carriers that have joint fare arrangements with Allegheny over Washington. Obviously Eastern is not going to lose Providence traffic to any such proportion of volume.

In its brief Eastern raised for the first time following the entry of the investigation order a contention that Allegheny cannot use Providence as an intermediate point between Washington and Hartford/Springfield to comply with the condition in its certificate that it shall schedule service to a minimum of one intermediate point, exclusive of New York, between Washington and Hartford/Springfield. Allegheny has moved to strike those pages of Eastern's brief directed to this argument. It is clear from the order of investigation that the Board did not intend to place this question in issue and in any event Eastern should have raised the question at the prehearing conference. The motion of Allegheny will be granted and accordingly the language in Eastern's brief on pages 7, 8, and 9 directed to this issue has been ignored.

On the basis of the foregoing findings and conclusions and all the facts of record, it is found—

1. That the proposed routing 30 to the extent that it is a rule or regulation affecting the fares between Hartford and Washington as contained on 18th revised page 26 of Agent C. C. Squire's CAB 44 will not be unjust or unreasonable, or unjustly discriminatory, or unduly preferential, or unduly prejudicial, or otherwise unlawful.

2. That said tariff provision should be allowed to become effective.

3. That the investigation instituted by order E–16614 on April 5, 1961, should be terminated and the complaints of American Airlines, Inc., in docket 12255, and Eastern Air Lines, Inc., in docket 12253, should be dismissed.

An appropriate order follows.

ORDER

A full public hearing having been held in the above-entitled proceeding, and, upon consideration of the record, there having been issued an initial decision containing findings and conclusions which is attached hereto and made a part hereof:

It is Ordered—

1. That the tariff provision of Allegheny Airlines, Inc., containing the proposed routing 30, to the extent that it is a rule or regulation affecting the fares between Hartford and Washington as contained on 18th revised page 26 of Agent C. C. Squire's CAB No. 44, be allowed to become effective;

2. That the investigation instituted by order E–16614 on April 5, 1961, be terminated;

3. That the complaints of American Airlines, Inc., in docket 12255, and Eastern Air Lines, Inc., in docket 12253, be dismissed.

[United States of America, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., Order 71–4–119]

ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT

Adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board at its office in Washington, D.C., on the 19th day of April, 1971.

Fare and routing changes proposed by American Airlines, Inc., Docket 23228.

By tariff revisions [1] marked to become effective on April 25, 1971, American Airlines, Inc. (American) proposes to revise its fares and applicable routings between Los Angeles and Little Rock. Presently American publishes two local fares, one applying to direct service, and a second applicable via Memphis at a level equal to the Los Angeles-Memphis fare. American's proposal would cancel the second-level fare and routing and apply the direct fare to service via Memphis.

United Air Lines, Inc., (United) has filed a complaint urging suspension and investigation of the proposal, alleging that charging the direct-route fare for service via Memphis would cause substantial revenue losses for both American and United, since it would undercut both existing joint fares which apply for services connecting at Memphis and the direct Memphis-Los Angeles fares. United is concerned that Memphis-bound passengers would purchase the lower-priced Little Rock ticket and deplane at Memphis, either destroying or reselling the remaining Memphis-Little Rock ticket coupon and saving $6.48 in coach service. United maintains that it could lose $150,000 in revenue in the Memphis market if all its passengers used the lower Little Rock-Los Angeles joint fares it would be forced to establish.

American has not answered United's complaint.

Upon consideration of all relevant matters, the Board finds that the complaint does not set forth facts sufficient to warrant suspension, and consequently the request therefor will be denied. This matter is already under investigation in Phase 9 of the *Domestic Passenger-Fare Investigation*.

We recognize that the proposal will result in an anomaly in the fare structure, in that Little Rock-Los Angeles passengers traveling via Memphis will pay less than Memphis-Los Angeles passengers. On the other hand, it will result in additional service alternatives for Little Rock passengers at the direct-route fare.

American's proposal will, as alleged, make it possible for a Los Angeles-Memphis passenger to purchase a lower-priced Los Angeles-Little Rock ticket for his transportation. However, we are not persuaded that abuse of this sort will occur in significant degree. In any event, if such abuse should occur, we would expect that American would take appropriate measures to curtail it, since it likewise has an interest in preserving its revenues from service to Memphis.

Accordingly, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and particularly sections 204, 403, 404, and 1002 thereof,

It is ordered that:

1. The complaint of United Air Lines, Inc., in Docket 23228 is dismissed; and

2. A copy of this order be served upon American Airlines, Inc., and United Air Lines, Inc.

This order shall be published in the Federal Register.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board:

HARRY J. ZINK,
Secretary.

---

[1] Revisions to Airline Tariff Publishers, Inc., Agent, Tariff C.A.B. Nos. 99 and 136.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, February 14, 1974*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path.—Psalms 119: 105.

O God and Father of us all, guardian of our pilgrim way and guide of our spirits through life, for this moment we would turn away from the clamor of a busy world to lift our hearts unto Thee that we may discern more clearly Thy will for us and for our Nation. Cleanse Thou our minds, strengthen our souls, give us wisdom, and make us ready for the responsibilities of these disturbing days.

Thy love divine hath led us in the past;
In this free land by Thee our lot is cast;
Be Thou our ruler, guardian, guide, and stay,
Thy word our law, Thy paths our chosen way.

In the spirit of Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, we pray. 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.

REQUEST TO TRANSFER CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Consent Calendar rule, clause 4, rule XIII, may be transferred from Monday, February 18, to Tuesday, February 19, 1974.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY OF INTERNATIONAL AIR TRAVEL BY GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

(Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under clause 8 of House rule XI, the Committee on Government Operations has jurisdiction over studying the operations of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency. In the fall of 1970, the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, which I chair, began a study of the economy and efficiency of international air travel by Government officials. We found that the Department of Defense travelers—both civilian and military—were transported by the U.S. international air carriers at substantially lower rates than were the official travelers of the nondefense agencies. Efforts had been made over the years to obtain the lower rates for all U.S. Government official travelers but to no avail.

By unanimous vote, the House Committee on Government Operations approved and adopted our report entitled "Economy and Efficiency of International Air Travel by Government Officials," House Report No. 93–599, October 19, 1973. In the report it was recommended that:

In view of the progress made during the course of the subcommittee's study—though

tardily in most instances—the Committee's recommendations are limited to the following:

1. The Administrator of the General Services Administration should immediately issue appropriate policy directives to permit the Department of Defense to place a chartered air shuttle system into operation and require the Government's official travelers to use such system except when use of other means of overseas transportation are specifically justified on individual travel authorization and individually approved by the Head of the Department or Agency concerned.

2. The Secretary of Defense should—immediately upon receipt of a delegation of authority from the Administrator of the General Services Administration—direct its Military Airlift Command to establish and operate, under charter, a worldwide air shuttle system for the overseas transportation of all official overseas travelers.

In concluding our 1972 hearings on this subject, I urged officials of the General Services Administration to again attempt to negotiate fair and equitable rates with the scheduled airlines. I also asked the Comptroller General to determine whether the procedures followed by the Civil Aeronautics Board in determining special Department of Defense rates were adequate to produce a fair and equitable return for the airlines. Subsequently, I was advised that the special Department of Defense rates are in reality adequate to provide efficient carriers with an opportunity to earn 10.5 percent profit on this segment of their business.

Officials of the General Services Administration testified, during our 1973 hearings, that neither of the two larger U.S. international air carriers would consider lower rates for the Government's nondefense business in spite of the fact that many elements of their costs—such as travel agency commissions, special promotional advertising cost, credit card fees, and billing costs—are not attributable to Government passengers. Thus, it became necessary for our Government to look for other more efficient and more economical methods of transporting its official travelers.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that officials of the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, the Department of State, and other agencies heavily involved in U.S. overseas operations—through mutual cooperation with one another—have developed a system for the mass transportation of all official overseas Government travelers. The airlift system—the initial phase of which will commence by May 1, 1974—will reduce the cost to the Government in transporting our overseas travelers from 7½ to 2½ cents per passenger-mile for the initial long leg of the travelers' journey. The Department of Defense computers estimate that the savings to the American taxpayers will be $20 to $30 million per year—each and every year.

During the past 14 years, the Department of Defense has contracted with certified U.S. air carriers—at rates set by the Civil Aeronautics Board—for plane load transportation of its civilian and military travelers and their dependents from the east and west coasts of the United States to appropriate points overseas. This system is now being expanded to include all Government official travelers and their dependents.

Essentially what this means is that official Government travelers will be transported in planeload groups between, say Dulles Airport and major airports overseas such as London, Frankfurt, Madrid, Rome, Athens, Istanbul, Ankara, Tokyo, Hong Kong, Saigon, Bangkok, Panama, and San Juan. Many of the Government's travelers are traveling on official business to these precise points. Others may be going to other nearby cities in connection with their official duties. In those cases, they will be transported to one of the foregoing major airports—at a cost of 2½ cents per passenger-mile—from which they will proceed to their final destination on regularly scheduled flights at regular commercial rates. For example, a State Department official assigned to Oslo, Norway, would be transported to London, England—3,658 miles—at 2½ cents per mile—on the governmental air shuttle at which point he would transfer to PanAm flight 102 and continue on to Oslo—730 miles, at 7½ cents per mile. Should this official instead be assigned to Moscow, why, of course, he could connect with a PanAm flight from London to Moscow. Currently, our Government is paying $291 to transport this State Department official to Oslo. Under the expanded Department of Defense airlift system, we will be paying less than $150. Savings on transporting our officials to locations in the Far East are even more impressive because of the initial longer distances involved—Washington to Tokyo equals $207 as compared to our current cost of $585.

As U.S.-flag carriers service the major overseas airports mentioned, I foresee no increased usage of foreign-flag carriers to transport our Government travelers. Naturally, I will expect the General Accounting Office to monitor this expansion of the Department of Defense airlift system to insure full use of U.S.-flag carriers.

Likewise, I foresee no increased cost to the Government as a result of layovers while travelers wait for ongoing transportation. Under current Government regulations, official Government travelers are permitted a rest stop in connection with most international flights because of the long distances involved. It is not unreasonable for an official traveler—after having flown for more than 17 hours on his way to an official duty station in the Orient—to be permitted a rest stop in, say, Tokyo before completing his trip. Here again, I would expect the General Accounting Office to monitor this expansion of the Department of Defense system to insure the utmost of economy and efficiency. After all, this airlift system has worked efficiently and economically for the Department of Defense for the past 14 years; thus, there is no reason to believe that it will not work equally well for the balance of the Government travelers.

Early during the deliberations on expanding the Department of Defense system to include all Government travelers, I asked the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board whether there were any governing factors which might preclude governmental use of chartered aircraft to transport official governmental travelers and was assured that there were not. In view of the 14 years' history of the Department of Defense plane load charter system and the assurances from the Civil Aeronautics Board, it became apparent that new legislation is not needed to expand the already existing Department of Defense airlift system. Interestingly, the Secretary of the Department of Transportation in commenting on the proposed expansion of the airlift system stated that he felt the proposal has merit and should be developed.

Equally important, during our deliberations we considered how expansion of the Department of Defense airlift system to include all governmental overseas travelers would affect usage of our fuel supplies. Simply stated, it is more efficient, in terms of fuel usage, to fly a plane with a 100-percent seat occupancy than to fly with only a 50- to 60-percent seat occupancy. Also, looking to further fuel conservation in light of the present fuel emergency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, on November 16, 1973, issued an order to permit the U.S. scheduled international air carriers to transport Department of Defense plane load charter passengers on their scheduled flights—at the special charter rates. Not only can we save fuel, we can also fill up some of those empty seats for the air carriers—but at special Government charter rates, which is as it should be.

Mr. Speaker, what it all comes down to is this: What is the Government going to pay to transport its overseas travelers?

For the past 14 years, the Department of Defense has been transporting its overseas travelers in plane load groups at rates which are roughly one-third the rate paid by our other Government agencies. The Civil Aeronautics Board has reviewed these special rates yearly—for the past 14 years—and has concluded that the special rates will permit an efficient air carrier to earn a 10½-percent profit on this segment of its business. The General Accounting Office auditors have checked the Civil Aeronautics Board review system and found nothing to criticize. Thus, it seems only proper that the Government expand the Department of Defense airlift system to include all its overseas travelers.

We also are faced with the necessity of fairly distributing the Government's business to all segments of the U.S. air carrier industry. With the termination of direct U.S. involvement in South Vietnam, the Government's business with the U.S. international air carriers has dropped from a high of about $700 million in 1968 to roughly $400 million for 1973.

Our Government has a responsibility to see that this reduced Government business is fairly distributed to all segments of the U.S. international air carrier industry. This we can better do through the expansion of the Department of Defense airlift system to cover all governmental overseas travelers.

The expanded airlift system to London and Frankfurt will be in operation by May 1, 1974. Airlift service to the Mediterranean area will commence in

July 1974, followed by inclusion of the non-Department of Defense passengers in the currently existing Defense plane load charters to the Far East by the fall of this year.

Mr. Speaker, let there be no doubt, I come here firmly convinced of the wisdom of this proposed system. I will be most pleased to explain this matter further to any of our colleagues. Also, the subcommittee staff is available for in-depth explanation of the mass transportation system to be used to transport our overseas travelers.

I will also be most pleased to provide copies of our printed hearings and report on this subject matter to any colleague who wants copies. For immediate delivery, please phone the subcommittee office—extension 5371—and ask for House Report 93–599.

ADDRESS BY DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN, VICE CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF TRUSTEES, WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS, ON THE OCCASION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF PRESIDENT WOODROW WILSON

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be present on February 3, 1974, at the Smithsonian Institution for an event marking the 50th anniversary of the death of President Woodrow Wilson.

Two distinguished Americans, former Ambassador George F. Kennan, and our present Ambassador to India, the Honorable Daniel P. Moynihan, delivered outstanding addresses on this occasion.

The event was sponsored by the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, of which Dr. James H. Billington is director.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of the address of Ambassador Moynihan, who also serves as vice chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN, VICE CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF TRUSTEES, WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS ON THE OCCASION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF PRESIDENT WOODROW WILSON

Woodrow Wilson once began an address to an occasion such as this by saying that when he thought of mankind he did not think of men in dinner jackets. This is not precisely so recorded by Arthur Link, but I was taught it by Ruhl Bartlett, and so much more of the same as to qualify as a third generation Wilsonian, studious of texts, but accepting as equally of apocrypha that evoke the spirit and the mystery of the man, as of the literal and undemanding facts. I will speak, as it were, from a mixture of both, for there is a Wilson who to any such as I still summons one to belief and disbelief and to a search for understanding of things necessary if not possible to know.

WILSON'S VIEW OF MANKIND

One would like to know, for it would matter, just what, if not men in dinner jackets, Wilson *did* think of when he thought of mankind. It is clear that once he entered politics he came more and more to think of the working masses whose party he was soon to lead. (I have argued elsewhere that the role of the International Labor Organization in his view of the League system was larger than generally appreciated, as was also the role of the ILO in the defeat of the Covenant.) He came to think, surely, of mankind as inclusive of persons who spoke other than English, and on his great Western tour in quest of the Covenant, would say so with a candor now quite lost to American public life:

"Do you know where Azerbaijan is? (He asked his audience speaking of the Peace Conference in San Francisco on September 18, 1919). Well, one day there came in a very dignified and interesting group of gentlemen from Azerbaijan. I did not have time until they were gone to find where they came from, but I did find this out immediately, that I was talking to men who talked the same language that I did in respect of ideas, in respect of conceptions of liberty, in respect of conceptions of right and justice. . . ."

It is at such points, of course, that one inclines to quarrel with Wilson: How can he ask us to believe that he believed such things? Worse: What if indeed he did? And for a new generation influenced at most by what I should suppose is now an attenuated Wilsonianism there are vastly greater difficulties of his concluding assertion:

"And I did find this out, that the Azerbaijanis were, with all the other delegations that came to see me, metaphorically speaking, holding their hands out to America and saying, 'You are the disciples and leaders of the free world; can't you come and help us?' "

I suppose there are among us those who would be willing to advise the Azerbaijanis on the correct pricing policies for crude oil, but for the rest . . . no, we fall back in disbelief. Even such as I do, who were taught, if anything, to move forward in acceptance.

What then does it matter what he thought of mankind? It matters because therein resides the essence of his quest for legitimacy in the world order, a quest which still eludes us, and which, if I am not altogether wrong, honesty requires that we acknowledge cannot any longer be successfully pursued in Wilsonian terms.

There is no mystery *here*. Wilson's was a profoundly optimistic, Christian view of man's condition. His vision of a world order was a religious vision: of the natural goodness of man prevailing through the Holy Ghost of reason. That it were Calvinist I will not contest; the distinctions are small, given the gulf between belief and disbelief, and it was neither reformed nor unreformed in its fundamentally Christian conviction that such visions are not in fact attained on earth. Or at very least, in its susceptibility to such conviction.

THE PUEBLO SPEECH

We gather on the anniversary of his death in Washington in 1924, but of course he died in the public sense on his way back from Pueblo, Colorado, on the night of September 25th, 1919. He was only once ever again to speak in public, on Armistice Day in 1924, a few weeks before the final end. The Pueblo speech is to be reread: the last of that Western tour. It is surely a premonition, an evocation almost, of death. A speech from the Cross. A speech to be sure by a Presbyterian St. Jerome, contesting texts to the very end, but a Passion withal. It is a premonition of his own death, and a prophesy, I suppose, of the death of the Western civilization that would not be saved, excepting always that those who believed would be saved, the City would not be saved: the City would be lost now to war and rumors of war.

The Biblican iambic, the New Testament ecstacy in that extempore speech are as moving as anything in the language of the American presidency:

"Again and again, my fellow citizens, mothers who lost their sons in France have come to me and, taking my hand, have shed tears upon it not only, but they have added, 'God bless you, Mr. President!' Why, my fellow citizens, should they pray God to bless me? I advised the Congress of the United States to create the situation that led to the death of their sons. I ordered their sons oversea. I consented to their sons being put in the most difficult parts of the battle line, where death was certain, as in the impenetrable difficulties of the forest of Argonne. Why should they weep upon my hand and call down the blessing of God upon me? Because they believe that their boys died for something that vastly transcends any of the immediate and palpable objects of the war. They believe, and they rightly believe, that their sons saved the liberty of the world. They believe that wrapped up with the liberty of the world is the continuous protection of that liberty by the concerted powers of all civilized people. They believe that this sacrifice was made in order that other sons should not be called upon for a similar gift—the gift of life, the gift of all that died—and if we did not see this thing through, if we fulfilled the dearest present wish of Germany and now dissociated ourselves from those alongside whom we fought in the war, would not something of the halo go away from the gun over the mantelpiece, or the sword? Would not the old uniform lose something of its significance? These men were crusaders. They were not going forth to prove the might of the United States. They were going forth to prove the might of justice and right, and all the world accepted them as crusaders, and their transcedent achievement has made all the world believe in America as it believes in no other nation organized in the modern world. There seems to me to stand between us and the rejection or qualification of this treaty the serried ranks of those boys in khaki, not only these boys who came home, but those dear ghosts that still deploy upon the fields of France."

He tells of visiting a cemetery in France where French women tended American graves:

"France was free and the world was free because America had come! I wish some men in public life who are now opposing the settlement for which these men died could visit such a spot as that. I wish that the thought that comes out of those graves could penetrate their consciousness. I wish that they could feel the moral obligation that rests upon us not to go back on those boys, but to see the thing through, to see it through to the end and make good their redemption of the world. For nothing less depends upon this decision, nothing less than the liberation and salvation of the world."

WILSON'S LEGALLY

What is one to make of this? Was he right? We have almost given off asking such questions, much less answering. But this, surely, is clear. It was very late in the history of the West to put any large public question in such terms. Carl J. Friederich and Charles Blitzer are correct, surely, that with the religious revival of the 17th Century, and the wars of that Century, "Once again, and for the last time, Life was seen as meaningful in religious, even theological, terms. . ." For the last time. A half century from Wilson, official belief is trivialized to the point of contempt and contemptibility. What will be more wondrous in two years time: that the Republic has survived two centuries, or that in a mere two centuries it has wholly lost the power to celebrate that survival. But one is not to pity the Bicentennial Commissioners, if there are any left, for their fumblings mirror our general fate. Nor for that matter lament the

loss of the halo round the gun over the mantlepiece. A world without God, Woodrow Wilson's or whomsoever's, is necessarily a world without pity. Sentiment is not the same, and its origin is in fear not faith.

The world does not share his faith, much as individually we might wish otherwise; and we do not share his optimism. But we *can* share his sense of personal and national honor, his ethic of effort, his nerve of failure, his attention to the large capacities of the American people. It is the hope of our Center—his Center—to do that.

RELIEF FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extent his remarks.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, American families with average or below average incomes are hard pressed by inflation, soaring costs of living, and high personal taxes. In this time of fuel shortage and of threatened shortages in other important areas of consumption, people are having to spend more to live worse.

Last year's inflation was the worst in 25 years, striking especially hard at families in the lower income brackets. Consumer prices as a whole rose 8.8 percent in 1973 and the trend is still up. Price increases were greatest for such necessities as food, housing, and fuel.

In an effort to bring some relief to the most seriously affected victims of this situation, I am introducing legislation that would reduce the average family's Federal income tax by up to several hundred dollars a year.

My bill is not complicated It simply proposes to permit taxpayers to take a $200 tax credit for themselves and each of their dependents instead of the present $750 personal exemption.

Each taxpayer would have the option of taking the $200 credit or continuing to use the $750 exemption. However, it would be to the advantage of nearly all families of low- or moderate-income to take the tax credit.

The $750 personal exemption only permits a percentage, its size depending upon total income, of that sum to be deducted from the tax to be paid. Under my plan, on the other hand, $200 for each family member would be deducted from the final tax bill. The saving to low-income families would be substantial.

In my south Texas district a great many families have incomes below $6,000 annually. A family of four with an income of $6,000 now pays a Federal income tax of $245, assuming standard deductions. Under my plan, that family would pay no tax at all.

A four-member family with an annual income of $8,000, taking standard deductions, now pays a tax of $569. My tax credit plan would reduce the tax to $333, a savings of $236.

Mr. Speaker, such sums as these are important to families struggling to keep a balance between inadequate income and inflated outgo. Furthermore, the money saved in taxes would be channeled immediately into consumer spending and stimulate the whole economy.

I respectfully solicit the support of my colleagues for this realistic proposal for giving a measure of tax relief to those who need it most.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MILLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to receive the program for the balance of this week, if any, and the program for next week from the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished acting minority leader will yield, I will be happy to answer the gentleman's request.

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the program for the House of Representatives for the week of February 18, 1974, is as follows:

Monday we will have the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address only.

Tuesday we will have the Private Calendar, and two suspensions, H.R. 1628, Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments; H.R. 10834, Golden Gate National Seashore Act Amendments; and then we will have a conference report on H.R. 10203, the Water Resources Act.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

S. 2589, the National Energy Emergency Act conference report, which is subject to passage in the Senate,

H.R. 11793, Federal Energy Administration, vote on amendments and the bill,

H.R. 11035, Metric Conversion Act, subject to a rule being granted, and

H.R. 12670, Aviation Career Incentive Act, also subject to a rule being granted, and it is expected that the Committee on Rules will meet on Tuesday and Wednesday on these last two items.

In addition, of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1974

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

INCREASING THE PRODUCTIVITY OF SMALL FORESTS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in 1972, I was privileged to play a role in the enactment of Public Law 92-288 to further the protection and management of the Nation's privately owned forest lands. This legislation broadened the scope of cooperative State-Federal forestry assistance programs to private forest owners and processors by providing authority for an "urban and community forestry" program. It increased the appropriation authority under the Clarke-McNary Act for fire protection from $20 to $40 million. It increased the appropriation authority under section 2 of the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950 from $5 to $20 million.

The enactment of this legislation by the 92d Congress demonstrated national concern for our environment and renewed interest in the importance of the three-fifths of our forest lands which are in small private ownerships.

While the appropriation authorities were increased, no budget action has been taken by the administration or Congress to increase the dollars needed to catch up with forestry needs and inflationary costs. In the meantime, the Congress has enacted forestry incentives legislation to stimulate timber production on nonindustrial private forest ownerships.

The energy crisis has put a spotlight on forest products as a low energy conversion substitute for materials such as steel and aluminum. These materials respectively require 8 and 44 times as much energy as wood for conversion to usable products. Forest values have increased at a rate far outstripping the inflationary rate, thus the risks at stake in fire protection are much greater. The effect of inflation, of course, has reduced the ability of our public agencies to provide needed services to forest landowners and processors. New air and water quality standards require more dollars to meet the silvicultural and protection standards for prudent management and utilization of forest resources.

All of these factors evince the need to increase the funds available for cooperative forestry assistance. I note the President's budget contains small increases for cooperative forest management, general forestry assistance, and cooperative tree planting. This is commendable but the request falls far short of the needs. I propose asking the Appropriations Committee to include $12 million for cooperative forest management, $25 million for fire protection under the Clarke-McNary Act and $25 million for forestry incentives. I urge widespread support for these efforts.

If you will indulge me for a few moments, I will expand upon what I believe are the Nation's concerns in this regard.

Twice in less than a decade we have seen housing construction starts reach an annual level approaching the level needed to attain our goal of a decent home for each American. And each time we have seen shortages and high prices for lumber and plywood short-circuit our progress toward this national goal.

Impending shortages of timber and other forest based products have been forecast just as the current energy shortage was forecast. This year we have seen three independent reports confirm this status of our forest resources and outline the national policy and commitment that is required to avoid future shortages. The "outlook for timber in the *United States*," the report of the President's Panel on Timber and the Environment, and the National Commission on Materials Policy Study, "Timber—The Renewable Material," all point to the same conclusions—to avert a timber problem similar in result to that we currently face in energy, we must manage this Nation's forests more intensively to produce more wood fiber without harming the air we breathe, the water we drink, our bountiful wildlife resources, and our splendid outdoor recreation playgrounds.

The forest industries of the Nation are currently managing their forests at a much more intensive level than any other category of forest ownership and this is to be expected. Our public forests are subjected to severe pressures to provide, in addition to timber, water, forage, wildlife habitat, and recreation opportunities in infinite variety. Millions of acres are being set aside for wilderness areas. Management for all these purposes must be intensified on public ownerships. However, these ownerships, industrial and public constitute only two-fifths of the commercial forests of the Nation.

My concern today and that addressed in our legislation in the last Congress is for the 296,000,000 acres of forests, 59 percent of the total, in the care of some 4 million private owners.

A recent study by the Trees For People Task Force of The American Forestry Association pinpoints the needs and concerns of this category of forest ownership.

These needs and concerns become the needs and concerns of the Congress and the Nation since nearly one-half of our annual timber supply is derived from these small privately owned forests. All the reports cited are in agreement that through improved management these forests can produce at double the rate they are currently producing and at the same time maintain and increase their contribution to the quality of our environment.

At the insistence of the Federal Government, State laws on air and water quality standards designed for the benefit of all our people are being enacted. These standards impact upon the activities of the small forest owner and require that he modify his actions to meet these environmental requirements. This owner is not generally a professional forest manager. He needs help to create and maintain the environmental conditions required by the regulations. To prevent these air and water quality regulations from becoming an intolerable burden, private and public assistance must be available to the forest owner to assist him in attaining the public goal of increasing productivity on his forest ownership without impairing the equally important environmental benefits.

To achieve this increase in productivity without adverse impact upon air and water quality, professional management assistance is required.

Twin concerns now and for the foreseeable future are energy and the environment. Wood and its products can be produced without significant adverse impact upon our environment, and in addition, its production, manufacture and use is conserving of energy. Converting raw wood to useable products requires less energy than aluminum or steel. Also it is renewable and biodegradable.

I now call your attention to program needs as I see them.

Protection from destruction by fire is basic if State and private forest lands are going to produce their optimum of goods and services for our Nation's needs. Forest fires not only cost the taxpayers millions of dollars each year in direct expenditures but they destroy many more millions of dollars worth of our natural resources. Many acres of timberland are burned and made nonproductive for years. It is a public responsibility to do all we can to reverse the current trend toward the increasing number of man-caused fires. A major reversal must be made for we can no longer accept the wasteful destruction of forest lands.

I was disappointed to note that no increase was indicated in the President's budget for the cooperative forest fire control program. It remains at the same level as fiscal year 1974. In fiscal year 1973 the Congress agreed on a $25 million level for this program. This increase was not made available to the protection agencies by the administration. Since then, inflation has kept fire organizations from making real progress in improving their capabilities.

Another objective of the new authority contained in Public Law 92-288 is to encourage the extension of forestry assistance beyond the rural forest into the communities and urban areas of the Nation. Forestry assistance is an integral part of efforts to upgrade urban and rural community environments. In my own State, foresters are assisting town and city governments in establishing provisions for retention, maintenance, removal, and utilization of trees. The foresters also provide assistance to developers in meeting these regulations for the benefit of all who live in and pass through these towns and cities. I know of similar pilot programs in Georgia, Kansas, and Missouri. All of these activities share a common problem, they are hampered by the shortfall between authority and appropriation.

We have provided authority in this legislation, we deliberated over its merits and found them to be extremely worthwhile, yet we have failed to carry through with our responsibility in providing the funds authorized. We have heard of the billions of dollars needed for a crash effort to become self-sufficient in the energy field in the next decade. Here we have in our grasp the means to make significant progress toward the goal of self-sufficiency in another important natural resource. Will we delay until it too becomes a crisis? Or will we begin now to make investments which will help to avoid that crisis in the future?

While I have confined my remarks to the forestry activities authorized under Public Law 92-288, I am aware of other pressing needs, such as protection from forest insects and diseases. Tree planting and stand improvement also must be considered in our deliberations in the months ahead.

I shall ask the Appropriations Committee to include increases for cooperative fire protection and forest management as they begin their work on the funding process—increases not to the full authorized amount, but to an amount commensurate with the need when viewed in the total context of our budget priorities. Increases, in my opinion, are warranted to bring appropriations to $12 million under section 2, and to $25 million under section 3 of the Public Law 92-288 authority. Approximately 100 of my colleagues cosponsored this important legislation with me. I urge you to again join in supporting the appropriations necessary to fulfill our commitment.

ENERGY DISASTER LOANS?—YES!

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is an unreal quality about many things these days—an increasingly pervasive sense, as Congress can find no leadership and no consensus for action on so many fronts, that official Washington is doing an awful lot of "fiddling" while, all around it, things are getting ready to "burn."

Take the so-called energy crisis—which some say is not even there. Well, I am certain we have a crisis, and not a manufactured nightmare, though I will not take the time to detail why, again. But one of the troubles with that crisis is that, while it concerns and plagues all of us with its attendant uncertainties, inconveniences, and potential for demanding eventual changes in our lifestyles, it has not really touched the vast majority of us.

Colder living rooms, and long lines—now on odd or even days—for buying a few gallons of gasoline do not really add up to hardships and are inconveniences standing light-years away from disaster. American industry has had to change many of its ways in its new awareness of the need to conserve both fuel and energy—but it will roll successfully with that punch and, in many cases, even benefit from it; not to mention those segments of American industry that stand to profit enormously—and unfairly, unless we do something about it—as a direct result of our energy crunch.

But, here is where some of that unreality begins to come in—for there are

others, and mostly small businessmen and their employees, to whom the energy crisis has brought, or threatens to bring, clear economic disaster. In our near-total preoccupation with the larger issues—how do we become energy self-sufficient, for instance, over the next few years—and the smaller issues—like whether or not gasoline rationing would do away with those service station lines—we have ignored, almost completely, those few citizens among us who have been caught right in the middle of the energy crunch and who do face, almost overnight, economic disaster.

I speak of the gasoline station owner-operator, himself; I speak of the automobile dealer who, up to his ears in big cars for which, at least today, there is no market, and unable to get enough small cars to meet even a tenth of his overhead has, in recent months, had to bail large sums of cash into his dealership-garage to meet his "floor-plan" payments and a minimum payroll; and I speak, too, of such people as the motel and resort proprietors who, like the gas station operator, the auto dealer, and probably others—small businessmen, all—now stand to lose their businesses, into which they have put a lifetime of toil, and all their savings, sometime in the next several months unless they have some help.

What kind of help, Mr. Speaker?

Well, surely their local financial institutions stand ready to help—in many cases—but at interest rates that are, themselves, disastrous; these small businessmen that have already borrowed all they can, locally, at prime interest rates these past few weeks just to keep their doors open until things get better, do not need any more of that kind of help.

I do not know if, for them, things are going to get better or not—nor how soon—though we can all certainly hope so. But, in the meantime, they do face, at least many of them, economic disaster of a sort demanding, I think Federal attention and help. My congressional district was one of those hard hit, year before last, by Hurricane Agnes. To its credit, both the administration and the then Congress came through, promptly and responsibly, with disaster loans through the Small Business Administration.

Agnes was a natural disaster—an act of God—not a manmade disaster such as the one I have been describing. But I think it matters little, in such circumstances, from whence disaster comes; the point is, if it is important to help these small businessmen, and their employees, and if it is an economically viable thing to try to do to help them over the present "energy-bump" so that they can stay in business, then we ought to do it, and do it now with the same sense of urgency that brought relief to the victims of Agnes.

In an effort to get things going in this direction, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which authorizes the Small Business Administrator to provide low interest—3 percent—loans to small businesses to meet their operating costs where other financial assistance is not available to them on reasonable terms, and where the Administrator finds that such business concerns have suffered substantial economic injury as the result of a shortage in any energy producing material.

Mr. Speaker, I believe such relief is urgently needed, and I hope that this step on my part will become a rallying point for early action.

The bill follows:

H.R. 12843

A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide low-interest operating loans to small businesses seriously affected by a shortage in energy producing materials

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) (1) The Administration also is empowered, where other financial assistance is not available on reasonable terms, to make such loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis) at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 per centum per annum as the Administration may determine to be necessary or appropriate to assist any small business concern to meet operating costs, if the Administration determines that such business concern has suffered substantial economic injury as the result of a shortage in any energy producing material.

"(2) No loan under this subsection, including renewals and extensions thereof, may be made for a period of more than five years."

U.S. FERROCHROME INDUSTRY LOSSES FROM SANCTIONS VIOLATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the United States is currently violating a solemn legal undertaking which we were instrumental in formulating: the United Nations sanctions against the illegal minority regime of Southern Rhodesia. Since 1971, the U.S. Government has openly violated sanctions by means of the Byrd amendment—section 503 of the Military Procurement Act of 1971. Although the advocates of violating sanctions originally argued in terms of the need for chrome ore imports for the ferrochrome industry, the major item imported from Southern Rhodesia has in fact been ferrochrome. This has been a major factor in eliminating one ferrochrome producer, and creating great difficulties for others. The almost desperate position of U.S. ferrochrome industry, an industry of vital national security interest to the Nation because it produces the material required for stainless steel, has been temporarily alleviated by the steel industry boom at home and abroad. However, if we continue to increase our dependence on Rhodesian and South African suppliers for ferrochrome, and allow our domestic industry to go under, we could find the vital supplies for our national economy and defense disrupted at a vital point. This could easily happen for economic reasons, given the world demand for ferrochrome, or for political reasons, since Rhodesia is notoriously and increasingly unstable. It is ironical that the very advocates of violating a solemn treaty obligation to observe sanctions have been responsible for allowing the erosion of an industry of major importance to the national economy and our national security.

Mr. Norris B. MacFarlane, group vice president of Airco, Inc., a major U.S. ferrochrome producer, has outlined the danger to the ferrochrome industry which arises largely from accelerating imports from Southern Rhodesia and South Africa—using Rhodesian chrome ore, which would make it inadmissible into the United States if the Byrd amendment were repealed. I am inserting this important article from American Metals Market of May 23, 1973, in the RECORD at this point:

THINGS DO LOOK BETTER—BUT FOR HOW LONG?

(By Norris B. MacFarlane)

MONTVALE, N.J.—It looks like the rocky road the ferroalloys industry has been traveling for the past five years is taking a turn for the better. Domestic producers are operating at capacity: prices are beginning to firm and have reached their best levels in years. Things are looking better—for now.

The obvious reason for this resurgence is the unprecedented boom in steel production. Domestic manufacturers are predicting that shipments will top the 100-million-ton mark this year. And the forecast is for continued strong demand for steel, which should keep the pressure on ferroalloys production.

But for how long? Should ferroalloys producers consider expanding capacity? These are the questions that probably are uppermost in the minds of domestic producers today.

To get a true picture of what the future portends we need only look back six months to see what happened to the ferro-alloy industry when dislocations occurred in the steel industry.

Sure, everything is rosy when steel production is booming; especially now, when European and Japanese steel production is also running at record levels, when the net effect being to reduce the availability to United States steelmakers of low-priced ferroalloys imports.

And last year's poor showing will happen again as soon as world demand for steel eases—if some action isn't taken to curb imports by quotas, or to increase tariffs on imports sufficiently to give domestic producers a fighting chance.

Also, unless action is taken, there is no incentive for U.S. producers to expand capacity.

PRODUCTION CAPACITY LOWER

In ferroalloys, virtually all new capacity placed on-stream in the past five years or so has replaced older production facilities—primarily in the interest of pollution control. There are less kilowatts of ferroalloys capacity operating in the U.S. now than there were five years ago because of all the negative forces affecting the industry.

Stringent pollution control regulations not only have forced a great deal of capacity to shut down because of high equipment installation costs but also have increased the operating costs of controlled capacity tremendously. Greatly increased power rates, with the promise of more increases, and abnormally high construction costs are also to blame.

All this amidst prices which, although firmer now than for some time, are still about 20 percent lower than they were 15 years ago. Producers just cannot justify new plant construction—as long as these costs keep soaring and imports continue uncontrolled.

IMPORTS DOUBLED

According to the Ferroalloys Association survey mentioned earlier, imports of ferroalloys have more than doubled in volume in

1972 over 1961–66, and were 64 percent above the 1967–71 average. These figures must be considered in light of the fact that domestic consumption was only 12 percent higher in 1972, compared with 1961–66, and was virtually unchanged in 1972, compared with 1967–71.

Although imports of all ferroalloys—manganese, silicon and chromium—are a serious threat to the entire domestic industry, ferrochrome imports have created a unique situation for that product in the U.S.

In 1972, more than 40 percent of the ferrochrome consumed in this country was imported. And now, with one domestic producer already shut down, another on its way out of the ferrochrome business, and still another importing more and more ferrochrome to meet customer demands, we are forced into the unenviable position of exporting an important part of the U.S. ferroalloys business to offshore producers.

This situation is certainly not healthy for the stainless steel producers in the U.S., especially when, because of rising costs and imports, expansion of capacity cannot be justified and domestic producers will have to rely on imports to fulfill much of their needs.

Consider what would happen if, say, foreign steel producing interests contracted to buy South Africa's total ferrochrome output. For one thing, U.S. stainless steel producers would have to reduce their production rates drastically (for lack of ferrochrome), and stainless steel imports would soar. It would certainly take too long to try to expand ferrochrome capacity here to forestall permanent dislocations in the stainless steel business.

A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PERMIT REMOVAL OF A PRESIDENT WHO HAS FORFEITED CONFIDENCE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution, House Joint Resolution 903 proposing an amendment to the Constitution to remedy a grave problem in representative government that the past year has shown to exist. By no stretch of the imagination could the amendment be enacted and ratified in time to affect the outcome of the constitutional crisis thrust upon us by Mr. Nixon. But we must give thought to future times.

The problem is how the United States is to be well governed, or perhaps governed at all, when the President is deemed to have lost the confidence of the Congress and the public, but refuses to step aside for the good of the country.

Public opinion polls are the least of the President's worries, of course. But the catastrophic plunge in the President's approval rating from 68 percent to 26 percent or lower symbolizes the demise of his ability to govern with the full effectiveness that modern times demand.

The people are convinced that he has lost the moral authority needed to lead. They have lost faith in him and his administration.

Yet they draw back from the trauma of impeachment. In the absence of a viable alternative, they prefer a crippled Executive to the dimly perceived evils they fear lurking throughout the impeachment process.

The same polls show a similar decline in public appreciation of Congress as an institution, and a decline in esteem for the individual Congressman. The public sees us, 535 strong, unable to enter upon any coherent policy, unable to move the administration upon a consistent policy designed to lead us out of our current troubles.

Of course we can and must do more than we have been doing. But it is to the Executive that the country must look for leadership, for execution of legislative policies, for planning and administration of the laws.

Under our present constitutional structure, the only way we can give them that kind of Executive is by the drastic remedy of impeaching the incumbent. As Lord Bryce said:

> The remedy of impeachment is so heavy it is unfit for ordinary use.

The House Judiciary Committee is now embarked on an investigation to determine whether grounds do exist for the impeachment of the President. However much the public may fear, and misconceive, the impeachment process, I am sure that we will not flinch our duty to do what we must upon the completion of the investigation. It may be that the committee will find that the President has committed impeachable offenses. We will act on that finding. It may be that the committee will find to the contrary. We will act on that finding.

But inability to lead, loss of moral leadership, presiding over an administration in shambles, possessing an aptitude to choose the wrong aides and subordinates—all these and many other faults are not impeachable offenses. If it is not shown that Presidential complicity in wrongdoings—whether indictable offenses or not—exists, we will not impeach, and we will not convict.

And the Presidency will stumble on. Things will grow worse. Congress can do a lot, but it cannot shoulder the burden alone.

Therefore, it seems clear that the necessity exists to develop an alternative method of removing the President—one that lets the people make the ultimate decision.

A parliamentary system has that alternative, of course. When the government loses the confidence of the people and of the legislature, it falls, and recourse is had to a new judgment of the people.

In the Federalist, Hamilton described the ideal of constitutional government—the idea of a constitution as a contrivance which not only empowers but confines government. He said:

> In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men the greatest difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions.

Among the auxiliary precautions is, of course, impeachment. But the framers also structured the powers conferred in the Constitution to include an intricate system of checks and balances. Impeachment, as we have seen, is so frightful a remedy as not to be readily invoked.

If we recur to Hamilton's "dependence on the people" as "the primary control on government," we must provide a mechanism by which vigor and health and moral authority can be restored to the Executive.

The constitutional amendment I propose is aimed at that goal. It is a variation on the parliamentary system. Under it the legislative branch, by a vote of no confidence, can set in motion proceedings for a new election to determine the choice of the people.

While the proceedings are in motion, the President who has brought his administration to such a state would be required to turn over the Government to his Vice President to act in his stead.

Here is the rationale for the amendment.

First, if the President has managed to weaken his administration to such a point that Congress is willing to vote no confidence, and call for new elections, that President should not be left in office to muddle through until new elections are held. But, in order to relieve any unease that a Congress in the hands of an opposition party would use the vote of no confidence as a narrow partisan weapon to get rid of the President, the proper recourse is to follow the line of succession established by the Constitution and statute. Passing the office to the Vice President would mean that the same party would retain the Presidency. Such a step would also deter narrow partisanship, inasmuch as the new acting President would be expected to enter into a honeymoon with public opinion and thus would be a leading candidate in the election.

Second, the special Presidential election that follows the vote of no-confidence will take place in 90 to 110 days, or at the mid-term congressional election date if the no-confidence vote occurs after June 1 of that year. In practice, if the no-confidence vote occurred during the first 17 months of the Presidential term, or during the third or fourth years—in which a vote of no confidence would be increasingly less likely, because of the term's prospective running its course—the special election would occur in this 90 to 110 days.

If the election occurs at the regular November midterm congressional election date, the President would serve a regular 4-year term, right in phase with congressional elections.

If the special Presidential election is set at 90 to 110 days from the date of adoption of the concurrent resolution, the term would be the time between that special election and the next congressional election, plus 2 years—a total of around 3 years or so. Such a term is long enough to make the special election process worthwhile, while at the same time it gets back into phase with the regular congressional election dates at the earliest possible time.

Third, since the incumbent President against whom no-confidence is voted will have sat out a substantial part of his term, it seems only fair and equitable to exempt him from the two-term limitation and permit him to submit himself to seek vindication from the voters if he wishes to have a referendum on his con-

duct in office—assuming, of course, that his party will nominate him.

Fourth, while the vote of no-confidence and the stepping aside of the President is new in the U.S. system, it is by no means a radical proposal. It is common to parliamentary systems, and its development in England preceded the American Revolution. To adopt the no-confidence procedure would be a long way from adopting the total parliamentary system, however, since the new government to emerge from the election would be the American Presidential government, not a British parliamentary prime minister-cabinet system.

Fifth, we should not think of the special election as something unheard of in our system. At the Philadelphia Convention the framers deliberately structured the language of Article II, section 1, clause 5, so as to give Congress the option of calling a special election whenever both the office of President and the office of Vice President became vacant at the same time. Acting upon this authority, the Congress in the act of March 1, 1792, dealing with presidential succession, did provide for a special election in that event. This provision was law for some 80 years and, while the occasion never arose for its utilization, its existence should dispel any inclination to view with alarm this proposal.

Incidentally, the same act also appears to have intended to give the victor of such a special election a full 4-year term rather than the remainder of the vacancy.

Sixth, it should be noted that the amendment is not intended to make, and does not make, a vote of no-confidence something easily achieved. An extraordinary three-fifths majority is required. And one-third of the Senate and all the House will be running at the same time as, or shortly after, the new Presidential election, vulnerable to the criticism that they have acted vindictively or on trivial grounds.

More important than the actual removal of a President is the existence of the power to remove. This should lessen Presidential arrogance, and induce a President to consult and cooperate with the Congress. It should help check the erosion of congressional power by the President—excessive delegation of powers to the President, use of Executive agreements not requiring ratification rather than treaties, making war without congressional approval, impoundment of funds, Executive privilege. Both the Presidency and the Congress would be strengthened in the process.

Our system needs measures to prevent a continuing downward spiral of governmental vitality. A strong President and a strong Congress are both necessary. I therefore submit this proposed amendment in the hope that it will stimulate serious study and thoughtful discussion.

The text of House Joint Resolution 903 and an explanatory note, follow:

H.J. RES. 903

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to a Congressional vote of no confidence in the President

Resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That

The following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress.

"SECTION 1. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, the President of the United States may also be removed from office upon the adoption of a Resolution of No Confidence by the Congress in the manner hereinafter provided for. A Resolution of No Confidence shall be privileged in the House of Representatives and shall have precedence over all other bills, resolutions, and motions in the Senate. A three-fifths vote of the Members of each House present and voting shall be necessary to adopt such a resolution as a concurrent resolution.

"SEC. 2. Upon the adoption by Congress of a Resolution of No Confidence, the President shall relinquish all the powers and duties of his office to the Vice President, or, if the office of Vice President be vacant, to the next officer in line by law to succeed to the office of the President, who shall thereafter act as President until he is discharged pursuant to this article of amendment.

"SEC. 3. In the resolution of no confidence, Congress shall fix a date falling not less than 90 days and not more than 110 days from the date of adoption of the resolution for the calling of a special election for the choosing of electors for President and Vice President: *Provided,* that if the date of adoption occurs on or after the June 1 of the second year of the President's term, and at least 90 days prior to the date of the choosing of Representatives in Congress in that year, the special election shall coincide with the choosing of Representatives; and *Provided further,* that if the date of adoption of the resolution of no confidence occurs in the last year of the President's term, Congress in its discretion may forgo providing for a special Presidential election. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall notify the Chief Executive of each state and of the District of Columbia of the date of the special election, and each state and the District of Columbia shall provide for the choosing of electors on that day. The convening and balloting of electors at a date specified by Congress, and the transmittal of the ballots to Congress which shall count them, shall be in the manner specified in the 12th and 20th articles of amendment.

"SEC. 4. If the election occurs at the time of choosing of Representatives in Congress, the President and Vice President chosen pursuant to this article of amendment shall enter upon their terms of office on January 20 of the year immediately following. If the election occurs at any other time, Congress in the resolution of no confidence shall specify a commencement date not less than 60 and not more than 75 days following the date of the election.

"SEC. 5. The term of office for the President and Vice President assuming office on January 20 of any odd-numbered year shall be four years. The term of office of the President and Vice President assuming office at any other date shall expire on January 20 of the next odd-numbered year which shall be more than two years following the date the commencement of the term.

"SEC. 6. Notwithstanding the Twenty-second article of amendment, the incumbent of the office of President at the time of adoption of the Resolution of no confidence shall be eligible to stand for election at the election herein provided for and to serve the term commencing thereafter.

"SEC. 7. The times, places, and manner of holding elections for presidential electors shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time make or alter such regulations.

"SEC. 8. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

EXPLANATORY NOTE

SECTION 1. The language of the first sentence is intended to make clear that this amendment would not supersede either the impeachment clause nor the Twenty-fifty Amendment. The second sentence is designed to make a resolution of no confidence privileged so that it could not be bottled up in committee but would have to be brought to the floor for a vote; the difference of language as between the two Houses recognizes the fact that the Senate does not really have any provision for privileged bills or resolutions as the House does. The language would not deal with the matter of the filibuster in the Senate.

SEC. 3. The language is intended to make the special election subject to all the other provisions of the Constitution dealing with the election of the President. As with the Constitution itself, the amendment would not deal with the selection of candidates by the parties through conventions or otherwise.

SEC. 7. The section is taken from Article I, section 4, clause 1, dealing with the election of Representatives and Senators. There is no similar provision in the Constitution dealing with presidential elections, and this absence has left in doubt Congress' power to legislate in this area. See the opinions of Justices Black and Harlan in *Oregon* v. *Mitchell,* 400 U.S. 112 (1970). It is intended to apply to all presidential elections.

STATEMENT ON INTRODUCTION OF EMERGENCY PROPERTY TAX RELIEF ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would encourage State and local governments to reform their real property tax systems to decrease the real property tax burden on low- and moderate-income persons 65 years and older.

Latest reports from the Bureau of Census show that a total of $45.9 billion was paid by the American populace in property taxes during the period between September 1972 and September 1973. This reflects an increase of 51.8 percent from January 1969 property tax figures.

This steep increase has been felt hardest by the older citizen. Persons over 65 pay an average of 8.1 percent of their total incomes for real estate taxes. Aged individuals with an income of less than $3,000 pay over 13 percent for this tax, and those with less than $200 per year incomes pay almost 16 percent.

The meager increases they receive in their social security or other retirement funds barely allow the aged to meet their living costs, and the increases are soon overshadowed by this regressive tax.

This legislation, the Emergency Property Tax Relief Act, is identical to S. 471, introduced on January 18, 1973, by Senator FRANK CHURCH and Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, page S952 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Emergency Property Tax Relief Act provides for Federal financial assistance to States which establish a system of tax relief to aged persons of greatest need.

The relief, in the form of credit, refund or rebate, would generally be available, on a tier, or step basis, to households with incomes of not more than $6,000. Individual jurisdictions would apply directly to the Secretary of the Treasury for qualification for payments under this act.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 12840

A bill to encourage State and local governments to reform their real property tax systems so as to decrease the real property tax burden of low and moderate income individuals who have attained age 65

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Property Tax Relief Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS

For purposes of this Act—

(1) JURISDICTION.—The term "jurisdiction" means a State, a political subdivision of a State, and the District of Columbia.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(3) PERSONAL INCOME TAX.—The term "personal income tax" means a tax imposed by a jurisdiction on the income of individuals.

(4) REAL PROPERTY TAX.—The term "real property tax" means an ad valorem tax imposed by a jurisdiction on real property.

(5) QUALIFYING HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD.—The term "qualifying head of household" means an individual—

(A) who has attained age 65, and

(B) provides more than 50 percent of the support of a household which is his principal residence.

SEC. 3. REIMBURSEMENT TO JURISDICTIONS PROVIDING REAL PROPERTY TAX RELIEF TO LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME OLDER INDIVIDUALS

(a) ENTITLEMENT TO REIMBURSEMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a jurisdiction has established a qualifying real property tax relief program which meets the requirements of subsection (b), he shall reimburse such jurisdiction for one-half of the qualifying revenue losses attributable to such program (as determined under subsection (c)) sustained by it during each fiscal year.

(b) QUALIFYING REAL PROPERTY TAX RELIEF PROGRAM.—For purposes of this section—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term "qualifying real property tax relief program" means a program established by law of a jurisdiction which provides for eligible households a credit against a personal income tax or real property tax imposed by the jurisdiction, or a rebate or other cash repayment in lieu of

(2) ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLD.—The term "eligible household" means a household of a qualifying head of household if the direct tax burden or indirect tax burden, as the case may be, of such household exceeds the applicable amount determined under the following table:

If the household income is:	And the direct tax burden exceeds:	Or the indirect tax burden exceeds:
$3,000 or less	4 percent of household income.	25 percent of household income.
Over $3,000 but not over $4,000.	$120, plus 5 percent of household income over $3,000.	25 percent of household income.
Over $4,000 but not over $5,000.	$170, plus 6 percent of household income over $4,000.	25 percent of household income.
Over $5,000 but not over $6,000.	$230, plus 7 percent of household income over $5,000.	25 percent of household income.

(3) HOUSEHOLD INCOME.—The term "household income" means the aggregate annual income of all individuals occupying the same household as their principal residence. For purposes of this paragraph, the term "income" means net income from whatever source derived and without regard to whether it is subject to the Federal individual income or the personal income tax of the jurisdiction in which the recipient resides.

(4) DIRECT TAX BURDEN.—The term "direct tax burden" means the amount of real property taxes imposed on the real property occupied as his principal residence by a qualifying head of household if such real property is owned, and such taxes are paid, by him or another member of the household.

(5) INDIRECT TAX BURDEN.—The term "indirect tax burden" means the amount of rent paid for occupancy of real property occupied as his principal residence by a qualifying head of household, if such rent is paid by him or another member of the household.

(c) QUALIFYING REVENUE LOSSES.—For purposes of this section, the qualifying revenue losses attributable to a qualifying real property tax relief program sustained by a jurisdiction during a fiscal year is the sum of—

(1) the credits allowed during the fiscal year with respect to eligible households against a personal income tax or real property tax imposed by the jurisdiction, and

(2) the rebates and other cash payments made during the fiscal year with respect to eligible households under such program.

but, with respect to any eligible household, only to the extent the amount of the credit, rebate, or other payment does not exceed $500, in the case of an eligible household which has a direct tax burden, or $300, in the case of an eligible household which has an indirect tax burden.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) APPLICATION, ETC.—

(1) A jurisdiction which desires to qualify for payments under this Act shall make an application therefor at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulations. Payments may be made to a jurisdiction only if its application is approved by the Secretary. The Secretary may not finally disapprove any application submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof, without first affording the jurisdiction submitting the application reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(2) Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to a jurisdiction which has had an application approved under paragraph (1), finds that such jurisdiction no longer has a qualifying property tax relief program, he shall notify such jurisdiction that it will not be eligible to receive payments under this Act until he is satisfied that the jurisdiction has a qualifying property tax relief program.

(b) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(1) If any jurisdiction is dissatisfied with the Secretary's final action with respect to the approval of its application submitted under subsection (a)(1) or with his final action under subsection (a)(2), such jurisdiction may, within sixty days after notice of such action file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the jurisdiction is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(2) The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

(c) PAYMENT.—Payment of the amount to which a jurisdiction is entitled for a fiscal year shall be made at such time after the close of the fiscal year as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulations.

(d) FISCAL YEAR.—For purposes of determining eligibility for, and the amount of, payments to a jurisdiction under this Act, any reference in this Act to "fiscal year" shall be considered to be a reference to the annual accounting period of such jurisdiction.

(e) REGULATIONS AND GUIDELINES.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act and such guidelines as may be necessary to enable jurisdictions to apply for and qualify for payments under this Act.

(f) This Act is not to be construed to discourage States from establishing a qualifying real property tax relief program which provides credits, rebates, or payments benefiting eligible households in excess of the qualifying limitations established under this Act.

SEC. 5. APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Payments may be made under this Act with respect to fiscal years beginning on or after January 1, 1974.

TO REDUCE REGRESSIVE SOCIAL SECURITY PAYROLL TAX

(Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today, along with 24 cosponsors, I am refiling the legislation I filed earlier last week with Congressmen VANIK, CORMAN, and GREEN, H.R. 12489, for the purpose of reducing the regressive social security payroll tax from its present 5.85 to 3.9 percent. To accomplish this goal, the bill provides for an increase in the taxable wage base from $13,200 to $25,000 and introduces financing out of the Federal Government's general revenues.

Mr. Speaker, I have an enormous amount of respect for the Representatives of the people in this Chamber who have joined me in cosponsoring this legislation. In so doing, they have shown a keen sense of foresight, fairness, and most of all, a willingness to change a system that is patently unfair to millions of wage-earning Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the following list is a showcase of the men and women of this body who are true Representatives of the people. I hope the other Members will soon be adding their names to this list and begin to fulfill their obligation as elected Representatives of the people:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Joseph Addabbo	Walter E. Fauntroy
Frank Annunzio	Michael Harrington
Edward P. Boland	Ken Hechler
Frank J. Brasco	Henry Helstoski
George E. Brown, Jr.	Floyd Hicks
Charles J. Carney	Joe Moakley
Shirley Chisholm	Thomas E. Morgan

Robert N. C. Nix
James G. O'Hara
Claude Pepper
Bertram Podell
Charles B. Rangel
Donald W. Riegle
Benjamin S. Rosenthal
John F. Seiberling
Gerry E. Studds
Robert O. Tiernan

THE TIMES OF THE AMERICAS

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 17 years ago this month, the first edition appeared of a brand new newspaper which was published in Havana, Cuba, by a small group of dedicated and hard-working U.S. citizens. Known as the Times of Havana, the paper covered the last 2 years of the Batista regime and the first 2 years of Castro. Eventually, Castro's policies made it impossible for a free press to continue to operate in Cuba and publication of the paper was moved to Washington.

The years since have not been easy ones, but as then editor of the Washington Daily News, John O'Rourke, wrote:

> The Times of Havana is proof of the old saying that nothing is harder to start than a good newspaper and nothing is harder to kill.

Despite all the hardships involved in moving the paper from one country to another, the Times, now known as the Times of the Americas has found a new home in the United States and established itself with its nationwide readership as a truly authoritative source of news on all Latin America.

As with every enterprise the story of the Times of the Americas success is the story of people and in this case of two brothers, Publisher Clarence Moore and Editor Carl Moore. Their diligence, many long hours of grueling work and dedication to the idea of the importance of Latin America to the United States have enabled them to succeed when lesser men would have given up.

On the occasion of the 17th anniversary of the Times of America I want to take this opportunity to salute Clarence and Carl Moore for the outstanding job they have done and to thank them for the great service they have performed for all of us who are interested in Latin America and the Caribbean.

A BILL TO HONOR SUSAN B. ANTHONY

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as of today there is no legal holiday or day of recognition in this country which honors an American woman. Is not this an oversight of more or less cosmic proportions? If so it seems to me time to rectify it. A search through the history of this Nation produces many candidates for that signal honor. But, surely, the great American woman figure who stands in boldest relief is Susan B. Anthony, who fought all the great fights a century ago. When told at a public meeting that women were invited to listen and not to speak, she realized there were other bonds to break.

She worked all her life to establish a recognition not just of the equality of women, but of the magnitude of their contribution once equality was achieved. The date of her birthday is February 15. That it is but 1 day after Valentine's Day should remind us that the emotional response to womanhood should be followed by a practical act of awareness.

Together with the 32 cosponsors who have joined me thus far on this bill, Mr. Speaker, I hope it will find favor in this House.

DADE COUNTY GAS SHORTAGE

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss the gasoline redistribution order announced by Energy Administrator William Simon earlier this week. Mr. Simon has ordered gasoline supplies to be shifted from the 10 Midwestern States to 12 other States and the District of Columbia. The State of Florida was conspicuously absent from the list of States scheduled to receive additional gasoline.

It is inconceivable to me that Florida will not be one of the States to receive more gas, since FEO officials in the field have admitted that the southern half of the State is facing one of the most severe shortages in the Nation. In spite of this, Mr. Simon appears to be ignoring Florida's problem entirely.

The gasoline problem in south Florida has become intolerable largely because the Federal Energy Office seems to be incapable of adjusting the area's allocation to account for its rapid growth since the 1972 base period.

Under the present system, each gasoline retailer is required to apply individually to the Federal Energy Office for additional gasoline. As recent events in south Florida have shown, this system of allocation is unwieldy at best, and unworkable at worst. In this particular case, the Federal Energy Office has shown a talent for making the worst of a bad situation. No effort was made by the FEO to inform gasoline retailers of the need to apply for more gasoline, nor were the necessary forms readily available.

My colleagues and I from south Florida were finally able to prevail on FEO officials to go down to south Florida to take a firsthand look at the situation and to distribute and explain these incredibly complex forms to the gasoline retailers. Now we hear that Mr. Simon has decided to ignore his own staff people, as well as the people of south Florida, and send the gasoline somewhere else.

While I agree that Mr. Simon had to circumvent his own system in order to more equally distribute gasoline, I am dismayed at his indifference to the needs of the people of south Florida, and I have called upon Mr. Simon to rectify this situation as quickly as possible.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding.

I think the gentleman should take note of the fact that we are trying to get gasoline to the people in the Northern States so that they can get down to Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I think that is a great idea. We have suggested that probably would be the greatest conservation feature of the whole program.

SITING OF NUCLEAR POWER REACTORS

(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, I have today submitted H.R. 12823, a new bill relating to the siting of nuclear power plants. This bill is cosponsored by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE), chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, along with Representatives HOSMER and HOLIFIELD who have worked so long to help build our nuclear power program. I believe this is an important piece of legislation, and I want to take this opportunity to call the Members' attention to it.

The purpose of this bill is to eliminate duplication and unnecessary delays in approving sites for nuclear power plants, preserve States' rights, provide a greater degree of local participation in decisionmaking, and maintain the maximum standards for protecting the environment and the public. I anticipate that if this bill is adopted and if the Atomic Energy Commission establishes a program of licensing reactors simultaneously with site selection by individual States, we may reduce the time required to get a nuclear power plant on the line by from 1 to 2 years.

In addition to transferring all nonnuclear decisions in choosing the locations for nuclear power plants to the individual participating States, the bill encourages the predesignation of approved sites for nuclear plants by the States, thus eliminating unnecessary litigation and delay in powerplant siting.

The bill also encourages the formation of interstate compacts wherein a group of contiguous States who may agree to act as a single governmental unit in locating nuclear powerplants and cooperating with the Atomic Energy Commission. Studies of possible future nuclear power parks are also proposed in the bill. Such parks might include several nuclear powerplants, along with nuclear fuel fabricating and reprocessing facilities and storage facilities for nuclear wastes.

The entire emphasis on this bill is to transfer as much authority as possible to the States. However, the States must agree to meet all of the safety and environmental standards of the AEC and to act promptly and decisively on requests by utilities for nuclear powerplant sites. This bill, if it becomes law, will save substantial time and considerable sums of money in getting nuclear powerplants on the line, thus helping in the long run to relieve the energy crisis. It will preserve States' rights, protect the environment,

reduce the cost of electrical power, and increase the reliability of utility systems.

PAY INCREASE RECOMMENDED FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the tremendous amount of the people's business that was not accomplished this week and the unburdensome schedule for next week, including two bills on the program for next week on which rules *have not even* been granted, I would suggest that Members of the House give a second thought and a second look at the 25-percent pay increase that has been recommended for them by President Nixon, and which may well go into effect without ever having been voted upon by Members of Congress.

That leads me to another observation and that is the groaning and crying and weeping in Congress, especially in the House of Representatives, about the power wielded by the President, the usurpation of power on the part of the President and the delegated powers to the President. It was this House and the other body which gave him the authority to determine pay increases for Members of Congress.

It seems to me the least the Members of the House of Representatives can do to demonstrate responsibility is to vote up or down on the issue of whether they get a 25-percent pay increase before the expiration of 30 days from the date the President recommended the pay increase.

On the basis of accomplishment since this session opened the Members do not deserve an increase in pay. Nor do they deserve an increase that is handed to them on a platter by the White House and on which those who may be opposed are precluded from a vote.

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. MILLER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROBISON of New York, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DIGGS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS (at the request of Mr. JAMES V. STANTON), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SIKES in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. RINALDO.

Mr. KEMP in four instances.

Mrs. HOLT.

Mr. HANRAHAN.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. BIESTER.

Mr. CONABLE.

Mr. TREEN.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. STEELMAN.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MAHON.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. MCFALL.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. BIAGGI in five instances.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming.

Mr. ULLMAN in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. DENT.

Mr. ADAMS in five instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in four instances.

Mr. BROOKS.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.

Mr. BREAUX.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1974

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 18, 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:

1889. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2575 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for more efficient disposal of lost, abandoned or unclaimed personal property that comes into the custody or control of military departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1890. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend the nutrition program for the elderly; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1891. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report that no specialized or technical services were provided by NASA to State or local governments during calendar year 1973 under title III of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4224; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1892. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the reports of the U.S. Water Resources Council and the Ohio River Basin Commission on comprehensive studies of the Wabash River Basin, Ill., Ind., and Ohio, and the Kanawha River Basin, N.C., Va., and W. Va., pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1962a–3(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1893. A letter from the Director, U.S. Water Resources Council, transmitting the report of the Council, together with the report of the Great Lakes Basin Commission and the final environmental statement of the Council on Environmental Quality, on the Genesee River Basin, N.Y. and Pa., pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1962a–3(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1894. A letter from the Director, U.S. Water Resources Council, transmitting the preliminary report of the Council on a comprehensive early-action plan for the Big Muddy River Basin, Ill.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1895. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Commission on its implementation and administration of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act during fiscal year 1973, pursuant to section 8 of Public Law 89–755; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1896. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the proposed disposal of NASA land at the Goddard Space Flight Center, pursuant to section 207 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2476a); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1897. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and improve the Nation's unemployment compensation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1898. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on how more intensive reforestation and timber stand improvement programs by the Forest Service could help meet timber demand; 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. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10834. A bill to amend the act of October 27, 1972, establishing the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Francisco and Marin Counties, Calif., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93–800). 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. McCORMACK (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. HOLIFIELD, and Mr. HOSMER):

H.R. 12823. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to provide for improved procedures for planning and environmental review of proposed nuclear powerplants, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 12824. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of dis-

ability compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12825. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the rates of educational assistance allowances; to provide for the payment of tuition, the extension of educational assistance entitlement, acceleration of payment of educational assistance allowances, and expansion of the work-study program, to establish a Vietnam Era Veterans Communication Center and a Vietnam Era Advisory Committee, and to otherwise improve the educational and training assistance program for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12826. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the veterans' education loan program, to authorize an action plan for employment of disabled and Vietnam-era veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 12827. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOWEN:

H.R. 12828. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for an additional 1-year period; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 12829. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for Federal participation in the costs of the social security program, with a substantial increase in the contribution and benefit base and with appropriate reductions in social security taxes to reflect the Federal Government's participation in such costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself and Mr. BIESTER):

H.R. 12830. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pensions and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 12831. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to utilize the deduction for personal exemptions as under present law or to claim a credit against tax of $200 for each such exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. REES, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mr. STARK, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. GUDE, and Mr. SMITH of New York):

H.R. 12832. A bill to create a Law Revision Commission for the District of Columbia, and to establish a municipal code for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 12833. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on the amounts paid for communication services shall not apply to the amount of the State and local taxes paid for such services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 12834. A bill to authorize the measures necessary to carry out the provisions of Minute No. 242 of the International Boundary and Water Commission, concluded pursuant to the Water Treaty of 1944 with Mexico (TIAS 994), entitled "Permanent and Definitive Solution to the International Problem of the Salinity of the Colorado River"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington (for herself and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 12835. A bill to implement the Federal responsibility for the care and education of the Indian people by improving the services and facilities of Federal Indian health programs and encouraging maximum participation of Indians in such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 12836. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 by designating segments of the New River as a potential component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 12837. A bill to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 12838. A bill to amend the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 12839. A bill to provide for public and regular disclosure of lobbying activities undertaken to encourage the taking of specific actions by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12840. A bill to encourage State and local governments to reform their real property tax systems so as to decrease the real property tax burden of low and moderate income individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 12841. A bill to make it clear that the bonus value of food stamps is to be included in the "hold harmless" amount guaranteed to recipients of supplemental security income benefits under the Social Security Amendments of 1972, so as to assure that recipients in cash-out States do not suffer reductions in the benefits they actually receive; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 12842. A bill to repeal the Emergency Daylight Savings Time Conservation Act of 1973; and to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to repeal daylight saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H.R. 12843. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide low interest operating loans to small businesses seriously affected by a shortage in energy producing materials; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 12844. A bill to provide for the cooperation between the Secretary of the Interior and the States with respect to the regulation of surface mining operations, and the acquisition and reclamation of abandoned mines, and for other purposes to the Committee on Interior ad Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER (for himself, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. WYMAN, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 12845. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to provide for the extension thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 12846. A bill to repeal the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 12847. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to improve the protection of the public health and safety, to repeal the Filled Milk Act and the Filled Cheese Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 12848. A bill to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971 in order to increase the Federal Government's share of the costs of State boat safety programs during fiscal year 1975 and thereafter, and to increase the authorization for appropriations for such programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 12849. A bill to establish a comprehensive program to insure the wholesomeness of fish and fishery products; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FULTON, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HOLT, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. METCALFE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. RIEGLE):

H.R. 12850. A bill to designate the birthday of Susan B. Anthony as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 12851. A bill to designate the birthday of Susan B. Anthony as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MCSPADDEN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. FISHER, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. LITTON, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 12852. A bill to amend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 to rollback the price of propane gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 12853. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.J. Res. 902. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the month of May 1974, as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.J. Res. 903. Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to a congressional vote of no confidence in the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H. Con. Res. 431. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning recognition by the European Security Conference of the Soviet Union's occupation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland (for himself, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. EILBERG):

H. Con. Res. 432. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should call an international conference to limit the sale of arms to the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Res. 868. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, DECEMBER 1973

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1974

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the December 1973 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, DECEMBER 1973

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in December 1973 was 2,810,239 as compared with 2,795,567 in the preceding month of November—a net increase of 14,672. Total pay for November 1973, the latest month for which actual expenditures are available, was $2,965,256,000.

Employment in the Legislative Branch in December totaled 34,105—an increase of 255, and the Judicial Branch decreased 257 during the month to a total of 8,682. These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in December, as compared with the preceding month of November, with June six months ago and with December a year ago, follows:

	Full-time in permanent positions	Change	Temporary, part-time, etc.	Change	Total employment	Change
Monthly change:						
November 1973	2,426,093		326,685		2,752,778	
December 1973	2,432,473	+6,380	334,979	+8,294	2,767,452	+14,674
6-month change:						
June 1973	2,421,700		359,189		2,780,889	
December 1973	2,432,473	+10,773	334,979	−24,210	2,767,452	−13,437
12-month change:						
December 1972	2,457,667		331,083		2,788,750	
December 1973	2,432,473	−25,194	334,979	+3,896	2,767,452	−21,298

Some highlights with respect to Executive Branch employment for the month of December and during the first six months of fiscal year 1974 are:

Total employment in the month of December for executive agencies shows an increase of 14,674, primarily in Postal Service with 14,397, Treasury with 1,947 and Health, Education, and Welfare with 1,543. The major decrease was in Agriculture with 1,771.

During the first six months of fiscal year 1974 total employment in the executive agencies decreased 13,437, primarily due to a decrease of 19,175 in Defense agencies. Much of this six month change is due to seasonal factors and summer youth employment.

Full-time permanent employment in the executive branch increased 6,380 during December and 10,773 over the first six months of fiscal year 1974. The increases were primarily in Postal Service, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Treasury; and the Defense agencies showed a major offsetting decrease over the six month period.

Based on the present level of full-time permanent employment in December it would appear that the President's new budget requests would provide for an increase of more than 48,000 by the end of the current fiscal year on June 30, 1974 and an additional 22,200 by the end of fiscal year 1975.

BUDGET PROJECTIONS

The following is a summary of full-time permanent employment—the relatively stable hard-core of federal civilian employment (excluding categories of temporary employment which are subject to sharp seasonal fluctuations)—comparing December 1973 with June 1973 and with the budgeted projections for June 1974 and 1975, contained in the 1975 budget document submitted by the President on February 4, 1973:

	Civilian agencies	Military agencies	Total
December 1973	1,449,641	982,832	2,432,473
June 1973	1,434,419	987,281	2,421,700
Budget projections:			
June 1974	1,455,300	1,025,300	2,480,600
June 1975	1,477,800	1,025,000	2,502,800

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a tabulation, excerpted from the joint committee report, on personnel employed full-time in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during December 1973, showing comparisons with June 1972, June 1973, and the new budget estimates for June 1974:

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1972	June 1973	December 1973	Estimated June 30, 1974 [1]
Agriculture	82,511	81,715	78,997	80,200
Commerce	28,412	28,300	27,975	28,600
Defense:				
Civil functions	30,585	29,971	28,506	28,700
Military functions	1,009,548	957,310	954,326	996,600
Health, Education, and Welfare	105,764	114,307	120,942	[3] 123,900
Housing and Urban Development	15,200	15,820	15,194	14,800
Interior	56,892	56,771	56,708	58,900
Justice	45,446	45,496	46,892	48,900
Labor	12,339	12,468	12,216	12,700
State	22,699	22,578	22,460	23,400
Agency for International Development	11,719	10,108	9,618	9,900
Transportation	67,232	67,885	67,249	69,500
Treasury	95,728	98,087	102,043	104,700
Atomic Energy Commission	6,836	7,145	7,305	7,400
Civil Service Commission	5,260	5,911	6,087	6,100
Environmental Protection Agency	7,835	8,270	8,537	9,200
General Services Administration	36,002	35,721	35,469	37,200
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	27,428	25,955	25,682	25,000
Panama Canal	13,777	13,689	13,709	14,000
Selective Business Administration	3,916	4,050	3,955	4,100
Selective Service System	5,791	4,607	3,437	3,100
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,001	13,995	13,553	14,000
U.S. Information Agency	9,255	9,048	8,871	9,100
Veterans' Administration	163,179	170,616	171,526	173,400
All other agencies	33,499	34,603	34,449	37,300
Contingencies				2,000
Subtotal	1,910,854	1,874,417	1,875,706	1,942,700
U.S. Postal Service	594,834	547,283	556,767	537,900
Total [2]	2,505,688	2,421,700	2,432,473	2,480,600

[1] Source: As projected in 1975 budget document submitted by the President on Feb. 4, 1974.

[2] Excludes 4,000 positions involved in proposed transfer of St. Elizabeths Hospital to the District of Columbia.

[3] December figure excludes 972 disadvantaged persons in public service careers programs as compared with 1,043 in November.