustn't forget that this stage of extortion forged a resentment which is today being expressed in a strong desire for emancipation and inevitable nationalism, Cervini emphasized.

Finally, I want to state that it is regrettable that bastard voices such as that of Bill Gunter are trying to impede relations between peoples through intimidation and the threat against the sovereignty and self-determination of the nations.

In official circles there were no comments, for the moment. Aside from this, this isn't the first time the United States Congressman has made statements more or less similar. At their time, they didn't have any official response either.

BLESSED SACRAMENT SCHOOL PRIZE-WINNING ESSAYS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a set of prize-winning essays by students of the Blessed Sacrament School in Charleston, S.C. Three young people, two 14 and one 13, have written on the topic of "Freedom of Religion." I think they have captured the essence of the spirit of youth today and kindled the fire of hope for tomorrow. To lean upon an old cliché—today's youth are tomorrow's leaders. Nothing could be closer to the truth. I present these essays in the firm belief that the future of America is headed toward good hands. After reading them, I am sure you will agree:

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

(First place: David Nelson, Age 14, Mount Pleasant, S.C.)

This is what I think about Freedom of Religion. It is one of America's most cherished freedoms. To preserve this priceless possession vigilance is essential. Laxity on our part could result in generations of young people growing up unfamiliar with the firm moral foundations upon which our country was founded and upon which it rests. The present era is full of the "now" generation. Yet our nation is what it is because of what it has been together with what man wants to make it.

It is important, therefore not only that our youth, but our older generation as well, remain aware of the principles that have made the United States unique. Important in this context are the words of the great Quaker William Penn:

"Unless we are governed by God we will be ruled by Tyrants."

The men and women who built America have been motivated by spiritual zeal that continues to influence the character and purpose of our life today. At the same time they assured its citizens the right to worship as they chose. To safeguard this right the Constitution was amended in this respect to read, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of Religion or prohibiting

the free exercise thereof" . . . (First Amendment to the Constitution).

Perhaps the essential genius of America and its profoundest philosophy is enunciated best by the French historian and statesman Alexis de Tocqueville who observed this in *Democracy in America*:

"Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because America is good . . . and if America ever will cease to be good . . . America will cease to be great."

What Tocqueville is trying to tell us is the reason America is great. She is great because her ministers, regardless of creed or color, have the right to preach about God and morality and the people have the right to worship in the churches of their choice. This right is denied to the people of the communist dominated countries. Many people down through the ages have fought and died for this freedom.

This freedom of religion is one of our greatest possessions today. It is up to us the "now" generation to cherish and preserve it, and to hand it down to the future generation.

ONE FREEDOM UNDER GOD

Second place: James Frappier, Age 14, Charleston, S.C.

Now as the conqueror comes,
They, the true-hearted came;
Not with the roll of stirring drums and the
trumpets that sing of fame;
Not as the flying come,
In silence and in fear;
They shook the depths of the desert's gloom
with their lofty hymns of cheer.
What sought they thus afar?
Bright jewels of the mine?
The wealth of seas? The spoils of war?
They sought a faith's pure shrine.
Ay, call it the holy ground, the soil where
first they trod!
They left unstained where they found
Freedom to worship God!!

—Felicia Dorothea Hemans.

In addressing the reader, first let me tell you that the United States Constitution guarantees the American people freedom of religion.

Yes, this poem by Dorothea Hemans explains to us the one and true reason why men went through great lengths, and sometimes even sacrificed their lives to win the freedom to worship in the way each individual saw fit.

The poem also explained to us that religious freedom is definitely not a new idea! Since the dawn of creation, there has been worship which is generally described in the Book of Genesis that man thanked and adored some head image or God as the Supreme Being.

And, because of this, there was also much persecution of the religious throughout history. We find this true of instances such as the Jews in Egypt and the Catholics in England. Even in the early part of our country's history, Catholics in England who moved from there to America where they were persecuted in most, if not all, of the newly established colonies in the United States. Yes, even the colony of Maryland, which has been justly called one of the true Catholic settlements throughout our country's history, has its days of persecution.

Yes, freedom of religion is definitely not to be known as the new conquest of a tenacious people, but rather, something that has been fought for throughout the entire course of world history.

With the signing of the Constitution, the freedom for worthy citizens of all ages, creeds, and colors to worship as they please was granted to every United States country-

man, and most of us still hold this freedom dear even today.

However, those of us who do treasure this freedom must respect the responsibilities and obligations that come with every other freedom. So, in general, let us live up to our duties and sacrifices to God, and the religious freedom will be ours to cherish forever.

FROM THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION: FREEDOM OF RELIGION

(Third place: Karen Grisillo, age 13, Sullivan's Island, S.C.)

The freedom to choose one's own religion is truly an important freedom. Today, we are under no obligation to have the same religious beliefs as someone else has. It's not like it was ages ago, when the ruler was of a certain religion, everyone would have to believe in that same religion also. We are not persecuted for our religion, as this was one of the main reasons the Pilgrims escaped to America—to be free from religious persecution. Neither are we thrown to the lions as Daniel was, when he professed his belief in Yahweh.

Today, we have the right to choose our own religion without a feeling of regret or suffering later for it.

There are many different freedoms; freedom to choose our own school, our own clothes, and so on. But, to choose our own religion should have more importance and more meaning than any other freedom.

The world itself—religion covers a lot of territory. What does religion mean to us? Does it mean, simply attending church for an hour on Sunday? Or does it mean loving and believing in God as we believe in others and ourselves? If we only go to Church because we have to, there is no feeling of love or respect involved, so we may as well stay home. We should go to Church to get a better understanding of God in the Gospel readings and all the other parts of the Mass. When we make our profession of Faith in the Creed, "I believe in God . . ." we should say it with love and be proud to say it like we mean it.

There is sometimes prejudice among the different religions. For example, a parent might say, "I don't want my child to play with the child down the street—he's Jewish." That attitude is just as bad as racial prejudice. We should know that there is diversity among religions.

The generation gap, too, is connected with religion. For instance, the Bibles of our parents may have had black covers on them—stating *The Holy Bible*. The bibles of the younger generation today have blue denim covers with such titles as *Christ Is Here*, and *The Way*. The older folks may be used to the traditional approaches to worship and are satisfied with it. They do not wish for a change—that's their choice. The new bibles are not published to torment the older generation but, rather to reach the young in a new way. It is not a gimmick. It's just an idea to try and let the young practice their religion in a way that is meaningful and suitable to them.

The denim covered bibles, no doubt will attract the attention of the young, and the result will be that they will study the bible and find religion hopefully playing an important part of their everyday lives.

I do not think it is at all right for the young to criticize the old, especially for the way they are accustomed to the traditional Mass. That is a privilege that cannot be taken away from them. But, neither do I think the older generation should feel that the person who comes to Church with the long hair and greasy jeans should not be allowed into the Church in that manner. At least he is coming! Isn't that what really counts?

In conclusion let the older people have their way of the Celebration of the Eucharist

with the songs of "ancient" years that have been sung over and over again. The younger generation is ready for a change. And, because of the First Amendment this country permits each individual to practice the form and type of religion he chooses. It may well be that the young feel the need for a change from the traditional structures of religion. Maybe there is a message that God is trying to transmit to us; Share, Love, and Compromise!

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Senate has recently passed, by a more than 2-to-1 margin its version of the bill to fund the U.S. contribution to the International Development Association—IDA. I was most disappointed that the House voted on January 23, 1974, to kill its version of the funding bill, H.R. 11354, and I hope the House will reconsider its unfortunate vote in the near future.

This bill would fund the \$1.5 billion U.S. contribution to the fourth replenishment of IDA's financial resources, and there are several compelling reasons why it should be passed. If the bill is allowed to die, the United States as well as potential recipients of IDA loans will all be the losers.

While I regretted the initial defeat of H.R. 11354, I was pleased that this action at least served to mobilize support for the bill. Former Treasury Secretary Shultz had indicated his intentions to make every effort to reverse the defeat and reconfirm our commitment to IDA, and I hope Secretary Simon will continue this effort. Shultz and Secretary Kissinger, in an unusual joint statement, had earlier called the defeat "a major setback to our efforts of cooperation and to the ability of the United States to provide leadership in a world where there is an increasing tendency for nations to believe that their best interest lies in going it alone."

World Bank President Robert McNamara, whose responsibilities include Bank-affiliate IDA, was even more outspoken, calling the vote an "unmitigated disaster for hundreds of millions of people in the poorest nations of the world."

Expressions of support for the funding of IDA have also been voiced by such divergent groups as the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the Catholic Conference of Bishops, the YWCA, the United Auto Workers, and the League of Women Voters. People around the country are evidently concerned about the House action, and rightly so.

WHAT IS IDA?

To clear up any uncertainty about who is helped by the International Development Association, it should be noted that this organization—created in 1960, largely at the initiative of Congress, as a member of the World Bank Group—acts as a primary channel through which to direct long-term, interest-free loans—

not grants—to the most destitute of the world's countries. One criterion for loan recipients is a per capita annual income of \$375 or less, and more than 70 percent of the loans have gone to the poorest of the poor, the 28 "have-not" nations with a total population of more than 1 billion and a per capita annual income of \$130 or less. This income figure is less than 3 percent of the estimated 1972 U.S. per capita annual income of \$4,480.

While the terms of IDA loans are quite concessionary—50-year maturity period, 10-year grace period, no interest charge but an annual service charge of three-fourths of 1 percent—they are structured in this way, because the credits are concentrated in low-income countries with serious debt service problems where concessionary assistance is essential if economic growth is to occur. Projects to be funded are subjected to rigorous economic evaluation and selection by expert World Bank staff; thus, the funds are not open-ended but must be linked to specific, concrete program operations. Many of the projects are in the human resources sector and are designed to increase agricultural production, improve educational systems, and control population growth in the recipient countries. Other types of projects deal with small-scale industry, urbanization, and tourism.

For instance, in fiscal 1973, IDA's efforts included these loans, which are representative of the entire range of its operations: \$9.5 million to Afghanistan for a livestock project involving development of 1,200 sheep farms; \$7.5 million to Bangladesh for reestablishment of a modern rice and wheat seeds industry; \$13.5 million to Indonesia for preparation, testing, production and free distribution of 138 million textbooks for primary school pupils; \$6.6 million to Lebanon to help finance construction of 66 schools and teacher training institutes; \$4 million to Mauritius for the establishment of an industrial park near the capital; and \$5 million to Malaysia for a project to extend family planning and health services to rural areas.

Projects like these are urgently needed for recipients' development in "normal" times, but the activities of IDA have become even more critical in the current crisis conditions of drought in the Sahel Zone of Africa, a threefold rise in the price of imported grain threatening grain imports in India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh, and a fourfold jump in the price of Arab oil which means that the poor countries will have to either divert funds—not IDA funds, which cannot be diverted—from other areas to pay for the fuel or reduce fuel consumed for development projects. In conditions like these, IDA assistance can make the difference between survival and starvation.

Failure of the Congress to pass H.R. 11354 does not merely mean that IDA will limp along without U.S. funds. It means IDA will come to a grinding halt. Resources currently available to IDA are expected to be fully committed by the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1974. The fourth replenishment of these resources, the U.S. contribution to which is contained in the bill, cannot become legally

effective without U.S. participation. Under IDA procedures, no member country contribution shall become payable until 80 percent of the contributions have been pledged. This in effect means that, since the U.S. share of the contributions comes to 33 percent of the total, any IDA replenishment is effectively stalled until legislative approval for IDA funds is reached in the United States.

WHAT IDA IS NOT: BILATERAL FOREIGN AID

It is important to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the IDA replenishment bill does not represent the bilateral type of foreign aid legislation that has been subject to increasing criticism in recent years. On the contrary, it is an excellent example of an international burden sharing arrangement. In fact, it was precisely the complaint about inadequate burden sharing in foreign assistance that prompted the creation of the International Development Association 14 years ago, with 25 major donor states.

Moreover, the U.S. share of the burden has been declining with each successive replenishment of IDA's finances, as the following figures show:

1. Initial subscription: U.S. share—43 percent.
2. First replenishment: U.S. share—43 percent.
3. Second replenishment: U.S. share—40 percent.
4. Third replenishment: U.S. share—39 percent.
5. Fourth replenishment (H.R. 11354): U.S. share—33 percent.

We are now at the point where the other 24 donors put in \$2 for every \$1 the United States contributes. That strikes me as burdensharing at its best, and it has come about, because of actions like the tripling of the Japanese quota and a doubling of the West German quota.

Our contribution is declining in absolute terms, as well as in relative terms. By dividing our payments over 4 years, as IDA arrangements permit us to, instead of over the usual 3, our annual installment will be cut from the current \$384 to \$375 million.

REASONS FOR SUPPORTING REPLENISHMENT

I was pleased to note the results of a recent survey by the respected Overseas Development Council in which 68 percent of the respondents supported the principle of providing assistance to the poor countries. Even when faced with budgetary choices, nearly one out of every two Americans polled favored maintaining or increasing the allocation for foreign economic assistance.

Moreover, the survey showed Americans prefer programs aimed not at gaining short-term political advantage, but at alleviating such basic human problems as hunger and malnutrition, disease, and illiteracy.

These are exactly the kind of problems that IDA is designed to deal with. I was quite heartened to learn of this survey, because it shows that congressional support for IDA would be consistent with public opinion. When my colleagues in the House reconsider the IDA funding bill, which I hope they will, they should keep this public support for foreign economic assistance in mind.

MORAL REASONS

There are other reasons, of course, for supporting IDA funding and aligning ourselves with the developing world, not the least of which is the moral reason. The United States, as the richest nation on Earth, has a moral obligation to be the world leader in providing economic assistance to those nations less fortunate than ours. In brief, we cannot live on a island of affluence in a sea of poverty. We seek to treat the problems of our own poor through income redistribution, health care delivery, and education, and we must be committed to these same issues abroad. The obligation to alleviate suffering exceeds any obstacles of race, creed, or nationality.

Granted that we have a multiplicity of problems here at home; we should still lend a helping hand to those poor nations willing to help themselves. Failure to do so, especially at a time when our share of the IDA lending burden is declining substantially, would severely tarnish our position of international leadership, and reflect a gross insensitivity to the plight of the great majority of the world's population. Moreover, we cannot expect other nations to carry their share of the burden if the richest member nation, the United States, refuses to do its part.

In sum, we should not give vent to our own economic frustrations by inflicting further suffering on impoverished foreign peoples.

POLITICAL REASONS

There are political and diplomatic reasons, as well, for supporting funding of IDA. Institutions such as IDA form a part of an international system of co-operation, with agreed-upon rules of economic behavior between nations, which, as former Secretary Shultz has pointed out, the United States is trying to improve and strengthen. From the viewpoint of foreign relations, IDA and other international financial institutions are an important part of the system that has developed since World War II to handle multilateral economic issues on a cooperative basis. The key here is co-operation. If the developing countries should come to feel that the United States is not doing its fair share in the financing of development projects, they could decide not to cooperate with us on any of a number of fronts. As Fred Bergsten has pointed out:

The developing countries could drive up our prices of raw materials through cartelization and hence further exacerbate inflation, or even deny us those materials. They could take over our investments, or at least sharply increase their take—and reduce ours—from both existing and new investments. They could deny us markets. They could block changes which we seek in the international monetary and trading rules and institutions.

In short, the United States would be wise to help the developing countries meet their needs and thereby preempt taking actions that would have an adverse effect on our own progress. It is very much in our own national interest to maintain an atmosphere, as well as a system, of international economic co-operation. Support for IDA is an important way of doing so.

ECONOMIC REASONS

Congressional support for IDA makes economic good sense too, and this is perhaps the most important reason for the reconsideration and passage of H.R. 11354.

The world economy is not a one-way street; development assistance brings mutual benefits to industrialized and less developed nations alike. The fact is that our own welfare and progress are linked with the economic realities of the rest of the world. The developing world is important to the United States, not just politically, but economically as well.

How important? Our failure to support IDA could undermine reliable and vitally needed supplies of raw materials, energy, and minerals which our own economy will require for the future. The United States already depends on imports for over half its supply of 6 of the 13 basic raw materials, and Interior Department projections indicate that the number will rise to 9 out of 13 a decade from now. Less developed countries presently supply us with 99 percent of our imports of natural rubber, 79 percent of our imports of copper ore, 98 percent of our bauxite imports, and 62 percent of our oil imports.

Figures like these represent the culmination of a long-term trend: the United States changed from a net exporter of raw materials to a net importer of them back in the 1920's, and our dependence on foreign sources has been growing ever since.

Just as the LDC's are a market for the United States, we are a market for them. Our exports to the developing countries amounted to \$14.6 billion in 1972, or about 30 percent of our total exports. These exports prevented our trade deficit from being worse than it was that year: our trade balance with the LDC's was in the black, though our overall trade deficit was \$6 billion. They also helped to support the more than 5 million American jobs that are export oriented.

According to a recent study prepared by the Congressional Research Service at the request of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, U.S. participation in multilateral lending institutions is also balance of payments. The study reveals that, while total U.S. contributions to the World Bank and regional development banks since their inception have been \$6.9 billion, the banks' payments to the United States for procurement, administrative expenses, interest on borrowed funds, and considerable investments in this country have totaled \$9.6 billion, resulting in a \$2.7 billion surplus. In the case of the IDA, its procurements in the United States through fiscal 1973 have amounted to \$426 million.

IDA's budgetary impact is slight because of the manner in which IDA disbursements are made. As the distinguished floor manager of the bill, Congressman GONZALEZ, pointed out during debate, while we are being asked to contribute \$1.5 billion over a 4-year period, the budgetary impact will be spread out over a period of 10 years or more, with virtually no impact in the early years. This is because when IDA makes a com-

mitment, it draws down its resources only as required to make progress payments on the projects being financed. The rest is kept in the U.S. Treasury. We only make the full authorization and appropriation, because it is required to make IDA commitments legal and binding. In other words, under the terms of the fourth replenishment we would have to appropriate \$375 million in fiscal 1976, but that money would not necessarily be expended for several years; it would just be made available for IDA projects as needed.

CONCLUSION

The United States can easily afford to participate in the fourth replenishment of IDA's resources. Our annual IDA contributions now represent only three one-hundredths of 1 percent of our gross national product, and only one-tenth of 1 percent of our budget.

The question is, can we afford not to participate? I think not. Through IDA, the United States is in a strong position to influence developing countries to become more productive, more self-reliant and less dependent on bilateral assistance. IDA offers a unique opportunity for us to improve our relationship with the third world—a group of nations that is very important to our continued economic growth.

In sum, support for H.R. 11354 is in our national interest and I urge my colleagues to give this bill favorable consideration whenever it reaches the floor again.

VOLUNTARY PUBLIC OPINION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe the mailing of questionnaires by Congressmen serves a dual purpose. Receiving the questionnaire makes the constituent aware the Congressman is soliciting his views. Tabulating the responses permits Members of Congress to keep their finger on the public pulse.

Many Congressmen are seriously interested in knowing what constituents think but fear they lack the background in statistical analysis to do an adequate job of sampling. The cost of hiring professional pollsters is often prohibitive.

Formulating the questions is an important part of the operation. The bias of the person asking the question must not be obvious and the questions must be concise and direct. Polling the district, moreover, can be a time-consuming and tedious venture. A considerable number of offices rely on interns to compile the results since the regular office staff simply lacks the time to assimilate all the data.

I am today introducing the Voluntary Public Opinion Act to assist Members in conducting public opinion polls and guarantee that the information gathered in polling is used rather than discarded or ignored. If constituents back home take the time and effort to complete questionnaires, the results should not simply be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and forgotten.

The Voluntary Public Opinion Act creates an Office of Congressional Polling to provide the expertise to do a professional job. The office staff will offer suggestions as to the wording of questions, the distribution of questionnaires and the tabulation of responses. The emphasis will be on statistically correct analysis.

The Voluntary Public Opinion Act authorizes the Speaker to appoint an office director with expertise in polling techniques. The office staff will submit quarterly reports to Congress summarizing the results of constituent polls. The office will then make these results available to the general public. Lobby groups, professional associations, and educational institutions will have access to current data on electorate moods and will therefore be better equipped to respond to the pressing needs of the people.

Passage of the Voluntary Public Opinion Act will add new dimensions to constituent polling. Although geographical differences preclude asking identical questions in all districts, certain questions are generally used by all. Comparisons of answers by district, State, and region are then endless.

The Office of Congressional Polling will provide the means to compare responses by people in San Francisco and Chicago and Boston but, more importantly, we can begin to analyze the reasons behind the different approaches.

Watergate has had a devastating effect on the confidence of the American people in their elected representatives. The low esteem reserved for Members of Congress comes as no surprise to any of us. Our goal should be to restore trust by listening to constituent opinion about priorities and then passing legislation to reorder the priorities. We must prove that responding to a questionnaire is not an exercise in futility, but a first step in tackling the many problems constituents face.

I view the Voluntary Public Opinion Act as a vehicle for this renewed confidence in Government officials. I enclose a complete text of the bill for your analysis:

H.R. 15178

To establish an office for the House of Representatives to assist Members of the House of Representatives in conducting public opinion polls

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 "Office of Congressional Polling Act".

SEC. 2. There is established in the House of Representatives an Office of Congressional Polling (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Office").

SEC. 3. The Office shall—

(1) conduct research into the drafting of public opinion questionnaires and methods of tabulating and analyzing the responses to such questionnaires; and

(2) provide technical assistance to any Member of the House of Representatives to assist in the planning and conducting of public opinion polls within his district.

SEC. 4. (a) The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the position.

(b) The Director shall be paid at a per annum gross rate equal to the rate of basic pay, as in effect from time to time, for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

Sec. 5. The Director shall, in accordance with policies and procedures approved by the Speaker, appoint and fix the pay of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of this Office at respective rates not more than the maximum rate of basic pay then currently paid under the General Schedule of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code. Any such appointment shall be made without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the position.

Sec. 6. The Office shall make available to the public upon request and at cost of reproduction and mailing, all information developed from the research under section 3 of this Act and the results of the public opinion polls conducted by Members of the House of Representatives with the assistance of the Office.

Sec. 7. The Office shall submit to the House of Representatives quarterly reports which summarize the results of the public opinion polls conducted by Members of the House of Representatives with the assistance of the Office.

REDEDICATION OF THE FIELD MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. COLLINS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, June 25, 1974, marks a stirring event in the history of Chicago. On that day the people of Chicago and the Nation will give special recognition to one of Illinois' most ambitious and zealous partnerships of public and private support for scientific and cultural advancement. On that day, its 80th anniversary, the Field Museum will be rededicated; and attention will be focused upon the first major renovation of its present 53-year-old permanent facility.

On June 2, 1894, the Field Museum of Natural History opened to the public for the first time. Its first home was in Jackson Park, Chicago, in what had been the Palace of Fine Arts of the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition. In 1920, Field Museum collections were moved to its present site in Chicago's Grant Park.

Today, that houses one of the world's greatest collections—more than 13 million specimens—of natural history and ethnographic objects. Since 1921, this vast collection has held the attention of more than 66 million people. During 1973 alone, it was estimated that more than 1.1 million persons, including my son and I, visited Field Museum.

I am proud of the fact that the Field Museum not only continues its objectives of collection, education and exhibition, but stresses the underlying importance of basic research—the results of which have contributed to its ever-increasing role as an educator as it disseminates knowledge through its hundreds of exhibits and its special educational programs for scientific study and public utilization.

THE NEED FOR LAND USE LEGISLATION NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the Members' attention an editorial from the New York Times of June 3, 1974, concerning the Land Use Planning Act (H.R. 10294). Entitled "The Bill of the Year," this editorial highlights the importance of this legislation to the country and the need to enact it this year. The editorial follows:

BILL OF THE YEAR

The House of Representatives is about to consider a bill that for the long view takes precedence over any other environmental legislation on the calendar. We refer to the land-use planning bill which the Administration's Congressional lieutenants unsuccessfully tried to smother in the Rules Committee.

Contrary to the flood of propaganda generated in good part by the United States Chamber of Commerce, this bill—which is practically the same as one already passed by the Senate—does not call for or even remotely suggest national planning for the use of the country's remaining empty land. Far from taking power away from the states, it would encourage them to take back a power they surrendered to their local communities back in the 1920's and 1930's, when zoning first came extensively into practice.

Local zoning controls were a reasonable and generally beneficial innovation when communities faced the need to prevent incompatible uses of the land. But it has become all too clear since then that they leave a huge and fatal gap in responsibility for land-use decisions that have statewide or regional impact. Local regulation alone can never deal adequately with such broad issues as the location of power plants, airports and highways. Nor on the preservation of farmland, the prevention of settlements on flood plains or the building of large housing developments beyond town or city limits but close to streams they can poison or marsh-land they can destroy.

These and many other vitally important decisions belong to the states and can only be fruitfully made if they bring to them a high degree of coherence and foresight. Some states have adopted this comprehensive approach. Others have not. The bill now pending in the House would encourage all states to do so—with funds to be provided for the kind of far-sighted planning that is desperately needed if wooded areas are not to vanish, if new towns are not to be sadly misplaced, if the building of power and industrial plants is not to be endlessly delayed by last-minute community objections, if open land is not to give way to mindless sprawls linked by highways lined with neon-lighted motels and quick-food stands.

Neither the House bill nor its Senate counterpart goes far enough. States would be at liberty to establish their own criteria or to ignore the program altogether if they chose. Unfortunately, no sanctions are provided. Nevertheless, the legislation would establish a national interest in the way the states dispose of the nation's ultimate resource—the land. It would strongly stimulate the trend—already noticeable—to substitute conscious development for haphazard proliferation, to preserve from irreversible decay a country inherently magnificent and, over a diminishing part of its area, still in its prime.

Mr. Speaker, the Land Use Planning Act of 1974 places major responsibility for the coordination of land use planning and management with State governments. It also requires that local governments play a major role in the overall land use process and program, but leaves the exact mix of responsibilities among State governments, regional planning

commissions, county governments, local and municipal governments up to those various parties to decide.

Many States have established independent efforts to deal with land use problems and are looking to the Federal Government for guidance and help. Speedy approval of Federal land use legislation destined to provide financial and technical assistance to States could go a long way toward assuring that a level of consistency is developed among the various statewide programs.

More than a score of States have considered legislation to deal with mounting land use problems and pressures. Although most are anxious to begin coping with these issues in an effective way, they are waiting for a lead from Congress—some indication of what Federal support may be available and how States may qualify for that support. Some States now have comprehensive statewide land use legislation pending; others are working on critical areas legislation.

A number of States—Hawaii, Maryland, Oregon, Vermont, Utah, and Florida—already have faced urgent land use problems and have not been able to wait for congressional action. They have enacted legislation to answer their needs, hoping it will be compatible with whatever Federal legislation is finally developed. Art Ristau, director of State planning in Vermont, stated:

The Land Use Planning Act would immeasurably assist us in Vermont, in our current efforts to formulate a statewide land use plan. Vermont's program is similar to the strategy contemplated by the Federal legislation. Federal financial assistance and guidance will give a considerable boost to the Vermont endeavor.

As States search for ways to deal with growth and land use problems, they seek examples—some form of background framework—that can point the way to development of compatible State and local programs. States also need the assurance that sufficient human and financial resources will be available to carry out land use programs as they are developed.

H.R. 10294 will provide a guide to States in the development of their land use programs and will make available—through grant-in-aid funds and technical assistance provisions—the resources States will need to assure that policy is transformed into action.

Federal legislative provisions—along with the guidelines, rules, and regulations—are intended to provide a minimum framework that States may use, with great flexibility, to deal with their unique problems. One provision, for example, suggests methods that State and local governments might use—on a State-by-State basis—to determine the portion of the mix of planning and management tasks each will assume in a new partnership of decisionmaking responsibility.

States with a strong tradition of home rule for local governments are expected to maintain that posture, while responsibilities in other States will be more widely shared. This legislation makes it clear that each State will decide its own procedures for developing a planning process. Federal funds are often applied to single purpose programs at the

State level, such as mass transit, air pollution and housing, without any central coordination for the integrated solution of these issues. More than \$40 billion in funds from more than 120 different Federal programs are distributed to States each year. These programs often conflict with one another—highways planned and built with Federal funds, for example, lead to creation of additional air pollution that other Federal funds are trying to eliminate.

Development of land use planning legislation would provide the coordinative effort required to tie those loose ends of single-purpose planning together. Under the provisions of the proposed Federal legislation, funds would be made available for establishment of State and local planning organizations, establishment of data and information systems, creation of training programs for personnel from State and local governments, development of comprehensive planning processes and programs and establishment of mechanisms to assure greater public involvement in land use decision-making.

Local and State planning difficulties become more severe as this lack of coordination and adequate funding continues. Heavy constraints are placed upon public and private development in the absence of a more orderly planning process in many communities. Capital investment decisions by industry are often delayed in the face of uncertainties and conflicts surrounding community growth and citizen reaction. Capital improvement plans are more readily made in those communities where a mechanism of management for planning decisions is functionally effective now.

The Land Use Planning Act will provide more than direction and funding to the States. It will help coordinate and focus the technical resources of Federal agency programs to assist the States where they request it. The legislation provides for a system which will make Federal data and information more readily available to State and local governments. Earth resource information from the Geological Survey of the U.S. Department of the Interior, soil and land use data from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and economic data from the U.S. Department of Commerce can be put together in a way that will be useful to individual States and of significant value in interstate planning situations.

Federal legislation also would require the Federal Government to "get its house in order" by making Federal programs more consistent with the provisions and requirements of State land use plans. Federal management actions on public lands and the funding of federally supported projects and programs on private lands also would have to be consistent with one another. These consistency requirements would give States a stronger voice in Federal activities impacting Federal and non-Federal lands.

State and local governments will better serve their many constituencies, once the direction, funding, technical assistance, and Federal consistency they so desperately need is received.

If States are forced to move ahead without Federal legislation, the incom-

patible, inefficient and chaotic land use patterns are certain to magnify their adverse impact on the Nation.

RETIREMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN J. ROONEY OF NEW YORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this coming Thursday I will have served 30 years in this distinguished body. I regret that I have to take this means at this time to advise all of my colleagues and longtime friends of a sad and painful decision I have been forced to reach. It is with sorrow and considerable heartache that I yield to the admonitions of my doctors and the pleas of my family not to be a candidate for reelection this year. I have been hospitalized six times since March 19, 1973.

I came to Washington as a freshman Member in the 2d session of the 78th Congress, fully determined to devote my complete energies and my full time to serving my constituents in Brooklyn's 14th Congressional District and the citizens of my country. I am proud to say that this determination has remained steadfast through each consecutive session of Congress to the present.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I may be forgiven if I speak with considerable pride in calling brief attention to the legislation in which I was fortunate in being able to play a significant role, both in its enactment and in its subsequent implementation with funds. Such legislative items include improvements in law and order and the control of crime; social security, medicare, and expanded welfare care; national defense measures; job and housing benefits; veterans' benefits; immigration and refugee help; and many other kindred measures, such as the approval of funds for hospitals and schools here and abroad.

I am indeed grateful for the rich experiences I have gained in this body. I have been permitted to make firm and lasting friendships with a host of leaders who, too, dedicated themselves to serve a grateful Nation.

I feel honored to have been allowed to play a personal role in more than a score of historic events that range from official inspection of the Western and Italian fronts in Europe in the winter of 1944, being an official observer at the first Bikini atom bomb test and later at the Japanese peace conference in San Francisco to more recent events that include the birth of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the admission to the Union of the States of Alaska and Hawaii.

My longtime tenure as chairman of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee which deals with the funding requests of the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Federal judiciary and related agencies gave me the opportunity to enjoy close working relationships and the friendship of the Secretaries of State who have served six Presidents, as have I. I am grateful, too, for my close relations with distinguished members of the judiciary and

Departments of Justice and Commerce officials.

I shall always treasure the experiences gained from the committee work which took me abroad where I was privileged to meet with Kings, with prime ministers, and with heads of State and other officials whose names have been and are today prominent in world affairs. I am grateful, too, for the cooperation and courtesies extended to me by so many of our Ambassadors and members of our Foreign Service at our posts abroad.

I find it extremely difficult to adequately express my appreciation to you, Mr. Speaker, and to my many dear colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the many courtesies and assistance extended to me.

I wish to convey my deep gratitude to my constituents and to my faithful political friends of the 14th Congressional District for manifesting their trust in me by electing and reelecting me to 16 consecutive terms.

My warmest thanks go to the dedicated members of my staff not only in Washington but in my Brooklyn office.

I am grateful, too, to my many friends from all walks of life who faithfully helped me to carry out the duties and responsibilities of my work as a Member of Congress.

I want my many real friends from the press, radio, and television, who conscientiously and forthrightly reported the truth and undistorted facts, to know how grateful I am to them.

To my friends from labor's ranks, to Government workers, and to spiritual leaders from all religious faiths, I say thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Having made the decision not to be a candidate for reelection this year, I find myself already possessed of a feeling of uncertainty and loss. I am unable to visualize a day-by-day existence devoid of the responsibilities and associations which have been my life the past 30 years. I confess that I have ignored leisure time pursuits and I have had little time to develop hobbies. My whole life has been wrapped up in the office to which I have been elected.

I sincerely trust that when my term expires, I can still be of service to my many warm friends and respected colleagues in this body. Until the day of my departure, health permitting, I shall do my utmost to carry on in the same manner known to most of you.

To you all I extend my warmest wishes for a full measure of health, happiness and success. This is not "Goodbye" or "Farewell" but merely "So long, see you again."

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 10701, HIGH SEAS OIL PORT ACT

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House is scheduled to consider House Resolution 1139, which provides for the consideration of H.R. 10701, to provide for construction and operation of certain port facilities.

House Resolution 1139, granting a rule

to a bill reported by the Committee on Public Works, was the result of consideration of offshore port facilities in three committees of the House. As reported, the rule, in my opinion, is completely unfair to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, in that the language of our bill is made in order as a substitute amendment only if the so-called Jones amendment is rejected. Under the circumstances, the House would be foreclosed under the rule from debating the two proposals on their respective merits.

In order to insure that the Members of the House will have the opportunity to consider an alternative to the Public Works bill outside the straitjacket imposed by the rule, it is my intention to propose an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to the Jones amendment. The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, which I propose contains most of the features of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee bill and its consideration will enable Members of the House to consider this important legislation in a rational manner. For the information of Members, the language of my proposed amendment is as follows: That this Act may be cited as the "High Seas Oil Port Act".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds—

(1) that the Nation's energy requirements will continue to increase for the foreseeable future and that energy demands will increasingly exceed available domestic sources of energy supply;

(2) that technological, economic, and environmental factors which will directly affect other potential sources of energy supply may dictate that the increased energy demand be met, for at least the near future, largely by the utilization of oil as the source of energy supply and that a substantial part of the needed oil must be imported from foreign sources;

(3) that the economic use of resources, the necessity for improving the national balance-of-payments position, the interest in transportation efficiency, and the maintenance of a competitive position in world trade demand the utilization of increasingly larger vessels to transport the needed quantities of foreign oil;

(4) that the physical limitations of present ports and port facilities in the United States render them incapable of accommodating the larger tankers that will be needed, and that it is not feasible, either economically or environmentally, to deepen the port waters and expand the port facilities to the extent required for the needed accommodation;

(5) that, as an alternative solution, the use of smaller tankers which can be accommodated in the port areas of the United States would result in substantially increased port congestion and would constitute a massive threat, from environmental and safety viewpoints, from the increased vessel traffic and the expanded oil transfer activities;

(6) that the construction of a significant number of high seas oil ports, located in areas where existing water depths will permit the accommodation of the deep draft vessels needed, will be both economically advantageous and environmentally sound;

(7) that the licensing of such ports as to location, construction standards, and operational regulations is a matter primarily of national interest, and that the shoreside impact of such ports is a matter of both national and local interest; and

(8) that the construction and operation of high seas oil ports, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, in waters superjacent to the Continental Shelf of the United States would be a reasonable use of the high seas and would be consistent with recognized principles of international law.

(b) PURPOSES.—The Congress declares that the purposes of this Act are—

(1) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to eligible applicants licenses for the construction of high seas oil ports;

(2) to authorize the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to issue necessary and reasonable regulations for the operation of high seas ports;

(3) to minimize any adverse impact on the marine environment which may result from the construction or operation of high seas oil ports; and

(4) to insure that all reasonable precautions are taken to protect the national interests of the United States in the construction and operation of high seas oil ports and to protect the national and local interests involved in the impact of such construction and operation on adjacent coastal States.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) "High seas oil port" or "oil port" means, in a structural sense, any complex, consisting of a permanently sited structure or structures, located in, or subjacent to, the offshore coastal waters of the United States, operated as a means for the unloading and further handling of petroleum or petroleum products for transshipment to the United States. The term includes all necessary components, such as vessel mooring facilities, storage facilities, cargo hose systems, pumping stations, operational platforms, pipelines, and their associated equipment and appurtenances. The term also includes any pipeline segment, lying in or subjacent to the territorial sea of the United States, designed to connect a component of the oil port to facilities located landward of the base line from which the territorial sea is measured. In a geographical sense, a high seas oil port shall consist of a circular zone, the center of which is the port reference point, and the diameter of which is not less than two, and not more than four nautical miles.

(b) "Offshore coastal waters of the United States" means the high seas, outside the territorial sea, superjacent to the Continental Shelf of the United States, as the latter term is delineated by the provisions of article 1 of the Convention on the Continental Shelf (15 U.S.T. 471; TIAS 5578).

(c) "United States" or "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(d) "Coastal State" means any State in, or bordering on, the Atlantic, Pacific, or Arctic Ocean, or Gulf of Mexico.

(e) "Adjacent coastal State" means, as to a high seas oil port (either existing or proposed), a coastal State any point of which lies within ten miles of the high seas oil port, as that term is used in either a structural or geographical sense.

(f) "Port reference point" means a point designated by the Secretary of the Interior and defined by coordinates of latitude and longitude, located as nearly as possible at the center of activity of a high seas oil port.

(g) "Person" includes private individuals, associations, corporations or other entities, and any officer, employee, agent, department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government, of any State or local unit of government, or of any foreign government.

(h) "Eligible applicant" means any citizen, or group of citizens, of the United States,

any private corporation, or other private entity, created pursuant to the laws of the United States or of any State, or any public authority created, pursuant to Federal or State law, for the purpose of constructing and operating a high seas oil port. To qualify as an eligible applicant, any such private corporation or other private entity must have as its president or other chief executive officer and as its chairman of the board of directors, or holder of a similar office, a citizen of the United States and may have no more of its directors who are not citizens of the United States than constitute a minority of the number required for a quorum necessary to conduct the business of the board.

(i) "Marine environment" means the offshore coastal waters of the United States; the coastal waters of a State, containing a measurable quantity or percentage of seawater, including, but not limited to, bays, sounds, lagoons, bayous, salt ponds, and estuaries; the living and nonliving resources of all such waters; and the economic, recreational, and esthetic values of those waters and their resources.

ACTIVITIES PROHIBITED

SEC. 4. (a) Except as specifically authorized by the laws of the United States (including the provisions of this Act), or pursuant to an authorized Federal program, no person may construct, maintain, or operate a high seas oil port or any other fixed structure in the offshore coastal waters of the United States.

(b) A high seas oil port, licensed pursuant to the provisions of this Act, may not be utilized—

(1) for the unloading of commodities or materials transported from the United States, other than materials to be used in the construction, maintenance, or operation of the high seas oil port, or to be used as ship supplies, including bunkering, for vessels utilizing the high seas oil port.

(2) for the transshipment of commodities or materials, to the United States, other than petroleum or petroleum products.

(3) except in cases where the Secretary of the Interior otherwise by rule provides, for the transshipment of petroleum or petroleum products, destined for locations outside the United States.

(4) for the transportation of minerals, including oil and gas, which have been extracted from the subsoil or seabed of the Continental Shelf of the United States, in the coastal area in which the high seas oil port is located, nor

(5) by carriers of petroleum or petroleum products, unless such carriers are equipped with collision avoidance radar systems which meet or exceed such systems as are required by the United States Maritime Administration of vessels built with the assistance of United States Government subsidies.

TITLE I—CONSTRUCTION OF HIGH SEAS OIL PORTS

DEFINITION

SEC. 101. For the purposes of this title, the term "Secretary" means, except where its usage specifically indicates otherwise, the Secretary of the Interior.

LICENSE TO CONSTRUCT

SEC. 102. (a) GENERAL.—Pursuant to the provisions of this title, the Secretary may issue to any eligible applicant a license to construct a high seas oil port, if the Secretary, after consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies and departments, first determines—

(1) that the applicant is financially responsible and has demonstrated the ability to comply with applicable laws, regulations, and license conditions;

(2) that operations under the license will

not adversely affect competition or result in restraint of trade;

(3) that the construction and operation of the high seas oil port will not pose an unreasonable threat to the integrity of the marine environment in which it is to be located, and that all reasonable precautions will be taken to minimize any adverse impact, actual or potential, on the marine environment, including the marine environment of any adjacent coastal State;

(4) that the high seas oil port will not unreasonably interfere with international navigation or other reasonable uses of the high seas, as defined by any treaty or convention to which the United States is signatory, or by customary international law;

(5) that the issuance of a license does not conflict otherwise with the international obligations of the United States;

(6) that the issuance of a license will not be contrary to the national security interests of the United States;

(7) that the location of a high seas oil port in the area for which the license is issued is in the national interest and will meet national needs, or regional needs, or both; and

(8) that the overall benefits resulting from the construction and operation of a high seas oil port will be greater than any potential adverse impact on existing nearby ports.

(b) **TERMS OF LICENSE.**—Any license issued under the provisions of this title shall be for a term of five years and may be extended for such additional period of time as the Secretary finds is reasonably necessary for the completion of construction. Such license shall be converted into a license to operate the oil port in accordance with the provisions of title II of this Act.

(c) **TRANSFER OF LICENSE.**—Upon the application of a licensee, the Secretary may transfer a license issued under this title when he determines that the proposed transferee qualifies as an eligible applicant and otherwise meets the requirements of this title.

(d) **LICENSE CONDITIONS.**—(1) The Secretary is authorized to include in any license issued, or transferred, under this title, any reasonable conditions which he finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such conditions shall include, but need not be limited to—

(A) such construction schedule requirements as the Secretary finds necessary to assure prompt and effective implementation of the license by the licensee;

(B) such fees as the Secretary may prescribe as reimbursement to the United States for administrative and other costs incurred in processing the application for, and in monitoring the construction of, the high seas oil port;

(C) such fees as the Secretary may prescribe as the fair market rental value of the seabed and seabed subjacent to the high seas oil port, including the fair market rental value of the right-of-way necessary for the pipeline segment lying outside the seaward boundaries of any State as that term is defined in the Submerged Lands Act (67 Stat. 29; 43 U.S.C. 1301-1315);

(D) such measures as the Secretary may prescribe to prevent or minimize any adverse impact of the construction on the marine environment, including the marine environment of any adjacent coastal State;

(E) such requirements as the Secretary may find necessary to insure that, during the period of the license, the licensee shall continue to meet the qualifications required of an eligible applicant;

(F) such requirements as the Secretary may find necessary in order to insure non-discriminatory access to the oil port at reasonable rates; and

(G) such bonding requirements or other

assurances as the Secretary may find necessary in order to insure that, upon the revocation or surrender of a license, the licensee will remove from the seabed and subsoil all components of the high seas oil port: *Provide*, That in the case of components lying in the subsoil below the seabed, the Secretary is authorized to waive the removal requirements if he finds that such removal is not otherwise necessary and that the remaining components do not constitute any threat to navigation or to the environment: *Provided further*, That, at the request of the licensee, the Secretary is authorized to waive the removal requirement as to any components which he determines may be utilized in connection with the transportation of oil, natural gas, or other minerals, pursuant to a lease granted under the provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (67 Stat. 462), after which waiver the utilization of such components shall be governed by the terms of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

(2) Prior to including any license condition which is designed to continue to be applicable after the license to construct is converted to a license to operate, pursuant to title II of this Act, the Secretary shall consult with, and give full consideration to the views of, the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

SEC. 103. (a) **CRITERIA.**—Prior to the issuance of a license under section 102 of this title, the Secretary, after consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies and departments, shall establish and apply, and may from time to time revise, criteria for evaluating the potential impact of the construction or operation of the proposed high seas oil port on the marine environment, including the marine environment of any adjacent coastal State. Such criteria shall include, but are not limited to—

(1) effects on aquatic plants and animals;

(2) effects on ocean currents or wave patterns, and on nearby shorelines or beaches, including bays and estuaries and other features of the coastal zone of any affected coastal State;

(3) effects on other uses of the high seas area, such as navigation, fishing, aquaculture, and scientific research;

(4) effects on other uses of the subjacent seabed and subsoil such as exploitation of resources and the laying of cables and pipelines;

(5) the dangers to any components of the oil port which might be occasioned by waves, winds, and other natural phenomena, and the steps which can be taken to protect against such dangers;

(6) effects on esthetic and recreational values;

(7) effects of land-based developments which are related to port development;

(8) effects on public health and welfare; and

(9) such other considerations as the Secretary finds reasonably necessary to fully evaluate the impact of any high seas oil port.

(b) **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.**—In connection with the grant or denial of an application for a license under this title, the action of the Secretary will constitute a major Federal action in the sense of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 852), and the requirements of that Act will be applied accordingly.

LICENSING PROCEDURES

SEC. 104. (a) **GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to issue reasonable rules and regulations prescribing procedures governing the application for and the issuance of licenses pursuant to this title. Such rules

and regulations shall be issued in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, without regard to subsection (a) thereof. Such rules and regulations shall contain a mechanism for full consultation and cooperation with all other interested Federal agencies and departments and with any affected adjacent coastal State, and for the consideration of the views of any interested members of the general public.

(b) **LICENSE APPLICATION.**—Each application shall contain such financial, technical, and other information as the Secretary may find necessary to evaluate the application. Such information shall include, but is not limited to—

(1) the specific location of the proposed high seas oil port including all components thereof;

(2) the type and design of facilities;

(3) where construction in phases is intended, the detailed descriptions of each phase, including the specific components thereof;

(4) the financial and technical capabilities of the applicant to construct and operate the oil port;

(5) the qualifications of the applicant to hold a license under this title, including, in the case of a private corporation or other private entity, necessary information relating to the citizenship of its officers and directors;

(6) an agreement that there will be no material change from the submitted plans without prior approval in writing from the Secretary;

(7) an agreement that the licensee, upon acceptance of the license, will comply with all conditions attached thereto; and

(8) an agreement that the licensee, upon termination of the license, pursuant to the provisions of this Act, will remove all components of the oil port from the seabed and subsoil, in accordance with the license conditions included pursuant to subsection 102 (d) hereof.

(c) **PUBLIC ACCESS TO INFORMATION.**—(1) Copies of any communications, documents, reports, or information received or sent by any applicant shall be made available to the public upon identifiable request, and at reasonable cost, unless such information may not be publicly released under the terms of paragraph (2) of this section.

(2) The Secretary shall not disclose information obtained by him under this section which concerns or relates to a trade secret referred to in section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, except that such information—

(A) shall be disclosed,

(1) upon request, on a confidential basis, to a committee of Congress having jurisdiction over the subject matter to which the information relates, and

(ii) in any judicial proceedings under a court order formulated to preserve the confidentiality of such information without impairing the proceedings; and

(B) may be disclosed,

(1) upon request, on a confidential basis, to another Federal department or agency, and

(ii) to the public in order to protect public health and safety after notice and opportunity for comment in writing, or for discussion in closed session within fifteen days, by the party from which the information was obtained (if the delay resulting from such notice and opportunity for comment or discussion would not be detrimental to the public health and safety).

(3) Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to require the release of any information described by subsection (b) of section 552 of title 5, United States Code, or which is otherwise protected by law from disclosure to the public.

(d) **AGENCY CONSULTATION.**—(1) Notwith-

standing any other provision of law, an application filed with the Secretary for a license under this title shall constitute an application for all Federal authorizations required for construction of a high seas oil port. The Secretary will furnish a copy of the application to all other Federal departments or agencies which would otherwise have permit authority over any aspect of the proposed construction and shall insure that the application contains all the information which would have otherwise been required by those agencies.

(2) Upon receipt of its copy of the application, each department or agency involved shall review the information contained therein and, based upon legal considerations within its area of responsibility, recommend to the Secretary the approval or disapproval of the application. In any case in which a department or agency recommends disapproval, it shall set out in detail the manner in which the application does not comply with any law or regulation within its area of responsibility and shall notify the Secretary how the application may be amended so as to bring it into compliance with the law or regulation involved. The failure of any department or agency to forward its recommendation to the Secretary within sixty days after receiving a copy of the application shall be conclusively presumed as a recommendation by that department or agency that the application be approved.

(e) COORDINATION WITH ADJACENT COASTAL STATES.—(1) Prior to issuing a license under this title, the Secretary shall consult with, and give full consideration to the views of, the responsible officials of any adjacent coastal State.

(2) When an adjacent coastal State has an existing State program controlling, or other legislative requirements related to, land or water uses, upon which the construction of a high seas oil port will have a direct impact, the applicant shall include, in his application to the Secretary, a certification that in the applicant's best judgment the issuance of the license applied for would be consistent with applicable State requirements. At the same time, the applicant shall furnish to the appropriate State officials a copy of the certification, with all necessary information and data. After completion of its established procedures for the consideration of such matters, the State involved shall, at the earliest practicable time, notify the Secretary that the State concurs with, or disagrees with, the applicant's certification, and in case of disagreement, the State shall specify the manner in which the certification is in error. The State shall also indicate how the application may be brought into compliance with State requirements, if such compliance is possible. In the event that the State fails to furnish the required notification of concurrence or disagreement, within six months after receipt of its copy of the applicant's certification, the State's concurrence with the certification shall be conclusively presumed. The Secretary may not grant a license under this title until the State has concurred with the application or until, by its failure to act, the State's concurrence is conclusively presumed.

(3) In addition to following the procedures outlined in paragraph (2) thereof, the Secretary shall also take into account the views of appropriate officials of any State which will be indirectly affected by the issuance of a license under this title, to the extent that the overall project will have a secondary impact on that State because of needs related to the addition or expansion of supporting landside facilities or the furnishing of expanded services.

(f) NOTICES, HEARINGS, AND REVIEW.—(1) Within thirty days after receipt of an application filed under subsection (b) hereof, and prior to granting any license, the Secretary

shall publish in the Federal Register a notice containing a summary of the application and information as to where the application and supporting data required by subsection (b) may be examined, allowing interested persons at least sixty days for the submission of written data, views, or arguments relevant to the grant of the license, with or without opportunity for oral presentation. Such notice shall also be furnished to the Governor of each adjacent coastal State, and the Secretary shall utilize such additional methods as he deems reasonable to inform interested persons and groups about the proceeding and to invite comments therefrom. Each such publication shall provide for a hearing or hearings which shall take place in the adjacent coastal State. After the completion of all hearings, the presiding officer shall submit to the Secretary a report of his findings and recommendations, and the participants in the hearings shall have an opportunity to comment thereon.

(2) The Secretary's decision granting or denying the license shall be in writing and shall be made within one hundred and twenty days following the conclusion of all hearings. The decision shall include a discussion of the issues raised in the proceeding and his conclusions thereon and findings on the issues of fact considered at any hearing. The decision shall be accompanied by the environmental impact statement as required by section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(3) Judicial review of the Secretary's decision shall be in accordance with sections 701-706 of title 5, United States Code. A person shall be deemed to be aggrieved by agency action within the meaning of this Act if he—

(A) has participated in the administrative proceedings before the Secretary (or if he did not so participate, he can show that his failure to do so was caused by the Secretary's failure to provide the notice required by this subsection) and

(B) is adversely affected by the agency action or asserts an interest and speaks knowingly for the environmental values asserted to be involved in the suit.

SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION OF LICENSE TO CONSTRUCT

SEC. 105. (a) Whenever a licensee, holding a license to construct, fails to comply with any applicable provision of this title or any applicable rule, regulation, restriction, or condition issued or imposed by the Secretary under the authority of this title, the Attorney General, at the request of the Secretary, may file an appropriate action in the United States district court nearest to the location of the high seas oil port to be constructed or in the district in which the licensee resides or may be found, to—

(1) suspend operations under the license; or

(2) if such failure is knowing and continues for a period of thirty days after the Secretary mails notification of such failure by registered letter to the licensee at his record post office address, revoke such license.

(b) When the licensee's failure to comply, in the judgment of the Secretary, creates a serious threat to the environment, the Secretary, in lieu of the action authorized under subsection (a), may suspend operations under the license forthwith and notify the licensee accordingly. Such suspension shall constitute final agency action for the purposes of section 704 of title 5, United States Code.

CERTIFICATION OF COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 106. (a) Upon completion of construction of a high seas oil port, the licensee shall notify the Secretary of such completion and of his readiness to commence operation of the oil port. Upon receipt of such notification, the Secretary shall cause an inspection

to be made to assure himself that the licensee has completed construction in accordance with the license including the conditions specified by the Secretary under section 102 of this title. If necessary, the Secretary may require such corrective measures as may be necessary to bring the construction into conformance with the provisions of this title.

(b) When the licensee to construct authorizes construction in designated phases, the licensee may notify the Secretary of the completion of a designated phase, and, upon the request of the licensee, the Secretary shall invoke the procedures of subsection (a) hereof, as if the construction had been fully completed. Subsequent phase completions shall be similarly treated.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 107. There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1974 and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years such sums not exceeding \$500,000 for any fiscal year, for the administration of this title, and for succeeding fiscal years only such sums as may be specifically authorized by law.

TITLE II—OPERATION OF HIGH SEAS OIL PORTS

DEFINITION

SEC. 201. For the purposes of this title, the term "Secretary" means, except where its usage specifically indicates otherwise, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

LICENSE TO OPERATE

SEC. 202. (a) GENERAL.—Upon receipt of the certification of the Secretary of the Interior, as required by section 106 of title I of this Act and subject to the provisions of subsection (b) hereof, the Secretary shall convert the license to construct a high seas oil port to a license to operate the oil port.

(b) DURATION AND RENEWAL OF LICENSE.—Each license converted, or renewed, pursuant to this title shall be limited to a reasonable term in light of all circumstances concerning the project, but in no event for a term of more than thirty years. In determining the duration of the license, as converted or as renewed, the Secretary shall, among other things, take into consideration the cost of the facility, its useful life, and any public purpose it serves. Upon the expiration of any licensing period, and on application of the licensee, the Secretary shall renew any such license: *Provided*, That at the time of the renewal, the high seas oil port is in commercial operation, is operating in accordance with the public interest, and the licensee is otherwise in compliance with the conditions of the license, with the requirements of this title and the regulations issued pursuant thereto, and with such other provisions of law as are applicable.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 203. (a) GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to issue reasonable rules and regulations prescribing procedures under which the high seas oil ports shall be operated. Such rules and regulations shall be issued in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, without regard to the limitations of subsection (a) thereof. They shall include, but not be limited to port operations, vessel movements, pilotage requirements, maximum vessel drafts, designation and marking of anchorage areas, facility maintenance, personnel health and safety measures, and the provision of all equipment necessary to prevent or minimize pollution of the marine environment, to clean up any pollutants which may be discharged, and to otherwise prevent or minimize any adverse impact from the operation of the oil port.

(b) LIGHTS AND OTHER WARNING DEVICES AND SAFETY EQUIPMENT.—The Secretary may

issue and enforce such reasonable regulations with respect to lights and other warning devices, safety equipment, and other matters relating to the promotion of safety of life and property on high seas oil ports or on the waters adjacent thereto as he may deem necessary.

(c) **PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION.**—The Secretary may mark for the protection of navigation any component of high seas oil port whenever the licensee has failed suitably to mark the same in accordance with regulations issued hereunder, and the licensee shall pay the cost thereof.

(d) **SAFETY ZONES.**—Subject to recognized principles of international law, the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Interior, shall designate a safety zone, surrounding any high seas oil port licensed under this Act, every point in the perimeter of which lies not less than two, and not more than ten, nautical miles from the port reference point. No other installations, structures, or uses incompatible with the operation of the high seas oil port will be permitted within the safety zone. The Secretary shall issue necessary rules and regulations relating to permitted activities within such zone. In promulgating such rules, the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of State to insure that the rules are consistent with the international obligations of the United States.

(e) **SPECIAL REGULATIONS FOR SAFETY OF NAVIGATION.**—In addition to any other regulations, the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to establish a safety zone in the manner described in subsection (d) hereof, and to issue reasonable rules and regulations relating thereto, to be effective during the construction of a high seas oil port for the purpose of protecting navigation in the vicinity of the construction.

APPLICABLE LAWS

SEC. 204. (a) **GENERAL.**—High seas oil ports licensed under this Act do not possess the status of islands and have no territorial seas of their own. Except as specifically provided otherwise in this section, the Constitution and the laws and treaties of the United States shall apply to such high seas oil ports in accordance with their location on the high seas.

(b) **STATE LAWS.**—State taxation laws shall not apply to any high seas oil port or to any component thereof located outside the tax jurisdiction of the State. In other respects, and to the extent that they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued pursuant thereto, or with other Federal laws and regulations now in effect or hereafter adopted, the civil and criminal laws of the State nearest to the high seas oil port, now in effect or hereafter adopted, are declared to be the law of the United States for the high seas oil port.

(c) **NAVIGABLE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES.**—For the purposes of title I of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972 (86 Stat. 424; 33 U.S.C. 1221–1227); of titles 52 and 53 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and of Acts amendatory and supplementary thereto, including, but not limited to, sections 4472 and 4417a thereof, as amended (46 U.S.C. 170, 391a); of title II of the Act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220), as amended (50 U.S.C. 191–194); and of sections 311 and 312 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 1321–1322), high seas oil ports, licensed under this Act, shall be deemed to be located within the navigable waters of the United States.

(d) **PORT OR PLACE WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.**—For the purposes of the International Voyage Load Line Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 418); of the Coastwise Load Line Act, 1935 (49 Stat. 891), as amended (46 U.S.C. 88–881);

of section 4370 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (46 U.S.C. 316); of section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 81; 46 U.S.C. 289); of section 27 of the Act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 998) as amended (46 U.S.C. 883); and of title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (86 Stat. 1052; 33 U.S.C. 1401–1421), high seas oil ports, licensed under this Act, shall be deemed to be ports or places within the United States.

(e) **TRANSPORTATION BETWEEN STATES: COMMON CARRIER.**—For the purposes of chapter 39 of title 18, United States Code (18 U.S.C. 831–837), and part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act (24 Stat. 379), as amended (49 U.S.C. 1–27), movement of petroleum or petroleum products by a pipeline component of a high seas oil port, licensed under this Act, from outside, to within, the territorial jurisdiction of any coastal State shall be deemed to be transportation or commerce from one State to another State, and the licensee shall be deemed to be a common carrier for all purposes of regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission and by the Secretary of Transportation.

(f) **COMPENSATION FOR INJURY.**—With respect to disability or death of an employee resulting from any injury occurring in connection with the construction, maintenance, or operations of, a high seas oil port, compensation shall be payable under the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (44 Stat. 1424) as amended (33 U.S.C. 901–950). For the purposes of applying that Act to high seas oil ports—

(1) the term "employee" does not include a master or a crewmember of any vessel, or an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof, or of any State, or foreign government, or of any political subdivision;

(2) employment in the construction, maintenance, or operation of a high seas oil port shall be deemed to be "maritime employment"; and

(3) high seas oil ports shall be deemed to be located in the navigable waters of the United States.

(g) **LABOR DISPUTES.**—For the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act (61 Stat. 136), as amended (29 U.S.C. 151–168), any unfair labor practices, as defined in that Act, occurring upon a high seas oil port, shall be deemed to have occurred within the nearest judicial district located in the coastal State nearest to the location of the oil port.

(h) **SPECIAL MARITIME AND TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION.**—For the purposes of section 7 of title 18, United States Code, high seas oil ports, licensed under this Act, shall be deemed to be within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

(i) **CUSTOMS LAWS.**—The custom laws of the United States shall not apply to any high seas oil port licensed under this Act, but all foreign articles to be used in the construction of any such high seas oil port, including any component thereof, shall first be made subject to a consumption entry in the United States and all applicable duties and taxes, which would be imposed upon or by reason of their importation if they were imported for consumption in the United States, shall be paid thereon in accordance with the laws applicable to merchandise imported into the customs territory of the United States.

FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS

SEC. 205. Except in a situation involving force majeure, a licensee of a high seas oil port may not permit a vessel, registered in or flying the flag of a foreign state, to call at, or otherwise utilize, a high seas oil port licensed under this Act unless (a) the for-

eign-flag state involved, by specific agreement, or otherwise, has agreed to recognize the jurisdiction of the United States over the vessel and its personnel, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, while the vessel is at the high seas oil port, and (b) the vessel owner, or bareboat charterer, has designated an agent in the United States for the service of process in the case of any claim or legal proceeding resulting from the activities of the vessel or its personnel while at the high seas oil port.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

SEC. 206. The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary, shall seek effective international action and cooperation in support of the policy of this Act and may, for this purpose, formulate, present, or support specific proposals in the United Nations and other competent international organizations for the development of appropriate international rules and regulations relative to the construction and operation of high seas oil ports, with particular regard for measures to promote the safety of navigation in the vicinity thereof.

OFFICIAL ACCESS

SEC. 207. All United States officials, including those officials responsible for the implementation and enforcement of United States laws applicable to a high seas oil port, shall at all times be afforded reasonable access to a high seas oil port licensed under this Act for the purpose of enforcing laws under their jurisdiction or otherwise carrying out their responsibilities.

PENALTIES

SEC. 208. (a) Any person who violates any provision of this title or any rule or regulation issued pursuant to section 203 hereof shall be liable to a civil penalty of \$10,000 for each day during which the violation continues. The penalty shall be assessed by the Secretary, who, in determining the amount of the penalty, shall consider the gravity of the violation, any prior violation, and the demonstrated good faith of the person charged in attempting to achieve rapid compliance after notification of the violation. No penalty may be assessed until the person charged shall have been given notice of the violation involved and an opportunity for a hearing. For good cause shown, the Secretary may remit or mitigate any penalty assessed. Upon failure of the person charged to pay an assessed penalty, the Secretary may request the Attorney General to commence an action in the appropriate district court of the United States for collection of the penalty, without regard to the amount involved, together with such other relief as may be appropriate.

(b) In addition to any other penalty, any person who willfully and knowingly violates any provision of this title, or any rule or regulation issued pursuant to section 203 hereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$25,000 for each day during which such offense occurs.

(c) Any vessel, except a public vessel engaged in noncommercial activities, used in a violation of this title or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant to section 203 hereof, shall be liable in rem for any civil penalty assessed or criminal fine imposed and may be proceeded against in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof; but no vessel shall be liable unless it shall appear that one or more of the owners, or bareboat charterers, was at the time of the violation, a consenting party or privy to such violation.

SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION OF LICENSE

SEC. 209. (a) Whenever a licensee, holding a license to operate, fails to comply with any applicable provision of this title or any applicable rule, regulation, restriction, or license condition issued or imposed under

the authority of this Act, or fails to operate the high seas oil port consistent with the policy of this Act, by denying reasonable access or otherwise unreasonably restricting the amount of petroleum or petroleum products received at the oil port or transhipped to the United States, the Attorney General, at the request of the Secretary, may file an appropriate action in the United States district court nearest to the location of the high seas oil port or in the district in which the licensee resides or may be found, to—

(1) suspend operations under the license; or

(2) if such failure is knowing and continues for a period of thirty days after the Secretary mails notification of such failure by registered letter to the licensee at his record post office address, revoke such license.

(b) When the licensee's failure to comply, in the judgment of the Secretary, creates a serious threat to the environment, the Secretary, in lieu of the action authorized under subsection (a), may suspend operations under the license forthwith. Such suspensions shall constitute final agency action for the purposes of section 706 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) In any case in which a license is revoked under subsection (a) hereof, the Secretary, in lieu of requiring or permitting the licensee to remove any of the components of the high seas oil port, may—

(1) order forfeited the posted bond or, in the absence of a bond, collect payment of a sum of money representing the other assurances given under section 102(d)(1)(G),

(2) take custody of the high seas oil port, and

(3) transfer the license to any other eligible applicant, with payment from the new licensee for the value of the high seas oil port, such value to be determined by the Secretary and such payment thereafter to be transferred by the Secretary to the former licensee.

(d) In any case in which a license is suspended under subsection (a) or subsection (b) hereof, the Secretary, after assuring himself that the basis for the suspension has been removed and that future operations will be conducted in accordance with applicable provisions of this title and with applicable rules, regulations, restrictions, and license conditions, may lift the suspension and reinstitute the license.

AUTHORITY FOR RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

SEC. 210. (a) The Secretary in cooperation with other Federal agencies of the Government, or not, as may be in the national interest, shall—

(1) engage in such research, studies, experiments, and demonstrations as he deems appropriate with respect to (A) the removal from waters of oil spilled incident to high seas oil ports operations, and (B) the prevention and control of such spills; and

(2) publish from time to time the results of such activities.

(b) In carrying out this section, the Secretary may enter into contracts with, or make grants to, public or private agencies and organizations and individuals.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 211. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1976 and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding \$2,500,000 for any fiscal year, for the administration of this title (other than section 210 hereof), and for succeeding fiscal years only such sums as may be specifically authorized by law.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1975, 1976, and 1977, to carry out the purposes of section 210 of this title.

GOVERNMENTAL RESPONSE TO THE ENERGY CHALLENGE

(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, earlier today, my colleague, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, addressed the 42d Annual Convention of the Edison Electric Institute in New York. In light of his long term, broad, and unprecedented experience in the development of energy and in governmental reorganization, his comments warrant the special attention of the Members of this body. His statement includes an excellent summary of proposed energy reorganization legislation now before the Congress. I highly commend his statement to all Members and ask that it be printed in this RECORD for the convenience of all.

The statement follows:

GOVERNMENTAL RESPONSE TO THE ENERGY CHALLENGE

(Remarks by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD)

I am pleased to participate in this 42nd annual convention of the Edison Electric Institute.

You have asked me to discuss recent activities of the Federal Government in responding to the energy challenge, with particular attention to the organizational aspects.

When serious national problems emerge, or a national crisis develops which calls for concerted Government action, planners and policy-makers begin to talk about *policy*, *organization*, and *resources*. From the congressional standpoint, this requires concerted action by three sets of legislative committees:

Policies are determined by the legislative authorizing committees having jurisdiction in the subject matter.

Organizations are prescribed by the Committees on Government Operations, which have specialized jurisdiction in creating or modifying organizations.

Resources, that is, funds, are provided by the Committees on Appropriations.

Using these broad categories, I will briefly review recent developments in Government relating to energy.

ENERGY POLICIES

In the policy area, the Government has been caught with its plans down. The oil embargo found a nation unprepared. Uncertainties, delays, lacks of information, and failure of leadership has been shown. The fact that the President is entangled in the Watergate affair makes things that much worse, and the public distrust of Government spills over to the Congress.

Crystallization of policy issues in the Congress is difficult, even in the best of times, since many regional, economic, social, and political interests are represented. Also, energy is one of those concepts which reaches into practically every committee's jurisdiction, whether it be foreign affairs, national defense, taxation, atomic energy, space exploration, public lands public works, water resources, agriculture, commerce, Government organization, small business—or what have you.

So far, there has been more sound and fury than hard policy being hammered on the legislative anvil. The output is not impressive. We have an Alaska Pipeline Act, which the President wanted very much; an Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act, which the President said he did not want; and a few energy conservation measures, such as year-

round daylight saving time and the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit on highways.

A comprehensive bill for emergency energy authority, including rationing, was passed after long and bitter controversy about price rollbacks and other issues, but it failed to survive a Presidential veto. A small piece of that omnibus legislation, directed to temporary relaxation of air quality standards, was passed as a separate bill and is now in conference between the House and Senate. Rationing and rollback appear to be dead issues.

The Administration never wanted rationing of fuels and energy, and the Congress has not explicitly authorized it. There is, however, a contingency plan for rationing which would require 17,000 persons to administer at a cost of \$1.5 billion or more a year. (For \$1.5 billion we can build nuclear generating capacity to produce the equivalent of 50 million barrels of oil each year or 1.5 billion barrels over the lifetimes of the plants.)

Without waiting for congressional authorization, the Federal Energy Office spent \$12 million for a three-month supply of ration coupons (4.8 billion coupons). Somebody discovered that the coupons will work in a dollar-bill change machine. The FEO claims that the coupons are still good because they would be worth more than a dollar in the open market.

The big oil companies, which have been showing big profits in their income statements, are not very popular these days. The public suspects that the shortages were largely contrived. The Committee on Ways and Means is developing tax legislation which will bite more deeply into oil company profits. This week, the Committee on Rules will consider whether to break a long-standing precedent which bars floor amendments for tax bills. If floor amendments are permitted, we may anticipate that the tax bite on the oil companies will be even deeper. The main target, of course, is ending the oil depletion allowance.

Committees of the Congress are busy as bees, debating energy policy and developing pet projects. If a bill has an energy tag, and is not too controversial, it can get passed. For example, the House and Senate have passed different versions of a bill to authorize demonstration projects in solar heating and cooling. Solar energy has great appeal to those who dream of safe, clean, inexhaustible energy supplies. In Government planning, however, even dreams need priorities.

The more ardent environmentalists want to leapfrog into the next century. Nuclear power and coal, the energy resources with the greatest potential for the years ahead, they regard as too dangerous and dirty. They want to harness the sun and the wind and the ocean tides, to mobilize the hydrogen atom and the laser beam. Is this a burning faith in science or a romantic escape from reality?

Jonathan Swift, in one of his stories about Gulliver's travels, more than 200 years ago, told about Gulliver's visit to a laboratory where scientists were hard at work on far-out projects. Let me read a brief passage describing a project in solar energy:

"The first man I saw was a meagre aspect with sooty hands and face, his hair and beard long, ragged and singed in several places. His clothes, shirt, and skin were all of the same colour. He had been eight years upon a project for extracting sunbeams out of cucumbers, which were to be put into vials hermetically sealed, and let out to warm the air in raw inclement summers. He told me he did not doubt in eight years more he should be able to supply the Governor's gardens with sunshine at a reasonable rate; but he complained that his stock was low, and entreated me to give him something as an encouragement to ingenuity, especially since this had been a very dear season for cucumbers. . . ."

Well, this is a very dear season for cucumbers, and we had better look for more promising sources of energy. Cucumber dreams will not solve the hard problems of the day. Energy legislation requested by the President, but not yet cleared by the Congress, illustrates the diversity of hard problems: De-regulation of natural gas from new wells; standards for strip mining of coal; licensing the construction and operation of deep water ports beyond the three-mile limit; speeding up the process of site approval for nuclear power plants, electric utilities, and petroleum refineries; stretching of deadlines for meeting secondary air quality standards in some areas.

In sum, energy policy is a composite of Administration requests and legislative initiatives in varying stages of progress or stalemate. Senator Henry M. Jackson has been trying to wrap it all up for the longer-term in legislation which would declare a ten-year goal of national self-sufficiency in energy and require research and development strategies stretching to the end of the century and beyond. His bill, S. 1283, passed the Senate last fall, and is now before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where all sorts of strange ideas are being added in committee mark-up. Some of them, in my opinion, would restrict rather than advance energy research and development, and I hope they will be screened out before this bill becomes law.

Let me say this about national self-sufficiency. As a policy, it has obvious appeal. The President calls it Project Independence and talks of a six- to ten-year realization. The facts and the prospects do not justify that kind of optimism.

Technologies do not advance that quickly, materials are not that readily available, investment funds are not that readily forthcoming, and the public is not yet prepared for the personal self-denial and social disciplines connected with the drastic conservation measures which would be required. I surmise that the year 2000 is a more realistic goal for Project Independence than 1980.

ENERGY FUNDING

No one has put a price-tag on Project Independence because there is no settled timeframe for its realization and no blueprint for milestone performance. How much should the Federal Government be spending? How much should industry be investing? Last year, Senator Jackson talked about a \$20 billion ten-year program of Government-sponsored energy developments. President Nixon talked about a \$10 billion five-year program. They were agreed on one point—that the spending rate for energy R & D should be \$2 billion a year, roughly a doubling of the present rate. Such expenditures by Government will not move us very quickly toward Project Independence.

Required investments by the private sector in exploration, development, production and distribution of energy supplies are estimated in the tens and hundreds of billion dollars, depending on the timeframe. Mr. Roy Ash, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, says that private industry will have to invest more than \$200 billion in the next five years to get the energy from our resources to industry and the consumers. I have no doubt that the investment will be massive, but will they be sufficient, timely sustained? Will they flow to the right places? Where is the policy, where is the direction, to insure that Government and industry, working together, can develop energy supplies that are environmentally acceptable and adequate to sustain our economic growth?

General policy statements written into law do not help us much in setting priorities and making the hard choices—where the money should be spent for optimum effect. As far as Government is concerned, the bud-

get makers are the policy makers. That is to say, we make policy on a year-to-year basis through the budget and funding process.

I might note, in this connection, an interesting move by the House Committee on Appropriations. It combined the energy research and development appropriations for eight departments, agencies, bureaus, offices, and commissions into a single appropriation bill for fiscal year 1975. This bill passed the House on April 30 and is awaiting action in the Senate. The bill appropriated just over \$2.2 billion for energy R & D.

This consolidated bill required concurrent hearings by six Appropriations subcommittees. It demonstrates the capacity of the Congress to adjust its appropriations process for unified action in special situations. Getting the Appropriations subcommittees to act in concert is not easy, but it is easier than getting the various legislative committees to act together on a common problem. There is a move in the House of Representatives to revise the whole committee system, and to reassign jurisdictional responsibilities in an effort to improve legislative policy-making. Recommendations to this effect have been made by a Select Committee, chaired by Representative Richard Bolling of Missouri. One recommendation is to scatter energy affairs in several committees. Such a move would be contrary to the principle of consolidation of energy matters. It would also give to new committees, which have had little or no background of effort in the energy development field, unfamiliar tasks to perform. Under the plan, environmentalists and energy-seekers would be placed in direct confrontation, possibly resulting in a stalemate or other interesting results.

Of even greater concern—to me, at least—is that the energy recommendations in the Bolling bill, if carried out, would dry up the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by taking away a large part of its jurisdiction. In my view, a sounder approach would be to reconstitute the Joint Committee as a broad-based Joint Committee on Energy, to parallel the Energy Research and Development Administration—which brings me to the organizational aspects.

ENERGY ORGANIZATIONS

Four organizational issues are in the forefront:

- (1) What kind of organization is needed for dealing with short-range and emergency energy problems?
- (2) What kind of organization is needed for long-range energy R & D?
- (3) Should there be a policy-making and coordinating mechanism above the action agencies, to tie together the many facets of the energy problem? And,
- (4) Do we need new organizations in the regulatory aspects of energy?

Federal Energy Administration

The answer to the first question, at least for the next two years, is given by Public Law 93-275, which created the Federal Energy Administration. The law makes FEA an independent agency in the Executive Branch to draw plans and direct programs pertaining to energy conservation, production, distribution, and use. The emphasis here is on near term measures and existing technologies.

The Act transferred to FEA the functions of the Department of the Interior relating to the following offices: Petroleum Allocation, Energy Conservation, Energy Data and Analysis, and Oil and Gas. Also transferred to FEA were all the energy functions of the chairman and certain other officers and components of the Cost of Living Council. The authority to control petroleum prices remains in effect until February 28, 1975. The FEA itself will have a two-year tenure, ter-

minating, according to the law, on June 30, 1976.

The legislation creating the FEA, reported by my committee, was to be the organizational counterpart of the comprehensive energy legislation—the Staggers bill—reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Since that legislation was vetoed, as I noted earlier, FEA remains an organization with less operational authority than originally contemplated. It does have important powers to allocate fuels, control energy prices, gather information, and work with State and local governments on energy problems.

Whether the FEA Act is extended two years hence, depends on how well it performs and on what are the perceived organizational needs at that time. We wrote a requirement into the Act that six months before its expiration, the President will submit to the Congress a report recommending the agency's disposition or continuance. Also, the President is asked to recommend how the Government should be more broadly organized for the management of energy and natural resources policies, and programs. The latter recommendation was written into the law at the behest of a senator who wanted to preserve the option for a Department of Energy and Natural Resources.

President Nixon favored—and still favors—a department which combines energy and natural resource functions. Although I am certain that the Department of the Interior could be reorganized with great advantage, I am opposed to energy functions being swallowed up in a big departmental bureaucracy. These functions need visibility and attention by the Government and the public. They need the spotlight of national concern.

To get action, it appeared to me, an action agency was needed. To create a conglomerate department, in which energy was linked with many other controversial issues such as those involving the public lands, the Forest Service, and the civil works of the Army Corps of Engineers, would be a long and uncertain effort. The consequence is that the departmental proposal is on the shelf and an Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) is in the making.

Energy Research and Development Administration

The ERDA bill, reported from my committee, passed the House in December of last year and will shortly come before the Senate. Although there are some issues still to be resolved, the thrust of the bill is to create a broad-based agency for energy research, building upon the laboratory complexes and facilities of the Atomic Energy Commission. ERDA would encompass the present development and operational activities of the AEC and energy R & D functions transferred from certain other agencies, including (from the Department of the Interior) the Office of Coal Research and the Energy Research Centers of the Bureau of Mines.

ERDA will have a broad charter for energy research and development. It will be charged with responsibility to explore and develop all possible energy sources and utilization technologies, including solar, tidal, wind, hydrogen, geothermal, and nuclear. It will vigorously pursue all promising primary energy sources and techniques for use. Its scope will embrace extraction, conversion, storage, transmission and utilization technologies. ERDA will also assume, and continue to conduct AEC's production and enrichment functions as well as AEC's nuclear responsibilities in regard to military and naval affairs and foreign nuclear agreements.

ERDA thus becomes the central agency for research and development in all forms of energy. When established it will be the agency making the hard choices and allocating the

resources for the major Government-sponsored programs in energy research and development.

Let me add here that we need this legislation—and soon! There is in our national laboratories a wealth of talent and resources waiting to go to work on energy problems. They have no firm policy direction. Agencies with R & D potentials are guarding their chips, waiting to see what happens. The hiatus in our national effort is devastating—and I will cite but two of many examples:

(1) The priority breeder program is being delayed unduly by administrative caution and procrastination. Thousands of scientists and facilities worth billions of dollars are not doing what they could to provide energy solutions.

(2) A complement of scientists at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory is ready to help in chemistry projects to upgrade coal as a fuel. But funds authorized and appropriated for this purpose are being held up by bureaucratic maneuvering for positions and blockages in the cross-agency flow of funds.

With the ERDA organization, headed by an expert, dynamic Administrator, we could put a stop to this sinful waste of critical talent and resources. We could overcome the hiatus and put steam into the energy drive.

Of course, we must have the same kind of Presidential leadership that we had in the space program, or confusion will continue to defeat our objectives.

The Administrator of the new agency will have great responsibilities to set priorities and get things moving. He will need your help and advice. So let us get ERDA established and the best person in the country to run it.

Energy Policy Council

The fact that we will have two new action agencies in the energy field, building on established functions and resources, has caused some people to worry about interfacing. They ask: Should we not have a broader policy council on top of the action agencies, coordinating their policies and relating such policies to others which may bear upon the whole energy field?

Answers to this question take several forms. One is an independent Council on Energy Policy in the Executive Office of the President, proposed by Senator Hollings. Legislation to this effect has passed the Senate no less than three times, either separately or as an attachment to other bills. It is now, I understand, included in the Senate Committee mark-up of the ERDA bill. Also included is an interdepartmental council comprising heads of designated departments and agencies. This would be, in effect, an interagency group to coordinate energy matters, an approach apparently favored by Senator Jackson.

What part of these recommendations for a policy council will survive, depends on what the Senate does on the floor and what is decided in conference. I hope we will know the answers within the next few weeks.

Regulatory aspects

In the meantime, an interagency study group chaired by William O. Doub, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, has submitted its report "Federal Energy Regulation: An Organizational Study." This group was formed at President Nixon's request "to determine the best way to organize all energy-related regulatory activities of the Government." The main recommendation of the Doub report is the establishment of a National Energy Council, to provide policy guidance on national energy objectives to all Federal agencies, including energy regulatory agencies.

The National Energy Council, as conceived in the Doub report, would not be restricted to regulatory matters, but would

have the whole energy field within its ambit for formulating national energy objectives, providing overall guidance, resolving differences in policy among agencies, and monitoring agency performance on a continuing basis. This is a task of a very large order, and the proposal raises some interesting questions, such as the extent to which the independent regulatory agencies should get policy guidance from a component in the President's executive office. The Doub report calls not only for broad policy direction at the top but for integration or, at least, better coordination of such functions as licensing energy plants and projects. It is clear that we need to devise ways and means of cutting through red tape and cutting down on the time needed to license nuclear and other utility plants. One-stop service seems to be the aim of the Doub report—devoutly to be wished, but difficult to achieve.

Regulation in the nuclear field is getting the most public attention right now. The ERDA bill provides that the licensing and regulatory functions of the AEC will be separately administered by a renamed Commission. The House-passed bill calls it the Nuclear Energy Commission; the bill reported by the Senate Committee on Government Operations calls it the Nuclear Safety and Licensing Commission.

Senator Ribicoff, chairman of the subcommittee handling the Senate bill, is greatly concerned about safety in nuclear energy. He proposes—and the Senate committee bill provides—that the Commission be composed of three components covering: nuclear reactor safety, nuclear safety research, and nuclear materials security. The Senate Committee also adopted a proposal by Senator Ervin which would make the Commission bipartisan, in line with the composition of most regulatory commissions.

There are other proposals, too many to mention here, which have been run into the Senate Committee bill. Senator Kennedy said he intends to offer an amendment which would, among other things, require that the AEC pay the legal costs of intervenors in a regulatory hearing or review process. It seems that there is no end of ideas to bog down energy development.

You can see from this necessarily brief and selective review that the state of energy, in its organization, policy, and regulatory aspects, is still unsettled, but some decisions are being made. FEA is about to be established, ERDA is on the way, some kind of policy council probably will come along with it, and the President undoubtedly will continue to voice his recommendation for a Department of Energy and Natural Resources.

This is certain—it is easier to identify the problems than to find solutions. The solutions, nonetheless, had better be found. We all know that our growth and progress, our high standard of living, our national security and well-being, have been made possible by abundant supplies of energy. We know that our consumption of energy, no matter how prudently managed, will continue to increase more rapidly than our present ability to supply it in environmentally-acceptable forms.

So we must get on with the energy tasks, both short-range and long-range. The challenge is formidable. We must begin to mount the most comprehensive, coordinated, and intelligent program within our capabilities, and these capabilities will have to be stretched and strained as never before in time of peace.

The challenge comes to industry as well as to Government. Both must work together—and work well—if this nation is to survive and prosper. The war on poverty—to cite one of our national objectives—will mean nothing if the war on energy shortage

is lost. All that we strive to do, so that our children will have a better life, comes to naught without energy. Energy is our most serious problem, and it will be with us for a long time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mrs. GRIFFITHS) leave of absence was granted to the following Member:

Mr. DIGGS, for today, tomorrow, and Thursday.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HOWARD (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for this week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SPENCE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, Jr., for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUPPE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, for 3 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STOKES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VANIK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of New York, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HAMILTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FORD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL, for 10 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAPPELL, for 30 minutes, June 5.

Mr. BADILLO, for 15 minutes, June 5.

Mr. MOAKLEY, for 30 minutes, June 5.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SPENCE) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. HANRAHAN in two instances.

Mr. PEYSER in six instances.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. SANDMAN.

Mr. McCLOREY.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. BAKER in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.
Mr. VEYSEY in two instances.
Mr. SNYDER in two instances.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. QUIE.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.
Mr. FROELICH in two instances.
Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.
Mr. BROWN of Michigan.
Mr. ESCH.

Mr. RINALDO in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. CONYERS in 10 instances.

Mr. BRADEMANS in six instances.

Mr. EILBERG in 10 instances.

Mr. CAREY of New York in two instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in 10 instances.

Mr. FORD in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in five instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in 10 instances.

Mr. PICKLE in 10 instances.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. DELLUMS in five instances.

Mrs. GRASSO in 10 instances.

Mr. NEDZI.

Mr. KYROS in three instances.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. ALEXANDER in 10 instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8215. An act to provide for the suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes until the close of June 30, 1976.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8215. An act to provide for the suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes until the close of June 30, 1976, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11223. An act to authorize amendment of contracts relating to the exchange of certain vessels for conversion and operation in unsubsidized service between the west coast of the United States and the territory of Guam; and

H.R. 12925. An act to amend the act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1974 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 5, 1974, 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:

2412. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting the quarterly report on the export expansion facility program for the period ended March 31, 1974, pursuant to Public Law 90-390; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2413. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the proposed use during fiscal year 1975 of construction of facilities funds appropriation to NASA for fiscal years 1968 and 1971 to provide for the rehabilitation and modification of facilities and for minor construction of new facilities, pursuant to section 3 of the NASA Authorization Act, 1968 and 1971 (Public Laws 90-67 and 91-303), respectively; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

2414. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the fourth annual report on services to AFDC families, pursuant to section 402(c) of the Social Security Act, as amended [42 U.S.C. 602(c)]; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2415. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the benefits and drawbacks of participating in international cooperative research and development programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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. TEAGUE: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 13998 (Rept. No. 93-1078). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. S.J. Res. 202. Joint resolution designating the premises occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as the official residence of the Vice President, effective upon the termination of service of the incumbent Chief of Naval Operations; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-1079). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIGGS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 15074. A bill to regulate certain political campaign finance practices in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-1080). 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. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HARRING-

TON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. POBELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 15156. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for emergency assistance grants to recipients of supplemental security income benefits, to authorize cost-of-living increases in such benefits and in State supplementary payments, to prevent reductions in such benefits because of social security benefit increases, to provide reimbursement to States for home relief payments to disabled applicants prior to determination of their disability, to permit payment of such benefits directly to drug addicts and alcoholics (without a third-party payee) in certain cases, to continue on a permanent basis the provision making supplemental security income recipients eligible for food stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.R. 15157. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for emergency assistance grants to recipients of supplemental security income benefits, to authorize cost-of-living increases in such benefits and in State supplementary payments, to prevent reductions in such benefits because of social security benefit increases, to provide reimbursement to States for home relief payments to disabled applicants prior to determination of their disability, to permit payment of such benefits directly to drug addicts and alcoholics (without a third-party payee) in certain cases, to continue on a permanent basis the provision-making supplemental security income recipients eligible for food stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 15158. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide service pension to certain veterans of World War I and pension to the widows of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 15159. A bill to authorize assistance for the resettlement of refugees from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 15160. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the amount of certain cancellations of indebtedness under student loan programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRON:

H.R. 15161. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the rate of the tax imposed on tax preferences from 10 percent to 14 percent, to reduce the amount of tax preferences exempt from such tax, and to treat interest on certain governmental obligations as an item of tax preference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 15162. A bill to amend chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an election to be exempt from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, made by a minister, a member of a religious order, or a Christian Science practitioner, may be revoked; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. SIKES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. FRITCHARD, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. WOLF PAT, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. YATRON, Mr.

CONTE, Mr. KEMP, Mr. ROE, and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 15163. A bill to establish a Marine Fisheries Conservation Fund; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CRONIN:

H.R. 15164. A bill to amend section 214 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for dependent care expenses for married taxpayers who are employed part time, or who are students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HAWKINS, Ms. JORDAN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. NIX, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RODINO):

H.R. 15165. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to terminate the quota for South Africa; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 15166. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income taxation for housing corporations, condominium housing associations, and certain homeowners' associations and to tax the unrelated business income of such organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.):

H.R. 15167. A bill to amend the Hobby Protection Act to include reproductions of antique firearms; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAY (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BOWEN, and Mr. LOTT):

H.R. 15168. A bill to name a post office, courthouse and Federal office building in Oxford, Miss., the "Jamie L. Whitten Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GUNTER:

H.R. 15169. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain interest forfeited by reason of premature cancellation of certain savings deposits shall not be included in gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANRAHAN:

H.R. 15170. A bill to conserve energy and save lives by extending indefinitely the 55 miles per hour speed limit on the Nation's highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 15171. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide low-interest loans to small businesses and homeowners whose real property located adjacent to any of the Great Lakes is damaged or destroyed as the result of erosion caused by the lake, and to provide grants to owners of public facilities and private nonprofit facilities whose real property located adjacent to any of the Great Lakes is damaged or destroyed as the result of erosion caused by the lake; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 15172. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to prescribe the fee for execution of an application for a passport and to continue to transfer to the U.S. Postal Service the execution fee for each application accepted by that Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. RAILSBACK, and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H.R. 15173. A bill to extend for 1 year the authority of the National Commission for the Review of Federal and State Laws on Wiretapping and Electronic Surveillance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. HAWKINS, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HUBER, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.R. 15174. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income taxation for cooperative housing corporations and condominium housing associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 15175. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the retirement of certain law enforcement and firefighter personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself and Mr. LUKEN):

H.R. 15176. A bill to amend the Mineral Lands Leasing Act to provide for a more efficient and equitable method for the exploration for and development of oil shale resources on Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15177. A bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of assistance under that title for nurse training; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 15178. A bill to establish an office for the House of Representatives to assist Members of the House of Representatives in conducting public opinion polls; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 15179. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 15180. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act (Public Law 87-415, as amended) to require prenotification to affected employees and communities of dislocation of business concerns, to provide assistance (including retraining) to employees who suffer employment loss through the dislocation of business concerns, to business concerns threatened with dislocation, and to affected communities, to prevent Federal support for unjustified dislocation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15181. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the labels on all foods to disclose each of their ingredients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 15182. A bill to encourage and assist States and localities to develop, demonstrate, and evaluate means of improving the utilization and effectiveness of human services through integrated planning, management, and delivery of those services in order to achieve the objectives of personal independence and individual and family economic self-sufficiency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLLEN:

H.R. 15183. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the computation of benefits thereunder on the basis of the worker's 3 years of highest earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15184. A bill, emergency authorization for community development and housing programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 15185. A bill to provide for establishment of the Father Marquette National Memorial in St. Ignace, Mich., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEELMAN (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. STEELE, Mr. O'BRIEN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 15186. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of grants to assist in the establishment and initial operation of agencies and expanding the services available in existing agencies which will provide home health services, and to provide grants to public and private agencies to train professional and paraprofessional personnel to provide home health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. ROBISON of New York, and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H.R. 15187. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship on certain Vietnamese children and to provide for the adoption of such children by American families; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 15188. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the maximum education benefits for chapter 35 trainees to 48 months; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 15189. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to determine if bounties, grants, or export subsidies are paid by foreign countries with respect to dairy products imported into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 15190. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the governments of Central America and Mexico in order to control outbreaks of plant pests and diseases when necessary to protect the agriculture of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. PREYER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. MANN, Mr. STARK, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. FISHER, Ms. SCHROEDER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HICKS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. RIEGLE, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. DRINAN):

H.R. 15191. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to permit the partial attachment of retired or retainer pay to satisfy judicially decreed child support contributions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITE (for himself, Mr. FISHER, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. POAGE, and Mr. PATMAN):

H.R. 15192. A bill to amend section 1152(a) of the Social Security Act to provide that any State with a statewide Professional Standards Review Organization shall be established as one area for which a Professional Standards Review Organization may be designated, if such State requests; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. ADAMO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CAREY of New York, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LENT, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PEYSER, and Mr. PIKE):

H.J. Res. 1045. Joint resolution designating October 10, 1974, as "The 90th Commemora-

tive of Eleanor Roosevelt's Birth"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.J. Res. 1046. Joint resolution designating October 10, 1974 as "The 90th Commemorative of Eleanor Roosevelt's Birth"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. THONE):

H.J. Res. 1047. Joint resolution requiring the President to submit to Congress a report concerning importations of minerals which are critical to the needs of U.S. industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. MAYNE, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. THONE, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. HUNT, Mr. FISH, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. MOOREHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. MANN, and Mr. PARRIS):

H. Con. Res. 513. Concurrent resolution to call on the American people to diligently continue their energy conservation measures in the postembargo period; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRASSO (for herself and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts):

H. Con. Res. 514. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the price of refined petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRITCHARD (for himself, Mr. HICKS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. KYROS, and Mr. COHEN):

H. Con. Res. 515. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the banning of high seas netting for salmon; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. BENITEZ, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. COTTER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. KING, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. ROY, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H. Con. Res. 516. Concurrent resolution for negotiations on the Turkish opium ban; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H. Res. 1159. Resolution providing for a date certain by which time the Committee on the Judiciary shall report on its investigation of the grounds for impeachment of the President; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, 492. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relative to the drought in West Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, Mr. HICKS introduced a bill (H.R. 15193) for the relief of Mrs. Keith Gordon, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

440. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Cape Coral Retired Citizens, Inc., Cape Coral, Fla., relative to the Federal Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

441. Also, petition of the City Council, Toledo, Ohio, relative to community action programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

442. Also, petition of the Common Council, Madison, Wis., relative to community action programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

E. RICHARD LOWE AND ROBERT W. INGERSON: 1974 GLEN "POP" WARNER HALL OF FAME INDUCTEES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of speaking to the 1974 banquet of the Springville Griffith Institute Glen "Pop" Warner Hall of Fame recently. I am proud of the fact that the greatest football coach of all time, Glen "Pop" Warner, grew to manhood in Springville in my district. "Pop" graduated from Griffith Institute in 1889. After graduation from Cornell University's College of Law, he married a Springville girl, Tibb Lorraine Smith.

"Pop's" participation and leadership in football led to his accepting a position as coach at the University of Georgia. He later won fame as coach at Cornell, Iowa State, Carlisle Indian School, University of Pittsburgh, Stanford University, and at San Jose State College. During 45 years of coaching, his teams won an alltime great of 305 games, a better record than any other coach. "Pop" had creative genius in coaching football and invented more practical equipment than any other coach.

The Warner Museum on Main Street has long paid silent homage to the memory of "Pop" Warner. Tonight we are proud to pay a living tribute to the grand old man of football by honoring two outstanding athletes; two men we believe "Pop" would have been proud to

have on his team. It is planned to select worthy athletes on an annual basis to have as a living tribute to "Pop" Warner, our grand old man.

From his spirit has come the "Pop" Warner Hall of Fame. This year Richard Lowe, and Robert W. Ingerson were inducted into the "Pop" Warner Hall of Fame. They are outstanding men in our community and are real examples for young men and women to emulate in every aspect of their lives. At this point I quote from the program:

E. RICHARD LOWE

Dick attended Griffith Institute during the war years. When their basketball coach left for the Army, Dick assumed the position of player-coach. In those years, equipment and travel fare (train or trolley) was furnished by the team members themselves. They played teams as far south as Bradford, Pa. and as far north as N. Tonowanda. During these days of center jump basketball, Dick had two games with over 50 points—54 in one, and 56 in another. He also played on the championship team against Depew, then a Buffalo pro-team. The win was Springville's greatest achievement.

After high school graduation, Dick played town team basketball and baseball. In 1922 he went to Delevan to coach the newly-organized basketball team there.

The next few decades found Dick promoting sports facilities for our school and community. Through his efforts, the baseball athletic field was acquired as well as the high school practice field. He himself was an avid golfer and tennis player, and these sports, along with baseball occupied much of his time for many years. His interest in golf led to the construction of Springville's nine-hole Country Club that eventually led to the fine 18 hole facility we have today. In addition, he promoted tennis

and personally would prepare the courts for match play.

Dick Lowe and his wife Catherine had four children, Margaret, Bill, Norton and Richard. Following some 54 years with the Springville Journal starting in 1921, Dick received the NYS Press Association Service Award for his over 50 years in newspaper work.

ROBERT W. INGERSON

Robert W. Ingerson, a coach and Physical Education teacher at G.I. for 28 years has been selected as a member of the "Hall of Fame."

After his graduation from Chautauqua Central School in 1934, where he was outstanding on the varsity basketball and baseball teams, Bob attended the Joe Strippel Baseball School in Florida. It was here that he played with the Washington Senators and New York Yankees farm clubs.

In 1937 he was offered an athletic scholarship by Ithaca College. He lettered in Varsity football (4 years), baseball (4 years), basketball (3 years) and track (1 year). After graduation in 1941 in physical education, he taught and coached at Andover, N.Y. While at Andover, he played semi-pro basketball with the Cuba Reds and in 1943 he signed a football contract with the Washington Redskins. It was at this time he chose to marry his wife Marie instead of the bumps of the pros.

Springville was fortunate to have Bob Ingerson accept a teacher-coach position in 1946. His ability to produce champions began immediately and in 1947 the Griffith Institute Year Book was dedicated to Bob.

RECORDS

1946-47: Southern Erie Co. Basketball Champions.

1947-48: Southern Erie Co. Basketball Champions.

1950-51: Southern Erie Co. Basketball Champions.