services with an annual value of approximately $13 million from local businesses within a 75 mile radius.

The inactivation of the ARADCOM units will result in the relocation of 263 military and 321 civilians. It will also result in the elimination of 487 military jobs and 715 civilian positions.

RESOLUTION

Now whereas, Fort MacArthur, established in 1888 as a military reservation, is situated in the San Pedro District of the Greater Los Angeles Complex and adjacent to the Port of Los Angeles and is the only active Army installation in the whole of Southern California; and,

Whereas, Los Angeles is one of the most important population, economic and industrial centers in the nation; and,

Whereas, because of the desire of retired military personnel to locate in an area close to a military installation, the San Pedro area is the home of some 43,000 former career servicemen who use the post exchange, commissary and medical clinic of Fort MacArthur; and,

Whereas, an estimated 45,000 dependents of active duty soldiers, sailors and airmen live in close proximity to Fort MacArthur and use the Post facilities; and

Whereas, the decision to close Fort MacArthur would eliminate 487 military and 715 civilian jobs, and cause the relocation of logistical support of 285 reserve, National Guard and other units to Fort Ord, 360 miles to the north; and,

Whereas, logistical and administrative support to Army Reserve units in Southern California has been provided at Fort MacArthur and dispersal of this support to Fort Ord and Los Alamitos Armed Forces Reserve Center would add significantly to transportation costs alone; and,

Whereas, the veterinarian activities of the U.S. Army with detachment headquarters at Fort MacArthur is one of the major food inspection teams supplying all military services and processed a total of 660,800,000 pounds of meat, poultry and produce at Los Angeles packers in 1973; and,

Whereas, one out of every 12 active duty Army personnel are natives of Los Angeles area making this the largest concentration of home addresses for military personnel within the military services, and certain disposition of emergency matters must be maintained in this area relating to AWOL, death, either of service person or member of family, and financial assistance; and,

Whereas, the annual payroll at the Fort is $28 million, which generates $74 million worth of business in the San Pedro Area and the loss of which would cause a serious economic blow to the local economy; and,

Whereas, Fort MacArthur is more than a convenience and necessity for retired servicemen and more than a factor in the local economy, it is a significant member of the community; and,

Whereas, it is a participant in numerous civic and patriotic observances through the 72nd Army Band and its color guard and enjoyed by thousands of residents; and,

Whereas, some 4,500 young people, in such groups as the Boy Scouts, the YMCA, the Explorer Scouts and the Girl Scouts, are welcomed and enjoy the Post Facilities each year; and,

Now therefore, be it resolved, that by the passage of this resolution, the San Pedro Chamber of Commerce, urges the Department of Defense to reconsider its decision to close Fort MacArthur.

DON LORENZ, *President.*

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the television policy of the National Football League last fall, some disparaging remarks were made in this Chamber about professional football in general, and about the NFL in particular.

I would like to share with my colleagues some of the little-known facts about those activities of the NFL which often go unnoticed, but reflect an integral part of league policy, as well as some facts about the preliminary results of congressional alteration of NFL television policy.

The National Football League has volunteered NFL films and TV air time, for the promotion of federally sponsored programs, since 1971, valued at $250,000. NFL players and their families have also donated their time for radio and television commercials and personal appearances to promote these agency efforts. In the past 3 years the NFL has extended over a half million dollars of time, people and footage for governmental projects in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Energy Commission, and the Department of Justice, as well as for projects dealing with sickle cell anemia, high blood pressure, Goodwill Industries, Careers, United Way, and cancer research. The National Football League and the players of the NFL have willingly and actively supported these civic service programs because they realize that their special expertise and appeal to a large cross section of our population places them in a unique position to easily influence their audiences, and in possessing that influence, that they have a responsibility to our society to encourage the development of and the participation in programs that better the society.

I am extremely proud of my years in pro football and of my affiliation with the game—its players, owners, and fans. And, as a Member of the House, I am grateful for the concern and commitment of the league to the betterment of our country and our people.

Further, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues some current statistics on league attendance which reflect what may be the results of Congress alteration of NFL television policy.

Of primary significance is the fact that there has been a 63.7-percent increase in no-shows in the 1973 season over the 1972 season. Total no-shows in the 1973 season totaled 1,059,236, including 41,893 no-shows in traditionally sellout postseason games.

The Washington Post recently pointed out that in the 13-week season of 1972, prior to enactment of legislation to lift TV blackouts, the no-show spectator count was 524,871. For that same period in 1973, after the legislation became effective, the no-show count was 826,182.

It would seem, in the interests of objectivity, that Congress should monitor closely the effects of lifting the TV blackout. Admittedly, all the evidence is not yet in. Yet, as the Post points out:

> The real test is expected to come next season when season-ticket holders, who comprise the bulk of NFL attendance, make their decisions about renewing tickets.

To call attention to these facts is not to "cry wolf" or engage in a "doomsday" prediction about the destruction of pro football. However, the Members who voted to alter the TV policy of pro football should be open to empirical evidence that indicates trends in pro football's financial future. Rather than closing our minds, or criticizing the league for showing its side of the story, and even telling pro football to outlaw the zone defense, let us be openminded enough to watch these statistics and trends and be willing to adopt remedial legislation if the facts so warrant.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, March 4, 1974*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

With God nothing shall be impossible.—Luke 1: 3.

Eternal God, our Father, as we go forth into this new day fresh from Thy hand, grant unto us an awareness of Thy presence and a realization of the truth that Thou art with us. In Thee may we find strength and wisdom and love.

Forgive the sins we have committed, the mistakes we have made, and the faults we have allowed to develop. Deliver us from unworthy fears, elevate our endeavors, expand our sympathies, exalt our aspirations, and enlarge our vision.

Grant unto our President, our Speaker, and Members of Congress wisdom and understanding as they face the difficult duties of these disturbing days. Reveal to them and to our Nation the unfailing resources of power which when tapped make us strong, keep us steadfast, and hold us steady all the way.

God bless America—land that we love, stand beside her, and guide her, through the night with the light from above. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amend-

ment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 905. Joint resolution extending the filing date of the 1974 Joint Economic Committee report.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7363. An act for the relief of Rito E. Judilla.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 581. An act for the relief of Ludwik Kikla;

S. 1346. An act for the relief of Leticia (Escobar) Richardson;

S. 2337. An act for the relief of Dulce Pilar Castin (Castin-Casas);

S. 2510. An act to create an Office of Federal Procurement Policy within the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes; and

S. 2705. An act to provide for the disposition of abandoned money orders and traveler's checks.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ON H.R. 13025

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the acting chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN), who is unable to be present today, I am making an announcement directed to my Democratic colleagues in the House, to comply with rule 17 of the Democratic Caucus.

We are today filing a report of the Committee on Ways and Means on H.R. 13025, which was ordered reported by the committee this morning. The bill serves only one purpose—to permit time for orderly predeterminations of disability to be made for disabled persons added to State welfare programs between June and December 1973. It is estimated that there are between 200,000 and 300,000 such persons. In the absence of this legislation, the Social Security Administration advises us that it expects to terminate payments to such persons on March 31. The bill which the committee has reported provides additional time until the redeterminations are made, but not later than January 1, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, because of the urgency of this one item, the committee expects to request a closed rule so that no extraneous amendments will be added. We regard this matter as urgent. We will take a firm position that amendments to this bill in the other body would not be appropriate. Our hope is that the bill will move through this House and through the other body without change so that no individuals will be improperly removed from the disability rolls.

CONGRESSIONAL COUNTDOWN ON CONTROLS CONTINUES

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

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, since the COLC released its proposed regulations governing the health care industry on November 6, I have responded to many letters from hospital administrators, practicing physicians, and officials of the Texas American Hospital Association, protesting the proposed rules and submitting supportive data, as well as alternative suggestions for cost controls.

One letter included these comments:

Utilities, fuel, and supplies are increasing in price and under the proposed Phase IV regulations it will be impossible to recover enough to continue to pay for these items. Phone charges have increased 18% to 20% in the last year and are expected to increase again in 1974. Depreciation and insurance on the completion of construction and purchase of equipment on the 4th floor will increase our expenses by 13% over this category for last year. Food costs are going up 20% a year. Linen costs are up 8% to 10% a year. Drug costs for Special Care patients are 20% higher than for other patients and are going to increase beyond this in 1974.

The overriding theme of the protest is that the quality of care for patients will deteriorate. Many feel that small hospitals will be encouraged to refer complicated or long-stay patients to a referral or teaching hospital because the intensity of care these patients require would result in an adverse effect on their average revenue and expense per admission. Physicians call this "patient skimming," and the end result seems to assign priority to patient shuffling instead of quality care. Hospitals already overburdened with the paperwork of medicare, medicaid, and private insurance companies will incur even more paperwork.

The hospital situation is unique. These facilities cannot "pump dry" or "sell out." Personnel cannot walk out. Facilities will continue to operate, some of them in the red, and will continue to provide the best care available. But the Government has placed them in the inevitable position of having to choose between quality care for their patients and compliance with economic controls, and I am afraid that the consumer, as a patient, will suffer.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, on roll No. 56, February 28, 1974, the vote on final passage of H.R. 2, to revise the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, I was unavoidably detained on other congressional business with a constituent and did not reach the floor in time to record my position. However, I want the RECORD to show that I favor this legislation and would have voted "aye."

CONSENT CALENDAR

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

TO SELL CERTAIN RIGHTS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 377) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain rights in the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask someone conversant with the several bills to be called up under Consent dealing with the disposal of land and certain mineral rights if in all cases and where applicable the bills contain the standard language protecting the Government as to reversion in cases of failure and also providing for fair market value where fair market value is and should be applicable.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. The chairman of the subcommittee is the gentleman from Hawaii and I am on the subcommittee that was discussing the bill. I am told the protection the gentleman refers to is contained in the bills.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am directing my question to all the bills, but I do not like to raise this question separately in each of the bills. I would like to know if the standard provisions are contained in the numerous bills.

Mr. UDALL. Yes. I am satisfied that they are.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman and I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

H.R. 377

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the record owner thereof, in accordance with section 3 of this Act, all right, title, and interest in minerals reserved in the United States in land described as the west half of the southwest quarter of section 20, township 15 south range 23 east, in Marion County, Florida.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall require the deposit of a sum of money which he deems sufficient to cover estimated administrative costs of this Act. If a conveyance is not made pursuant to this Act, the deposit shall constitute full satisfaction of administrative costs notwithstanding that the administrative costs exceed the deposit, but if the amount of the deposit exceeds the actual administrative costs, the Secretary shall refund the excess.

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

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

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

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "west half" and insert in lieu thereof "northwest quarter".

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "the deposit shall constitute full satisfaction of administrative costs notwithstanding that" and insert in lieu thereof "and".

Page 2, line 3, after "deposit," insert "the Secretary shall bill the applicant for the outstanding amount".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

TO SELL RESERVED PHOSPHATE INTERESTS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA TO THE RECORD OWNER OR OWNERS OF SUCH LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1494) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in certain lands located in the State of Florida to record owner or owners of such lands.

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

H.R. 1494

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey, sell, and quitclaim all phosphate interests now owned by the United States in and to the hereinafter described lands to the present record owner or owners of the surface rights of such lands: Southeast quarter of northeast quarter of section 1, township 25 south, range 27 east, Tallahassee meridian, Florida, containing forty acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. In the event that the Secretary of the Interior determines that the lands described in the first section are not prospectively valuable for phosphate, he shall convey the reserved phosphate interests to the present record owner or owners of the surface rights upon the payment of a sum of $200 to reimburse the United States for the administrative costs of the conveyance; otherwise, the phosphate interests shall be sold to the record owner or owners of the surface rights upon the payment of a sum equal to $200 plus the fair market value of the phosphate interests as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary.

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

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, beginning on line 3, strike out all of sections 2 and 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

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

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

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

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

PROVIDING FOR THE CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN PROPERTY IN UTAH TO THE RECORD OWNERS OF THE SURFACE OF THAT PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5236) to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in Utah to the record owners of the surface of that property.

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

H.R. 5236

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to those persons who, on the date of enactment of this Act, are the record owners of the surface rights thereof, or to the heirs, successors, or assigns of such person or persons, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property consisting of twenty acres and more particularly described in section 2 of this Act. Such conveyance shall be made only if application is made therefor by a record owner of the surface rights within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, and upon payment to the United States by such applicant of such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary to reimburse the United States for the administrative cost of the conveyance plus the fair market value of the minerals as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 2. The real property referred to in the first section of this Act is situated in Utah County, Utah, and is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point south 151.8 feet and west 0.27 feet from the north quarter corner of section 17, township 5 south, range 2 east, Salt Lake base and meridian, and running thence south 89 degrees 54 minutes east 62.0 feet; thence north 0 degree 06 minutes east 152.1 feet; thence north 89 degrees 29 minutes 44 seconds east 70 feet; thence south 0 degree 06 minutes west 165.62 feet; thence south 89 degrees 54 minutes east 164.97 feet; thence north 0 degree 06 minutes east 137 feet; thence north 89 degrees 51 minutes east 16.5 feet; thence south 0 degree 06 minutes west 137 feet; thence south 39 degrees 20 minutes west 135 feet; thence south 51 degrees 07 minutes east 660 feet; thence north 88 degrees 40 minutes west 268.8 feet; thence south 0 degree 28 minutes 30 seconds west 1262.9 feet along a fence line; thence north 89 degrees 46 minutes west 364.2 feet; thence south 89 degrees 06 minutes 30 seconds west 133.2 feet; thence north 1 degree 17 minutes 30 seconds east 1323.2 feet; thence east 4.34 feet; thence north 0 degree 06 minutes east 466.7 feet, more or less to the point of beginning.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "all of the right, title, and interest of" and insert in lieu thereof "all mineral interests reserved to".

Page 1, strike out the sentence beginning on line 10 and ending on page 2, line 7.

Page 3, following line 6, insert the following new sections:

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall require the deposit of a sum of money which he deems sufficient to cover estimated administrative costs of this Act. If a conveyance is not made pursuant to this Act, and the administrative costs exceed the deposit, the Secretary shall bill the applicant for the outstanding amount, but if the amount of the deposit exceeds the actual administrative costs, the Secretary shall refund the excess.

SEC. 4. No conveyance shall be made unless application for conveyance is filed with the Secretary within six months of the date of approval of this Act and unless within the time specified by him payment is made to the Secretary of (1) administrative costs of the conveyance and (2) the fair market value of the interest to be conveyed. The amount of the payment required shall be the difference between the amount deposited and the full amount required to be paid under this section. If the amount deposited exceeds the full amount required to be paid, the applicant shall be given a credit or refund for the excess.

SEC. 5. The term "administrative costs" as used in this Act includes, but is not limited to, all costs of (1) conducting an exploratory program to determine the character of the mineral deposits in the land, (2) evaluating the data obtained under the exploratory program to determine the fair market value of the mineral rights to be conveyed, and (3) preparing and issuing the instrument of conveyance.

SEC. 6. Moneys paid to the Secretary for administrative costs shall be paid to the agency which rendered the service, and deposited to the appropriation then current. Moneys paid for the minerals or mineral interests conveyed shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed

and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS TO THE OWNER OR OWNERS OF RECORD OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6541) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain mineral interests of the United States to the owner or owners of record of certain lands in the State of South Carolina.

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

H.R. 6541

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, in accordance with section 3 of this Act, to convey by quitclaim deed to the present owner or owners of record all mineral interest of the United States in the following described lands in Clarendon County, South Carolina:

All that piece, parcel, or tract of land lying, being, and situate a north corner iron being 152 feet south of the city limits of Manning, South Carolina, containing 9.7 acres of land and described as follows:

Beginning at a point of the right-of-way of United States Highway 301 and running along United States Highway 301 north 58 degrees 45 minutes east 240.3 feet to a stake;

thence south 31 degrees 15 minutes east 460 feet to a stake;

thence north 58 degrees 45 minutes east 302.4 feet to a stake;

thence north 27 degrees 48 minutes west 459.8 feet to a stake;

thence north 59 degrees 12 minutes east 85.7 feet to a point of curve;

thence north 60 degrees 5 minutes east 32.5 feet to a stake;

thence south 29 degrees 50 minutes east 150 feet to a stake;

thence north 60 degrees 10 minutes east 194.8 feet to a stake;

thence south 46 degrees 55 minutes east 219.2 feet to a stake;

thence south 16 degrees 6 minutes west 123 feet to a point of curve;

thence south 8 degrees 4 minutes east 125.6 feet to a point of curve;

thence south 12 degrees 37 minutes east 106.3 feet to a point of curve;

thence south 20 degrees 22 minutes west 105.7 feet to a point of curve;

thence south 44 degrees 28 minutes west 124.7 feet to a point of curve;

thence south 37 degrees 25 minutes west 114.9 feet to a point of curve;

thence south 32 degrees 39 minutes west 88.6 feet to a point of curve;

thence south 22 degrees 22 minutes west 136.1 feet to a stake;

thence north 38 degrees 58 minutes west 149 feet to a point of curve;

thence north 42 degrees 53 minutes west 190.7 feet to a point of curve;

thence north 48 degrees 44 minutes west 93.5 feet to a point of curve;

thence north 81 degrees 6 minutes west 114.9 feet to a point of curve;

thence north 55 degrees 54 minutes west 110.1 feet to a point of curve;

thence north 24 degrees 24 minutes west 135.4 feet to a point of curve;

thence north 5 degrees 32 minutes west 86.6 feet to a point of curve;

thence north 30 degrees 9 minutes west 171.5 feet to the point of beginning.

Said tract of land bounded as follows: North by United States Highway 301 and the lands of the San-Man Inn of Manning Incorporated; east by the lands of M. R. Webster and of J. K. Breedin; south and west by the lands now or formerly of Anna and John R. Stewart.

For a more particular description of said land, a comparison may be had of a plat made by W. B. Sykes, surveyor, dated March 16, 1951, and recorded in plat book 14 at page 39 in the Office of the Clerk of Court for Clarendon, a plat made by W. B. Sykes, surveyor, on November 16, 1960, and recorded in plat book 16 at page 157 in the Office of the Clerk of Court for Clarendon County, and a plat made by W. B. Sykes, surveyor, dated December 29, 1961, and recorded in plat book 17 at page 31 in the Office of the Clerk of Court for Clarendon County.

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

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

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

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

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "9.7" and insert in lieu thereof "10.4".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CONVEYING CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6542) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain mineral interests of the United States to the owner or owners of record of certain lands in the State of South Carolina.

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

H.R. 6542

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, in accordance with section 3 of this Act, to convey by quitclaim deed to the present owner or owners of record all mineral interest of the United States in the following described lands in Clarendon County, South Carolina:

All that piece, parcel, or tract of land, lying, being, and situate the north corner iron being on the south city limits of Manning, South Carolina, containing one lot of land and described as follows: Beginning at a point on the right-of-way of the United States Highway 301 and running along United States Highway 301 north 60 degrees 10 minutes east 152 feet to a stake; thence south 45 degrees 46 minutes each 156 feet along the south city limits of Manning, South Carolina, to a stake; thence south 60 degrees 10 minutes west 194.8 feet to a stake; then north 29 degrees 50 minutes west 150 feet to the point of beginning. Said tract of land bounded as follows: North by United States Highway 301; east by the lands of J. K. Breedin; south and west by the lands of B. F. Hill.

For a more particular description of said land reference may be had to a plat made by W. B. Skyes, surveyor, on December 29, 1961, and recorded in plat book 17 at page 31 in the Office of the Clerk of Court for Clarendon County.

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

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

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

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

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the words "of land" insert "of .6 acres".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SELL CERTAIN RIGHTS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10284) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain rights in the State of Florida.

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

H.R. 10284

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the record owner thereof, in accordance with section 3 of this Act, all right, title, and interest in phosphate deposits reserved to the United States in land described as the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, section 29, township 17 south, range 26 east, lying south of right-of-way of State road numbered 42; less the west thirty feet thereof, in Marion County, Florida.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall require the deposit of a sum of money which he deems sufficient to cover estimated administrative costs of this Act. If a conveyance is not made pursuant to this Act, the deposit shall constitute full satisfaction of administrative costs notwithstanding that the administrative costs exceed the deposit, but if the amount of the deposit exceeds the actual administrative costs, the Secretary shall refund the excess.

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

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

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

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out all of lines 3, 4 and 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "made pursuant to this Act, and the administrative costs exceed the deposit, the Secretary shall bill the applicant for the outstanding amount, but if the amount".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 90–335 RELATING TO PURCHASE, SALE, AND EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS ON THE SPOKANE INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5035) to amend Public Law 90–335 (82 Stat. 174) relating to the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain lands on the Spokane Indian Reservation.

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

H.R. 5035

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of the Act of June 10, 1968 (82 Stat. 174) is amended by deleting the proviso so that said subsection will read as follows:

"(c) Title to lands, or any interests therein, acquired pursuant to this Act for the Spokane Tribe or individual enrolled members thereof, shall be taken in the name of the United States of America in trust for the tribe or individual Indian, and shall be nontaxable as other tribal and allotted Indian trust lands of the Spokane Reservation."

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

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF SENATE COMMITTEES

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 2315) relating to the compensation of employees of Senate committees.

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

S. 2315

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 105(e) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1968, as amended and as modified by the Order of the President pro tempore of the Senate of October 4, 1973, is amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (1), strike out "ranging from $18,525 to" and insert in lieu thereof "at not to exceed".

(2) In paragraph (2)(A), strike out "$8,265 to" each place it appears therein and insert in lieu thereof "not to exceed".

(3) In paragraph (2)(B), strike out "$18,240 to", "$14,250 to", and "$8,265 to" and insert in lieu thereof in each place "not to exceed".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, immediately below line 3, of S. 2315, insert the following:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3216 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out ", and the printed words 'Postage paid by Congress' ".

(b) Section 733 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Postage paid by Congress.".

(c) Section 907 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Postage paid by Congress".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 5(d) of the Act of December 18, 1973 (87 Stat. 742; Public Law 93–191), is amended by striking out "or 3218" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 3218, or 3219".

(b) Section 6(a) of the Act of December 18, 1973 (87 Stat. 744; Public Law 93–191), is amended by striking out "or 3218" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 3218, or 3219".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend the minimum limits of compensation of Senate committee employees and to amend the indicia requirements on franked mail, and for other purposes.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT, "THE IMPACT OF THE ENERGY AND FUEL CRISIS ON SMALL BUSINESS"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93–858) on the House resolution (H. Res. 726) providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "The Impact of the Energy and Fuel Crisis on Small Business", and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 726

Resolved, That there shall be printed for the use of the Permanent Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives two thousand additional copies of the House Report entitled "The Impact of the Energy and Fuel Crisis on Small Business," it being House Report Numbered 91–1751 (Ninety-first Congress, second session).

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "CONCENTRATION BY COMPETING RAW FUEL INDUSTRIES IN THE ENERGY MARKET AND ITS IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESS"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93–859) on the House resolution (H. Res. 727) providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Concentration by Competing Raw Fuel Industries in the Energy Market and Its Impact on Small Business," House Report No. 92–719, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 727

Resolved, That there shall be printed for the use of the Permanent Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives three thousand additional copies of the House report entitled "Concentration by Competing Raw Fuel Industries in the Energy Market and Its Impact on Small Business"; it being House Report Numbered 92–719 (Ninety-second Congress, first session).

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "CONCENTRATION BY COMPETING RAW FUEL INDUSTRIES IN THE ENERGY MARKET AND ITS IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESS"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93–860) on the House resolution (H. Res. 728) providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Concentration by Competing Raw Fuel Industries in the Energy Market and Its Impact on Small Business," volume 3, "National Gas Survey and Synthetic Fuel Development," House Report No. 92–1404, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 728

Resolved, That there shall be printed for the use of the Permanent Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives two thousand additional copies of the House report entitled "Concentration by Competing Raw Fuel Industries in the Energy Market and Its Impact of Small Business"—volume 3—"National Gas Survey and Synthetic Fuel Development"; it being House Report Numbered 92–1404 (Ninety-second Congress, second session).

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "CONCENTRATION BY COMPETING RAW FUEL INDUSTRIES IN THE ENERGY MARKET AND ITS IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESS"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93–861) on the House resolution (H. Res. 729) providing for the printing of additional copies of the House Report entitled "Concentration by Competing Raw Fuel Industries in the Energy Market and Its Impact on Small Business"—Volume 2—"Tennessee Valley Area", House Report Numbered 92–1313.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 729

Resolved, That there shall be printed for the use of the Permanent Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives two thousand additional copies of the House report entitled "Concentration by Competing Raw Fuel Industries in the Energy Market and Its Impact on Small Business"—Volume 2—"Tennessee Valley Area"; it being House Report Numbered 92–1313 (Ninety-second Congress, second session).

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF A VETERANS' BENEFITS CALCULATOR

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93–862) on the House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 78) to authorize the printing of a Veterans' Benefits Calculator, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 78

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That after the conclusion of the second session of the Ninety-third Congress there shall be printed fifty thousand one hundred and fifty-five copies of a Veterans' Benefits Calculator prepared by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs of which two thousand copies shall be for the use of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, two thousand copies for the use of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, thirty-seven thousand four hundred copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and eight thousand seven hundred and fifty-five copies for the use of the Senate.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, delete "one hundred and fifty-five"; insert "three hundred and twenty-five".

Page 1, line 9, delete "four hundred"; insert "five hundred and seventy".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "FOREIGN POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF THE ENERGY CRISIS"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. 93–863) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 397) providing for the printing of additional copies of hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy entitled "Foreign Policy Implications of the Energy Crisis," and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 397

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, one thousand additional copies of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy on September 21, 26, 27, and October 3, 1972, entitled "Foreign Policy Implications of the Energy Crisis".

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE 46TH BIENNIAL MEETING OF CONVENTION OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. 93–864) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 55) authorizing the printing of the report of the proceedings of the 46th biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document, and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 55

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the report of the proceedings of the forty-sixth biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, held in Indianapolis, Indiana, from June 24, 1973, through June 29, 1973, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document. Five thousand five hundred additional copies of such document shall be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE HEARINGS ON CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION ACT, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. 93–865) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on the Child Abuse Prevention Act, 1973, and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. Con. Res. 56

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the compilation entitled "Disclosure of Committee on Labor and Public Welfare one thousand additional copies of the hearings before its Subcommitteee on Children and Youth during the present session on the Child Abuse Prevention Act, 1973.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT OF COMMISSION ON BANKRUPTCY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. 93–866) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) authorizing the printing of additional copies of report of Commission on Bankruptcy Laws of the United States for use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 58

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary one thousand additional copies each of parts I and II of the Report of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States (House Document 93–137).

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF COMPILATION ENTITLED "DISCLOSURE OF CORPORATE OWNERSHIP" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration. I submit a privileged report (Rept. 93–867) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) authorizing the printing of the compilation entitled "Disclosure of Corporate Ownership" as a Senate document, and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 59

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the compilation entitled "Disclosure of Corporate Ownership", prepared by the Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations and Budgeting, Management and Expenditures, of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document; and that there be printed five thousand additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART I OF SENATE COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "CONFIDENCE AND CONCERN: CITIZENS VIEW AMERICAN GOVERNMENT—A SURVEY OF PUBLIC ATTITUDES"

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. 93–868) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) authorizing the printing of additional copies of part I of the Senate committee print entitled "Confidence and Concern: Citizens View American Government—A Survey of Public Attitudes," and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 61

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of part I of its committee print entitled "Confidence and Concern: Citizens View American Government—A Survey of Public Attitudes," dated December 3, 1973.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL EULOGIES AND OTHER TRIBUTES TO THE LATE J. EDGAR HOOVER AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. 93–869) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 64) authorizing the printing of congressional eulogies and other tributes to the late J. Edgar Hoover as a Senate document, and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 64

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with an illustration as a Senate document a compilation of materials eulogizing the late J. Edgar Hoover, including: memorial tributes in the Congress; the eulogy by Warren E. Burger, Chief Justice of the United States, in the Rotunda of the United States Capitol on May 3, 1972; the funeral services for Mr. Hoover at the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, District of Columbia, including the eulogy by President Richard M. Nixon and the tribute by the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, Chaplain of the United States Senate; and the various articles and editorials relating to the life and work of J. Edgar Hoover and his contributions to the well-being of the American people.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed five thousand five hundred and fifty additional copies of the document authorized by section 1 of this concurrent resolution, of which four thousand four hundred and twenty shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, one thousand thirty shall be for the use of the United States Senate, and one hundred shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 3. The copy of such document shall be prepared under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, and the document shall be printed and bound in the format currently used for memorial tributes to deceased Members of Congress.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESUMPTION OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH EGYPT

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday for the first time in nearly 7 years the Stars and Stripes were raised over the American Embassy in Cairo, Egypt. This signified the resumption of full diplomatic relations between Egypt and the United States for the first time since the June 1967 war between Israel and Egypt.

It also signifies the tremendous advance in peaceful relations that has been achieved in the Middle East during the past 6 months under the leadership of the Nixon administration.

Effective diplomacy by the United States stopped a war in the Middle East, on two occasions prevented a superpower confrontation in that region, then succeeded in negotiating a cease-fire and separation of forces.

All this would have been impossible had not President Nixon first established understanding and trust between the United States and other States, notably the Soviet Union, Egypt, Syria, as well as Israel.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce we are adding two bills to the Suspension Calendar for tomorrow:

H.R. 13025, to provide additional time for screening disability determinations; and

H.R. 8245, to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1973, with Senate amendment.

AMENDMENTS TO THE WAGNER-O'DAY ACT

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11143) to provide the authorization for fiscal year 1974 and succeeding fiscal year for the Committee for Purchase of Products and Services of the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11143

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to create a Committee on Purchases of Blind-made Products, and for other purposes", approved June 25, 1938 (41 U.S.C. 46–48c) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1(a) is amended—

(A) by striking out "Committee for Purchase of Products and Services of" in the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee for Purchases from";

(B) by striking out "fourteen" in the second sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "sixteen";

(C) by striking out "and other severely handicapped individuals" in paragraph (2)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof a period;

(D) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (2) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively, and inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

"(B) The President shall appoint one member from persons who are not officers or employees of the Government and who are conversant with the problems incident on the employment of other severely handicapped individuals."; and

(E) by adding at the end of paragraph (2) the following new subparagraph:

"(E) The President shall appoint one member from a list of four persons, each of whom is the head of a State vocational rehabilitation agency, submitted to him by the Executive Committee of the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation.".

Section 1(d) is amended—

(A) by striking out "paragraphs (2) and (3)" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (2), (3), (4) and (5)"; and

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

"(4) The member first appointed under paragraph (2)(B) of subsection (a) shall be appointed for a term of three years.

"(5) The member first appointed under paragraph (2)(E) of subsection (a) shall be appointed for a term of four years.".

(3) Section 5 is amended—

(A) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) The term 'direct labor' includes all work required for preparation, processing, and packing of a commodity, or work directly relating to the performance of a service, but not supervision, administration, inspection, or shipping.";

(B) by striking out paragraph (6); and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (7), (8), and (9) as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively.

(4) Section 6 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Committee to carry out this $240,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and such sums as may be necessary for the succeeding fiscal years.".

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to redesignate the Committee for Purchase of Products and Services of the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped as the Committee for Purchases Form the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, to authorize the appropriation of funds for such committee for fiscal year 1974 and succeeding fiscal years, and for other purposes.".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 11143, to provide the authorization for fiscal year 1974 and succeeding fiscal year for the Committee for Purchase of Products and Services of the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, and for other purposes, with committee amendments.

The bill before the House is a vehicle aimed at enabling the Committee for the Purchase of Products and Services of the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped to perform its task more effectively. The committee, established under the Wagner-O'Day amendment of 1971, has as its function to help increase employment opportunities for blind and handicapped workers by selecting products and services which the Government will purchase from certified workshops employing such workers.

The 1971 amendment provided authorizations only through fiscal year 1974. This bill provides a continuing authorization to the Wagner-O'Day committee of "such sums as may be necessary" for its operations. Its needs are relatively small. It is believed that its appropriation will not exceed the $300,000 level until fiscal year 1979. The Special Studies Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations will, of course, exercise continuing oversight of the operations of the Wagner-O'Day committee.

The bill also increases the membership of the Wagner-O'Day committee by 2 public members, making a total of 5 public members out of 16. One of the additional public members will be a person with knowledge of problems incident to the employment of the nonblind handicapped. There is now one member who covers that group as well as the blind but will hereafter represent only the latter.

The second additional public member will be the head of a State vocational rehabilitation agency. It is an amendment resulting from the suggestion of a member of the Special Studies Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG). Since rehabilitation is an important ingredient of the sheltered workshop program, it is believed that such representation will assist the Wagner-O'Day committee in its work.

Further, the bill shortens the title of the Wagner-O'Day committee to "Committee for Purchases from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped." The word "severely" is retained in the bill as reported because objection was made to its deletion during the course of the subcommittee hearings.

Finally, the bill extends the definition of "direct labor" to apply to the performance of work under a service contract. This would require that 75 percent of the work be done by those who are blind or otherwise severely handicapped, as is now required in the case of products.

The Special Studies Subcommittee held 4 days of hearings on H.R. 11143 as well as examining the operations of the Wagner-O'Day committee since the 1971 amendments. These hearings have been printed. The bill as it now stands will have a beneficial effect, and I urge that it be adopted.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I join with Mr. HICKS, the chairman of my subcommittee which considered H.R. 11143, in recommending passage of this bill.

The Committee for Purchase of Products and Services of the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped performs valuable services for many disabled people in America. By encouraging the establishment of workshops for the handicapped and selecting various products of those workshops for procurement on a priority basis by the Federal Government, the committee promotes employment for disabled individuals.

In fiscal year 1973, the committee certified 19 new groups of commodities and one new service for priority purchase by the Government. These additions have an annual sales value of more than $3 million, and will create jobs for 172 blind and 102 other severely handicapped persons. For fiscal year 1973, workshops sales to the Government increased by $5 million over the previous year—to approximately $30 million.

Nearly 5,000 handicapped people were employed in producing the goods and services which were worth that amount. Due in large part to the efforts of the Committee for the Purchase of Products and Services of the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, those people are living useful lives as gainfully employed participants in our economic system, rather than subsisting on public welfare. The small sum which we appropriate annually for the committee is a wise investment.

Mr. Speaker, this record in my opinion justifies continued authorization of the committee. H.R. 11143, the bill before us now, provides that continued authorization. The distinguished chairman of the Special Studies Subcommittee has explained its specific provisions well. I only add the observation that this bill engendered no controversy in either subcommittee or full committee and urge my colleagues to endorse the measure.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Special Studies Subcommittee, which originally considered H.R. 11143, I rise in support of the bill.

The Committee for Purchase of Products and Services of the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, which this measure would continue, serves a worthy purpose. I endorse, as I am sure all Members do, providing employment opportunities for disabled Americans. I am encouraged to learn, as we did from the chairman of the committee during our hearings on H.R. 11143, that the program for the blind is vigorous, and that there has been a definite acceleration in adding commodities and services to the procurement list for workshops serving the other severely handicapped. For this, I congratulate the committee and seek approval of the bill which would prolong its existence.

One item troubles me in reviewing the committee's performance, however, Many of the jobs done by handicapped individuals under its direction require only rudimentary skills; the committee has made little effort to develop the potential of its clients. When the former committee chairman testified before us last June, he told us that his agency planned to expand its operations to assist in training handicapped citizens so that they have sufficient skills to leave their sheltered workshops and become truly self-sufficient. When the current chairman testified in November, he told us the same thing.

The handicapped need action in achieving this objective, not just plans. They, like all Americans, ought to have the chance to develop their talents. We have made a first step in this direction in H.R. 11143 by requiring that the President appoint a State vocational rehabilitation agency director to the committee; we hope that individual will be able to force the committee to focus more of its activities in the area of training and education. The responsibility for implementing the goal remains with the committee, however. I trust that when a chairman of that body next appears before the Special Studies Subcommittee, he will be able to report progress in this area.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

May I ask the gentleman from Washington how many blind people are on the National Committee for the Blind?

Mr. HICKS. On this particular committee that we are talking about here, the Government committee?

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. HICKS. There is one representing their interests.

Mr. GROSS. One out of how many?

Mr. HICKS. One out of 16.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman from Washington not think——

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me to interrupt, I beg the pardon of the gentleman from Iowa. There are two on the committee; I have just been corrected by our staff.

Mr. GROSS. Two out of 16?

Mr. HICKS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder, does the gentleman from Washington not agree that there might well be four, or some such number, on that committee in order to give the blind better representation?

Mr. HICKS. That might be correct, but the purpose of this committee primarily is to allocate contracts to the workshops that are capable of handling them. Primarily the membership of this committee is made up of representatives from the various departments of the Government that have knowledge of what they have in the way of contracts that could be awarded that might be able to be handled by these workshops. These people get together and they set the prices, and that is the price the Government must pay. And as these contracts are put out, nobody else gets them. The prison workshops get first shot at them, then the second priority are the blind workshops, then the third priority are the severely handicapped workshops. So actually what is needed on the committee is somebody who can make some input to the Government members, telling them what the blind are capable of doing, and that sort of thing and then the Government people are there to see what kind of contracts they have that fit the criteria and can be sent out to these workshops.

Mr. GROSS. I know there is some dissatisfaction on the part of the blind that there are not more blind people represented on the committee.

Mr. HICKS. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that in our hearings we did not hear that expressed. This representation of the blind has been in existence for a number of years, as I understand it, and it was the severely handicapped that were objecting that their people were not adequately represented. That is why we added that one person for the severely handicapped.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for his answers to my questions.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, for the important work the gentleman has done in this area. Both the handicapped and the blind are very satisfied with the bill which has been brought here for our consideration today.

Extensive hearings were held before the committee on this bill. I believe that that Wagner-O'Day Act will be strengthened by these changes. I urge support of this legislation.

Under H.R. 11143, the Committee for the Purchase of Products and Services of the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped will be expanded to include two additional members: one from the private sector, presumably from a central nonprofit agency dealing with the committee, and the other a representative of the national organization of State vocational rehabilitation directors. The authorization for $240,000 and "funds as needed" will provide the committee with much-needed additional funds and, equally important will grant it the stability of an open-ended authorization.

The provision for two additional members on the committee is significant. By providing for additional representation by those familiar with the problems of the handicapped, the present focus of the committee—emphasizing government procurement problems—should be changed to give greater emphasis to the problems and needs of the blind and the handicapped. I am gratified, too, that my proposal for increased coordination between this program and the vocational rehabilitation program has been embodied in this provision. It is my hope that the Wagner/O'Day program will now be administered in such a way that it can play a significant role in the rehabilitation process.

I am pleased that the Special Studies Subcommittee is issuing an oversight report on the problems still existing in the administration of the Wagner/O'Day program. The report will provide us with the guidance and study necessary to create a comprehensive program dealing with problems not yet solved including the areas of minimum wage standards, fringe benefits, and research and development of new production techniques adapted to the use of handicapped workers. The projection of such a comprehensive plan could more effectively guarantee every blind and handicapped worker a decent wage, decent working conditions, and the potential to lead a more normal life.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11143, to provide the authorization for fiscal year 1974 and succeeding fiscal years for the Committee for Purchase of Products and Services of the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped.

A Committee on Purchases of Blind-Made Products to provide employment opportunities for the blind in making products the Federal Government needed, and would otherwise procure on the open market, was created by the Wagner-O'Day Act of 1938. Under this system an item put on the procurement list, had to be procured at the price specified from a nonprofit workshop for the blind and blind or visually handicapped workers had to perform 75 percent of the direct labor involved in making the commodity.

In 1971, the 1938 law was expanded to include other severely handicapped people, and to include the performance of services as well as the purchase of commodities. This, of course, increased the administrative work of deciding which items should be placed on the procurement list and which workshops should be certified.

It is a happy occasion, today, because this program has been so successful that it is necessary to increase the membership on the Committee for Purchase of Products and Services of the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped. I am pleased to support this legislation and the minor improvements it makes in the existing law—namely, shortening the name of the aforemention commission to Committee for Purchases from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, and defining "direct labor" so that the statutory test of performance by the handicapped will be applicable to procurement of services.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11143, authorizing appropriations for the Committee for Purchases From the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped and making other amendments to the Wagner-O'Dav Act, and urge my colleagues to vote for its approval.

This legislation would amend the Wagner-O'Day Act to expand the size of its statutory Committee for Purchases From the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped by adding two more public members. H.R. 11143 provides there should be a separate member who is "conversant with the problems incident to the employment of the blind," and another one who is similarly knowledgeable as to such problems relating to "other severely handicapped," rather than one member for both as at present. The second additional public member of the Committee would be drawn from the ranks of officials who head State vocational rehabilitation agencies, appointed by the President from a list of four submitted by the Executive Committee of the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation.

I am proud of the sheltered workshops for the blind and other severely handicapped located in Iowa's Sixth Congressional District. They and other workshops serve a very useful function, providing handicapped men and women with the opportunity to produce goods and services which are useful and giving them pride in their ability to do this work despite their disabilities. However, workshops are only custodial in nature if they fail to train those handicapped who are trainable and then move these qualified clients into employment in the workaday world where they can compete with nonhandicapped persons and need not feel they are "second class citizens." This bill, by broadening the membership of the Committee for Purchases From the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped to include a public member who is engaged on the State level in promoting rehabilitation of the blind and other handicapped, should significantly facilitate the objectives of the Wagner-O'Day Act.

The bill clarifies the act so that its requirement for performance of 75 percent of the "direct labor" by the blind and other severely handicapped persons would include not only products but also work performed under a service contract.

Another major effect of the bill is to extend the appropriation authority for funding the Wagner-O'Day program without any limit, by authorizing appropriation of "such sums as may be necessary for succeeding fiscal years." This change is needed so that repetitive authorization of relatively small amounts will not be required in the future. It is anticipated that the legislation will cost $252,000 in fiscal year 1974, $265,000 in fiscal year 1975, $280,000 in fiscal year 1976, $295,000 in fiscal year 1977, and $310,000 in fiscal year 1978. This will indeed be money well spent, particularly in view of the increased emphasis on rehabilitation which will come about through the change in the administering Committee's membership. I urge the approval of this needed legislation.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill presently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HICKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11143, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 308, nays 0, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—308

Abdnor	Conlan	Hanrahan
Abzug	Conte	Hansen, Idaho
Adams	Coughlin	Harsha
Alexander	Crane	Hays
Anderson, Calif.	Cronin	Hébert
Anderson, Ill.	Daniel, Dan	Hechler, W. Va.
Andrews, N.C.	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Heckler, Mass.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Danielson	Heinz
Annunzio	Davis, Wis.	Henderson
Archer	de la Garza	Hicks
Arends	Delaney	Hillis
Armstrong	Dellenback	Hogan
Ashley	Dellums	Holifield
Aspin	Denholm	Holt
Bauman	Dennis	Holtzman
Bennett	Dent	Horton
Bergland	Derwinski	Hosmer
Bevill	Devine	Howard
Biester	Dickinson	Huber
Bingham	Diggs	Hudnut
Blackburn	Dingell	Hungate
Blatnik	Drinan	Hunt
Boggs	Duncan	Hutchinson
Boland	du Pont	Jarman
Bolling	Eilberg	Johnson, Calif.
Bowen	Erlenborn	Johnson, Colo.
Brademas	Esch	Jones, Ala.
Bray	Evans, Colo.	Jones, N.C.
Breaux	Evins, Tenn.	Jordan
Brooks	Fascell	Karth
Broomfield	Findley	Kastenmeier
Brotzman	Fish	Kazen
Brown, Calif.	Fisher	King
Brown, Mich.	Flynt	Koch
Brown, Ohio	Foley	Kyros
Broyhill, N.C.	Ford	Landgrebe
Broyhill, Va.	Forsythe	Landrum
Buchanan	Fountain	Latta
Burgener	Fraser	Leggett
Burke, Mass.	Frelinghuysen	Lent
Burleson, Tex.	Frenzel	Litton
Burlison, Mo.	Frey	Long, Md.
Byron	Fulton	Lott
Carney, Ohio	Gaydos	Lujan
Carter	Gettys	McClory
Casey, Tex.	Giaimo	McCollister
Chamberlain	Gibbons	McCormack
Chappell	Gilman	McFall
Clancy	Goldwater	McKinney
Clark	Gonzalez	Madden
Clausen, Don H.	Goodling	Madigan
Clawson, Del	Griffiths	Mahon
Clay	Gross	Mallary
Cleveland	Grover	Martin, Nebr.
Cochran	Gude	Mathis, Ga.
Cohen	Guyer	Matsunaga
Collier	Haley	Mayne
Collins, Ill.	Hamilton	Mazzoli
Collins, Tex.	Hammer-schmidt	Meeds
Conable	Hanley	Melcher
		Metcalfe
		Mezvinsky
		Michel
Milford	Regula	Steiger, Wis.
Miller	Reuss	Stephens
Minish	Rhodes	Stokes
Mink	Rinaldo	Stuckey
Mitchell, Md.	Roberts	Studds
Mitchell, N.Y.	Robinson, Va.	Sullivan
Mizell	Robison, N.Y.	Symms
Mollohan	Roe	Talcott
Moorhead, Calif.	Rogers	Taylor, N.C.
Moorhead, Pa.	Roncallo, Wyo.	Teague
Morgan	Rooney, Pa.	Thompson, N.J.
Mosher	Rose	Thomson, Wis.
Murtha	Rosenthal	Thone
Myers	Roush	Thornton
Natcher	Runnels	Tiernan
Nedzi	Ruppe	Towell, Nev.
Nelsen	Ruth	Van Deerlin
Nichols	St Germain	Vander Jagt
Obey	Sarasin	Vander Veen
O'Brien	Sarbanes	Vanik
O'Hara	Satterfield	Waggonner
O'Neill	Scherle	Wampler
Parris	Sebelius	Whalen
Passman	Seiberling	White
Patman	Shipley	Whitten
Patten	Shoup	Widnall
Perkins	Shriver	Williams
Pettis	Shuster	Wilson, Bob
Pickle	Sikes	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Pike	Sisk	Wolff
Poage	Skubitz	Wright
Podell	Slack	Wyatt
Powell, Ohio	Smith, Iowa	Wylie
Preyer	Smith, N.Y.	Yates
Price, Ill.	Staggers	Yatron
Price, Tex.	Stanton, J. William	Young, Alaska
Pritchard	Stanton, James V.	Young, Fla.
Quillen	Stark	Young, Ill.
Railsback	Steed	Young, Tex.
Rangel	Steelman	Zablocki
Rarick	Steiger, Ariz.	Zion
Rees		Zwach

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—123

Addabbo	Gray	Pepper
Ashbrook	Green, Oreg.	Peyser
Badillo	Green, Pa.	Quie
Bafalis	Gubser	Randall
Baker	Gunter	Reid
Barrett	Hanna	Riegle
Beard	Hansen, Wash.	Rodino
Bell	Harrington	Roncallo, N.Y.
Biaggi	Hastings	Rooney, N.Y.
Brasco	Hawkins	Rostenkowski
Breckinridge	Helstoski	Rousselot
Brinkley	Hinshaw	Roy
Burke, Calif.	Ichord	Roybal
Burke, Fla.	Johnson, Pa.	Ryan
Burton	Jones, Okla.	Sandman
Butler	Jones, Tenn.	Schneebeli
Camp	Kemp	Schroeder
Carey, N.Y.	Ketchum	Snyder
Cederberg	Kluczynski	Spence
Chisholm	Kuykendall	Steele
Conyers	Lehman	Stratton
Corman	Long, La.	Stubblefield
Cotter	McCloskey	Symington
Culver	McDade	Taylor, Mo.
Daniels, Dominick V.	McEwen	Treen
Davis, Ga.	McKay	Udall
Davis, S.C.	McSpadden	Ullman
Donohue	Macdonald	Veysey
Dorn	Mailliard	Vigorito
Downing	Mann	Waldie
Dulski	Maraziti	Walsh
Eckhardt	Martin, N.C.	Ware
Edwards, Ala.	Mathias, Calif.	Whitehurst
Edwards, Calif.	Mills	Wiggins
Eshleman	Minshall, Ohio	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Flood	Moakley	Winn
Flowers	Montgomery	Wydler
Froehlich	Moss	Wyman
Fuqua	Murphy, Ill.	Young, Ga.
Ginn	Murphy, N.Y.	Young, S.C.
Grasso	Nix	
	Owens	

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Udall.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Kemp.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California.
Mr. Dominick V. Daniels with Mr. Beard.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Froehlich.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Owens with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Conyers.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Vigorito.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Mailliard.
Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Young of Georgia.
Mrs. Schroeder with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Maraziti.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Martin of North Carolina.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Quie.
Mrs. Burke of California with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Flood with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Breckinridge with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Moakley with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Spence.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Steele.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Ware.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Taylor of Missouri.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Walsh.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Brinkley with Mr. Whitehurst.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Young of South Carolina.
Mr. Ginn with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Gunter with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Jones of Oklahoma with Mr. Lehman.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Mann.
Mr. McKay with Mr. Mills.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Roy with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Treen with Mr. Montgomery.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX RELIEF FOR LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES

(Mrs. GRIFFITHS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would give low- and middle-income families income tax relief in this period of spiral-

ing prices. This bill would give taxpayers the option of taking a $200 credit for themselves and each dependent instead of the existing $750 personal exemption.

The average family would pay nearly $200 less in income taxes. A family of four earning $6,000 would save $245, while a family of 6 earning $10,000 would save $330. In fact, nearly all families earning $20,000 or less would pay less taxes by using the optional credit rather than the $750 exemption.

Some of the hardest working American families were actually worse off economically in 1973 than in 1972, despite small wage gains. This is because they paid about 20 percent more for food, 19 percent more for gasoline, plus higher social security and income taxes.

Individually, these families need help. Collectively, we need to keep their consumer demand and purchasing power strong to ward off recession and even higher unemployment.

This measure would provide nearly $6.5 billion in tax relief. Ninety percent of these savings would accrue to persons earning less than $15,000 a year, a group which will channel their tax savings back into the economy in the form of spending on family necessities. It will help such families far more than raising the amount of the personal exemption—a device which already benefits most those who need the tax savings least.

Mr. Speaker, I include tables showing the total distribution of tax relief by income category, and tax savings to several family types by income category in the RECORD along with the bill:

TAX SAVINGS FROM PROPOSAL

[Assumes personal deductions of 15 percent of income]

Adjusted gross income	Present tax	Tax with $200 credit	Tax saving
MARRIED COUPLE WITH 4 DEPENDENTS			
$5,000	0	0	0
$6,000	$28	0	$28
$8,000	322	0	322
$10,000	620	$290	330
$12,500	1,024	758	266
$15,000	1,435	1,248	187
$17,500	1,903	1,779	124
$20,000	2,385	2,340	45
MARRIED COUPLE WITH 2 DEPENDENTS			
$5,000	$98	0	$98
$6,000	245	0	245
$8,000	569	$333	236
$10,000	905	690	215
$12,500	1,309	1,158	151
$15,000	1,765	1,648	117
$17,500	2,233	2,179	54
$20,000	2,760	2,740	20
MARRIED COUPLE WITH 1 DEPENDENT			
$5,000	$208	0	$208
$6,000	362	$153	209
$8,000	706	533	173
$10,000	1,048	890	158
$12,500	1,463	1,358	105
$15,000	1,930	1,848	82
$17,500	2,416	2,379	37
$20,000	2,948	2,940	8
MARRIED COUPLE WITH NO DEPENDENTS			
$5,000	$322	$169	$153
$6,000	484	353	131
$8,000	848	733	115
$10,000	1,190	1,090	100
$12,500	1,628	1,558	70
$15,000	2,095	2,048	47
$17,500	2,604	2,579	25
$20,000	3,135	3,135	0
SINGLE PERSON			
$5,000	$491	$433	$58
$6,000	681	637	44
$8,000	1,100	1,078	22
$10,000	1,530	1,515	15
$12,500	2,059	2,059	0
$15,000	2,630	2,630	0
$17,500	3,249	3,249	0
$20,000	3,915	3,915	0

"BREAKEVEN" POINTS

(Adjusted gross income level at which the optional $200 tax credit is worth the same as the $750 personal exemption.)

Type of tax return and adjusted gross income level:

Married couple with four dependents	$21,764.71
Married couple with three dependents	21,274.51
Married couple with two dependents	20,784.32
Married couple with one dependent	20,294.12
Married couple with no dependents	19,803.92
Single person	12,500.00

DECREASE IN TAX LIABILITY UNDER PROPOSAL

[Based on calendar year 1972 income levels]

Adjusted gross income class	Percent of returns in each income class [1]	Number of returns with tax decrease (thousands)	Decrease in tax liability (millions)	Percent of total decrease
$0 to $3,000	23.1	3,220.5	$165.8	2.6
$3,000 to $5,000	13.4	7,745.8	626.4	9.7
$5,000 to $7,000	11.9	8,736.8	983.3	15.2
$7,000 to $10,000	16.9	12,229.1	1,763.0	27.2
$10,000 to $15,000	19.6	15,045.2	2,280.8	35.3
$15,000 to $20,000	8.7	6,881.2	599.3	9.3
$20,000 to $50,000	5.9	1,017.6	$51.3	0.8
$50,000 to $100,000	.5	1.8	.2	
$100,000 and over	.15	.4	.1	
Total	100.15	54,878.5	6,470.1	100.1

[1] In calendar year 1971 (1972 data unavailable).

INADEQUATE WHEAT SUPPLIES

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

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my strong displeasure with the present administration's nonpolicies to assure adequate wheat supplies to the American consumers.

On several occasions I have written to the President and the Secretary of Agriculture expressing my strong feelings about the prompt need for action on the wheat crisis. Yet the only response I receive is couched in excuses for inaction and rhetoric to shift the blame to the free market system.

As a consequence, I found it necessary to recommend in a letter to the President the following four-point program to be implemented immediately:

First, that USDA should determine the minimum wheat supply necessary to assure a full supply of wheat products during the second quarter of 1974, and to develop a plan to assure that supply. Second and simultaneously, that the President should assign the Director of the Council on International Economic Policy, the responsibility for securing firm agreements from foreign purchasers to delay their shipments until July 1. Third, that the administration should review planned concessional sales and donations under the Public Law 480 program to determine which ones could be postponed without causing undue hardships in foreign lands.

Finally, if these proposed methods do not yield the necessary assured domestic supply, the Secretaries of Commerce and Agriculture should move under the Export Administration Act of 1969, to establish an export licensing system. This should be combined with an immediate announcement that 1973–74 U.S. wheat is "sold out" and that no additional export licenses will be granted for sale of such wheat. This would allow many existing contracts to be filled, but permit an adequate wheat supply to American consumers.

I hope these actions are taken immediately to protect the American consumers.

PRIVACY OF INFORMATION

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow, in the course of the consideration of H.R. 11793, providing a Federal Energy Administration, it is my intention

to offer an amendment to safeguard the privacy of information obtained in the administration of this program.

The amendment follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOLDWATER TO H.R. 11793

Page 35, after line 10:

To protect and assure privacy of individuals and personal information, the Administrator is directed to establish guidelines and procedures for handling individual identifiable personal data. He shall provide in such guidelines and procedures a reasonable and expeditious method for each individual data subject to:

(a) be informed if he is the subject of personally identifiable data.

(b) gain access to such data.

(c) contest the accuracy, completeness, timeliness, pertinence and necessity of retention or inclusion of such data. The Administrator shall take necessary precautions to assure that no indiscriminate transfer of personally identifiable data is made to any other person, organization or government agency.

AMENDMENT TO OSHA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a bill I introduced February 27, H.R. 13118, to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970—OSHA.

The purpose of OSHA is to assure safe and healthful working conditions for American workers—with equity for employers and employees alike.

Presently under the act, employees of the States and their political subdivisions are expressly excluded from its coverage, except under approved State plans.

The purpose of H.R. 13118 is to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 by providing for Federal authority to help assure safe and healthful working conditions of State and local employees where a pattern or practice of unsafe or unhealthful working conditions or imminent danger exists.

State and local governmental employees are not now covered because the term "employer," which is controlling for coverage purposes, expressly excludes States and their political subdivisions.

According to section 3(5) of the act:

(5) The term "employer" means a person engaged in a business affecting commerce who has employees, but does not include the United States or any State or political subdivision of a State.

The term "State" is defined as follows in section 3(7) of the act:

(7) The term "State" includes a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Since States, as defined in section 3(7) of the act, and political subdivisions of States are not regarded as employers under section 3(5) of the act, they are not covered as employers under the act, except to the extent that section 18(c)(6), and the pertinent regulations of that section, requires as a condition of approval that a State plan:

(6) Contain(s) satisfactory assurances that such State will, to the extent permitted by its law, establish and maintain an effective and comprehensive occupational safety and health program applicable to all employees of public agencies of the State and its political subdivisions, which program is as effective as the standards contained in an approved plan.

The Department of Labor has established that any entity which has been: First, created directly by the State, so as to constitute a department or administrative arm of the Government, or, second, administered by individuals who are controlled by public officials and responsible to such officials or to the general electorate, shall be deemed to be a "State or political subdivision thereof" under section 33(5) of the act and, therefore, not within the definition of employer, and, consequently, not subject to the act as an employer.

The Department of Labor has further established in section 1975.5 of the Federal Register—January 21, 1972—various factors which will be taken into consideration in determining whether an entity meets the above two tests. Each case is viewed on its merits.

Examples of entities which would normally be regarded as not being employers under section 3(5) of the act are the State departments of labor and industry; the State highway and motor vehicle departments; State, county, and municipal law enforcement agencies as well as penal institutions: State, county, and municipal judicial bodies; State university board of trustees; State, county, and municipal public school boards and commissions; and public libraries.

Depending on the facts in the particular situation, the following types of entities would also probably be excluded as employers under section 3(5) of the act: harbor districts, irrigation districts, port authorities, bi-State authorities over bridges, highways, rivers, harbors, et cetera; municipal transit entities; and State, county, and local hospitals, and related institutions.

The following examples are of entities which would normally not be regarded as a "State or political subdivision of a State," but unusual factors to the contrary in a particular case may indicate otherwise: Public utility companies, merely regulated by State or local bodies; businesses, such as alcoholic beverage distributors, licensed under State or local law; other business entities which under agreement perform certain functions for the State, such as gasoline stations conducting automobile inspections for State and county governments.

Some protection of the employees of State and local governments is provided for elsewhere in the act. Section 18(c)(6) says that a State plan may be approved only if it contains satisfactory assurances that a State will, to its legal ability, establish and maintain an effective and comprehensive occupational safety and health program for public employees.

The Department of Labor has issued guidelines for the States as to the requirements for State and local public employees. These are set forth in the decision approving the North Carolina plan—38 CFR 3041, February 1, 1973. That decision rules that the remedial system of a State public employee program "does not have to be the same as the remedial system available to private employers." Instead, the decision says that, for approval, the State plan must contain assurances that the safety and health programs for State public employees provide for the following: First, regular inspections of workplaces, including inspections in response to complaints; second, a means for employees to bring possible violations to the attention of inspectors; third, notification to employees when no violations are found in a complaint-response inspection; fourth, information for employees about their protection and responsibilities under the program; fifth, protection for employees against employer retaliation for exercising their rights under the program; sixth, information for employees about their exposure to toxic materials, especially when exposures are above levels specified by standards; seventh, procedures for prompt restraint or elimination of imminent danger situations; eighth, a means of notifying employers and employees when an alleged violation has been found; and ninth, a means of establishing timetables for correction of violations, and for notifying employees and employers about them.

All of the approved and proposed State plans provide coverage for State and local public employees. However, the application of the State safety and health program to public employees may be developmental. The Secretary has said that, for approval, a State plan need not meet all of the requirements of section 18 at the time of submission, but may be approved if it meets these requirements within a 3-year developmental period. The period for the development of State and local coverage and the particular provisions in State safety plans vary widely.

All approved State plans provide for some manner of enforcing a compliance of State and local governmental agencies. In a number of States the same type of enforcement is used for public employers as for private employers—that is, Alaska, Iowa, Minnesota, Oregon, and Washington. In other States coverage of State and local employees is similar to that provided for in section 19 of the act for Federal employees, with assurances that the program will meet the specific requirements outlined above—that is, Montana and North Carolina.

In 1972 the Bureau of Labor Statistics published "Injury Rates by Industry, 1970". The following work-injury rates were published based on work injuries and disabling work injuries per million employee-hours of exposure:

Industry	SIC code	Injury-frequency rates 1970	Injury-frequency rates 1969	Injury-severity rate	Average days charged per injury: Permanent partial	Average days charged per injury: Temporary total	Average days charged per injury: All disabling injuries	Percent of disabling injuries resulting in—: Death	Percent of disabling injuries resulting in—: Permanent impairment	Percent of disabling injuries resulting in—: Temporary total disability
MANUFACTURING										
Manufacturing, total		15.2	14.8	759	427	18	50	0.2	4.4	95.4
NONMANUFACTURING										
Contract Construction										
Contract construction, total		28.0	28.0	2,100	613	17	75	.7	2.6	96.7
Wholesale and Retrail Trade										
Wholesale and retail trade, total		11.3	11.6	452	545	14	40	.2	2.1	97.7
Educational services	82	6.7	7.3	385	748	15	57	.4	2.2	97.4
Elementary and secondary schools	821	7.1	7.5							
Colleges and universities	822	7.1	7.4	287	639	17	40	.3	1.2	98.5
Government										
State government:										
Hospitals	9280P	21.4	16.0	636	843	17	30		1.5	98.5
Institutions of higher education	9282P	7.4	6.2	308	665	15	42	.3	.8	98.9
Other State government	9290P	10.4		910	646	14	88	.8	2.0	97.2
Local government:										
Transit systems	9341P	22.0		853	557	25	39	.2	.5	99.3
Electric systems	9349P	17.2	17.8	1,391	1,171	20	81	.7	1.3	98.0
Gas systems	9349P	14.1	11.0							
Water supply systems	9349P	24.9	20.1	1,583	771	16	63	.5	1.5	98.1
Refuse collection and disposal	9349P	63.9	48.3	2,598	793	14	41	.3	1.1	98.6
Other utilities (and combination utilities)	934P	23.0								
Hospitals	9380P	13.0	12.2	400	670	16	31	.1	1.7	98.3
Elementary and secondary schools	9382P	9.3	7.5	300	564	13	32	.2	1.4	98.4
Police	9390P	45.6	42.3	2,521	797	12	55	.5	1.3	98.1
Fire protection	9390P	41.7	48.8	4,349	1,275	22	104	.6	3.1	96.3
Highways and streets	9390P	35.6	40.4	2,369	338	14	67	.8	1.3	97.9

There are few instances where the injury frequency rate for State and local employees is lower than those reported under Nonmanufacturing, Manufacturing and Wholesale and Retail Trade. These figures reflect the need for further efforts to assure safe and healthful working conditions for State and local employees.

The present procedures for assuring the safety and health of State and local public employees followed by the States and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration surely comply with the act as it is written. But these procedures lack consistency and they fail to cover public employees in States without approved State plans. The statistics indicate that occupations in State and local employment can be every bit as dangerous as those in the private sector. I therefore believe there is a need to amend the act to provide for an effective and constitutional mechanism to improve the State and local public employee protection on the part of OSHA.

For these reasons, I have introduced H.R. 13118 to amend OSHA of 1970. This bill grants Federal authority to help assure safe and healthful working conditions for State and local employees where a pattern or practice of unsafe or unhealthful working conditions or imminent danger exists. It provides full coverage to public employees and employers, with enforcement through the District Courts in order to be consistent with the Constitutional limitations of *Maryland* v. *Wirtz*, 392 U.S. 183 (1967).

Generally the bill would extend OSHA's coverage to States and their political subdivisions. Specifically, it would amend the definition of the term "person" in the act to include any State or political subdivision of a State. Further, it would amend the definition of "employer" by striking out the phrase which eliminates States and their political subdivisions. These changes in the definition would give to employees of the States and their political subdivisions, as defined by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, coverage under the act, and provide the full protection of the imminent danger provisions of section 13 of the act.

The bill would also increase the membership of the National Advisory Committee on Occupational Safety and Health from 12 to 14. One of the new members would be a representative of State and local governments and the other would be a representative of employees of State and local governments.

Any employees or representatives of employees of a State or a political subdivision of a State, who believe that a safety or health violation exists that threatens physical harm, or that an imminent danger exists, may request an inspection by giving notice to the Secretary or his authorized representative, of such violation or danger. Any notice shall: First, be in writing, second, set forth with reasonable particularity the grounds for the notice and third, shall be signed by the employees or representative of employees. A copy shall be provided the employer or his agent no later than at the time of inspection, except that, upon the request of the person giving notice, his name or the names of the individual employees referred to in the notice shall not appear in the copy or on any record published, released, or made available according to the act. If the Secretary, upon receipt of the notice, determines there are reasonable grounds to believe that a pattern or practice of such violations or danger exists, he shall make a special inspection as soon as practicable, to determine if such pattern or practice or danger exist.

If the Secretary determines there are no reasonable grounds to believe that a pattern or practice of such violations or dangers exists, he shall notify the employees or representatives of employees in writing of this determination. If the Secretary determines there are no reasonable grounds to believe that a pattern or practice of violations or dangers exists, but that violations or dangers exist which do not constitute a pattern or practice, or that dangers exist which do not constitute imminent dangers, he shall notify the employer and the employees or representative of the employees in writing of this determination.

Prior to or during any inspection of a workplace, any employees or representative of employees employed in the workplace may notify the Secretary or the representative of the Secretary responsible for conducting the inspections, in writing, of any violation of section 5(a) of the act which they have reason to believe exists in the workplace; that is, the general duty clause of the act will cover State and local employees.

The U.S. district courts shall have jurisdiction, upon petition of the Secretary, to restrain any pattern or practice of any violation of section 5(a) that exposes employees of any employer who is a State or a political subdivision of a State to unhealthful or unsafe working conditions. Any such petition to restrain any pattern or practice of any violation of section 5(a) by an employer shall be filed with the appropriate U.S. district court not later than 6 months after the occurrence of any violation which is part of such pattern or practice, and any affected employees or representative of af-

fected employees shall have an opportunity to participate as parties in any proceeding held with respect to such petition. Any order issued may require such steps to be taken as may be necessary to avoid, correct or remove such pattern or practice.

Upon the filing of any petition, the district court shall have jurisdiction to grant such injunctive relief or temporary restraining order as it deems appropriate. The proceeding shall be as provided by rule 65 of the Federal Rules, Civil Procedure.

In the case of a petition to restrain any pattern or practice of any violation of section 5(a) by an employer who is a State or a political subdivision of a State, the Secretary shall, before filing the petition, attempt to eliminate such pattern or practice through voluntary compliance by the employer achieved by informal conciliation or other mediation procedures. Any affected employees or representative of affected employees shall have an opportunity to participate in such procedures.

I am confident this bill will help to assure employees of States and their political subdivisions coverage under OSHA with equity for employers and employees alike. It provides legal and consistent coverage for all of the Nation's State and local employees which the act currently lacks. Procedures for prompt restraint or elimination of imminent danger situations are retained as well as assurances to employers and employees alike for fair and equal treatment under the law.

An amendment such as this is not easily written, and I want to acknowledge the invaluable technical assistance offered by the Labor Department, the Legislative Counsel, the Staff of the Education and Labor Committee and Chuck Hurley and Kathy Farnsworth of my staff. I feel it is essential that we allay the concern expressed by those in the private sector who say, "I am required to do certain things. Why does not the Government have to do the same?"

I am convinced this bill justly handles a situation which requires our attention. Our distinguished colleague, DOMINICK DANIELS, chairman of the Select Labor Subcommittee, has announced oversight and amendment hearings on OSHA beginning March 19. I am confident this legislation will receive the attention and discussion it requires.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 13118

A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 by providing for Federal authority to assure safe and healthful working conditions of State and local employees where a pattern or practice of unsafe or unhealthful working conditions or imminent dangers exists

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That (a) section 3(4) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 is amended by striking out "or" the second time it appears therein and by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or any State or political subdivision of a State".

(b) Section 3(5) of such Act is amended by striking out "or any State or political subdivision of a State".

SEC. 2. Section 7(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "twelve" and inserting in lieu thereof "14" and by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "One such member shall be a representative of State and local governments and one such member shall be a representative of employees of State and local governments."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 8 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h)(1) The provisions of subsection (f) shall not apply with respect to any employer who is a State or political subdivision of a State.

"(2) In the case of any employer who is a State or a political subdivision of a State, any employees or representative of employees who believe that a violation of section 5(a) exists, or that an imminent danger exists, may request an inspection by giving notice to the Secretary or his authorized representative of such violation or danger. Any such notice shall be reduced to writing, shall set forth with reasonable particularity the grounds for the notice, and shall be signed by the employees or representative of employees, and a copy shall be provided the employer or his agent no later than at the time of such inspection, except that, upon the request of the person giving such notice, his name and the names of individual employees referred to therein shall not appear in such copy or on any record published, released, or made available pursuant to subsection (g) of this section. If upon receipt of such notification the Secretary determines there are reasonable grounds to believe that a pattern or practice of such violations or dangers exists, he shall make a special inspection in accordance with the provisions of this section as soon as practicable, to determine if such pattern or practice or dangers exist. If the Secretary determines there are no reasonable grounds to believe that a pattern or practice of such violations or dangers exists he shall notify the employees or representative of the employees in writing of such determination. If the Secretary determines there are no reasonable grounds to believe that a pattern or practice of violations or dangers exists, but that violations or dangers exist which do not constitute a pattern or practice or that dangers exist which do not constitute imminent dangers, he shall notify such employer and the employees or representative of the employees in writing of such determination.

"(3) Prior to or during any inspection of a workplace, any employees or representative of employees employed in such workplace may notify the Secretary responsible for conducting the inspection, in writing, of any violation of section 5(a) which they have reason to believe exists in such workplace."

SEC. 4. Section 9 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply with respect to an employer who is a State or a political subdivision of a State."

SEC. 5. (a) Section 10 of such Act is amended by inserting after subsection (c) thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) The provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall not apply with respect to an employer who is a State or a political subdivision of a State.

"(e) The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction, upon petition of the Secretary, to restrain any pattern or practice of any violation of section 5(a) that exposes employees of any employer who is a State or a political subdivision of a State to unhealthful or unsafe working conditions. In the case of petition to restrain any pattern or practice of any violation of section 5(a) by any such employer (1) such petition shall be filed with the appropriate United States district court not later than 6 months after the occurrence of any violation which is part of such pattern or practice, and (2) any affected employees or representative of affected employees shall have an opportunity to participate as parties in any proceeding held with respect to such petition. Any order issued may require such steps to be taken as may be necessary to avoid, correct, or remove such pattern or practice.

"Upon the filing of any petition, the district court shall have jurisdiction to grant such injunctive relief or temporary restraining order as it deems appropriate. The proceeding shall be as provided by Rule 65 of the Federal Rules, Civil Procedure.

"In the case of a petition to restrain any pattern or practice of any violation of section 5(a) by an employer who is a State or a political subdivision of a State, the Secretary shall, before filing such petition, attempt to eliminate such pattern or practice through voluntary compliance by such employer achieved by informal conciliation or other mediation procedures. Any affected employees or representative of affected employees shall have an opportunity to participate in such procedures."

SEC. 6. Section 11 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d), and by inserting after subsection (b) thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The provisions of subsection (a) and subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to an employer who is a State or political subdivision of a State."

SEC. 7. Section 17 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) The provisions of subsection (a) through subsection (e) and subsection (i) through subsection (l) of this section shall not apply with respect to an employer who is a State or a political subdivision of a State."

SEC. 8. (a) Section 18(a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", or over any such issue with respect to employees of such State or political subdivision of such State".

(b) The second sentence of section 18(e) of such Act is amended by inserting after "(c)" the first time it appears therein the following: ", and, specifically, the requirement set forth in paragraph (6) of such subsection,".

SEC. 9. The amendments made by the foregoing provisions of this Act shall take effect 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

REDUCING SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to inform the Members of the House that I have again today reintroduced my bill to reduce social security taxes for the employer and the employee.

I have joining me 25 other cosponsors, which makes 75 Members of the House, who have cosponsored this legislation.

This social security tax, if you will check back in your home districts, you will find is the most regressive tax in our Nation's history. Over 50 percent of the workers in this country are paying more in social security taxes than they are in income taxes. This is a tax that falls very heavily on small business and places domestic industry at a real disadvantage when they try to compete with our trading partners in the European nations

where they pay only a tax of one-third on the employer, one-third on the employee, and the rest from general revenue.

I urge my other colleagues who have not cosponsored this legislation to look into the legislation and join with me so that we can have additional copsonsors. I expect to file another 25 names by next Monday, so it would be nice if you will look into this bill and join the honor roll of cosponsors who are trying to do something about this regressive tax.

HEARINGS ON PARENS PATRIAE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on H.R. 12528 and H.R. 12921, bills to amend Federal antitrust laws to allow States to sue as parens patriae on behalf of its citizens or for injuries to its own general economy. Hearings on this subject will commence on March 11, 1974, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2141 Rayburn House Office Building. At that time testimony will be heard for the National Association of Attorneys General. Subsequent hearings will be announced at a later date.

Those wishing to testify or to submit statements for the Record should address their request to the Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

LABOR—FAIR WEATHER FRIEND—IV

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, during the last several days I have told how a clash developed between the demonstrably unfair management of the Farah Co. and the union that was trying to organize it. I am sure that my colleagues will recall that during some of the most bitter days of the dispute I was approached in the public streets of San Antonio by a group of people who had lost their jobs on account of the situation, and these people asked me to hear their grievances—which I did, as it was my duty. Much to my surprise, a few dedicated enemies of mine in the labor movement decided to use this incident to portray me as being antilabor and guilty of "union busting." They knew then and they know now that nothing could have been further from the truth.

But as fate would have it, these individuals seem to have remarkable access to the great powers of labor, and it was not long before I found myself the target of nothing less than the official organ of the AFL–CIO itself.

This particular AFL–CIO report on me resulted from a press release engineered by these few people in San Antonio, who knew that their effort was a complete distortion of what had actually happened, and moreover portrayed me as being unsympathetic to organized labor, when in fact I have always defended labor. I have never apologized for my support of the right of the working man to organize and bargain collectively; that is a right that I have always believed in and defended, even when it cost me political support, and even when my opponents took advantage of it to portray me as a tool of "union goons" as they characterized labor.

So I have been a friend of labor through thick and thin. I thought that if there had ever been any question about anything I had ever said or done, surely I would get the courtesy of being asked for my side of the story. Not so here. I never even got the courtesy of receiving a copy of a message that was supposed to have been sent to me, or a copy of the press release condemning me, until days after the event, and then only through the kindness of a fellow who wondered just what was going on.

Now I was aggrieved by this shabby and grossly unfair treatment. So I wrote a letter to the man most responsible for this whole thing, and who had it in his power to see that the situation was corrected—namely, Don Slaiman, who heads up the AFL–CIO civil rights department, and who provides the money and wherewithal that enables the Labor Council for Latin American Advancement to exist. And in fairness to that body, I will say that its attack on me was not cleared by its board—only two or three board members actually seem to have known about it.

I thus had every reason to think that Slaiman would understand my grievance: Here, after all, was a lifelong friend of labor, from an area where labor has few friends, being assailed by all the powers of the AFL–CIO as a result of the devious efforts of a few people who could influence a guy who controlled an AFL–CIO letterhead. Here I was, victimized by an organization that then had no official existence, and whose directors were not even aware of it. And here I was, not having received even a message from anybody, receiving attacks from the heights of George Meany himself.

You can understand my rage, when I wrote Slaiman this letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 20, 1973.

Mr. DON SLAIMAN,
Director, AFL–CIO Civil Rights,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SLAIMAN: Through the courtesy of Mr. Richard Murphy, Legislative Director of SEIV Committee on Political Education, I have received a copy of a Press Release and purported telegram from the so-called Labor Council for Latin American Advancement, condemning what it calls my "union busting attitude".

Needless to say, I have yet to receive the supposed telegram, and can only state that its hypocrisy is equalled only by the shabbiness of your tactics and sheer untruthfulness of your statements. You know as well as anyone, my consistent support for the causes of the people and my stands in behalf of organized labor since long before labor had any importance in my section of the country. You know as well as anyone, my long-standing support of Civil Rights and human decency, even in the days when such stands caused me considerable personal danger and my family much anxiety. You know my voting record.

In light of all this, it is hard to believe how hypocritical it is of you and your cronies not to so much as ask me what my position is respecting the Farah Company, let alone give me the benefit of any doubt whatever. I don't think I owe you any explanations for my conduct. You have not earned the right to condemn me. Your actions can only harm the cause that we both stand for. I would feel much better if you would spend your time attacking the real enemies of labor rather than your friends.

I hope that I will not see again such shabbiness from you or anyone else associated with labor. What labor stands for is too good to be besmirched by such crude, vicious and untrue statements as that I read this morning.

When you need a real friend, don't call on me. I will do what is right because I believe in it, not because I owe you anything—I never have and I never will.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

I waited a decent length of time for Slaiman to answer, allowing for the holiday season and for possible mail delay, before trying again:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1974.

Mr. DON SLAIMAN,
Director, Civil Rights Department, AFL-CIO,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SLAIMAN: Last December 20, I wrote you a letter regarding a Press Release issued by the Labor Council for Latin American Advancement, in which I was attacked for a "Union busting attitude."

Thus far, I have not heard anything from the LCLAA, not even a peep. I have yet to receive the telegram that they supposedly sent to me on or about December 18, and the only communications I have had have been from several Board Members of the Organization who have wondered why they were not contacted before this statement was issued. And I am not terribly surprised that I haven't heard anything from you either.

I think that you know what my record in support of Labor is and it speaks for itself. I think that you and those responsible for the Press Release know what the truth is, but you do not want to admit it even to yourselves. You owe me an apology and the LCLAA does, too. I expect it and I demand it. I also expect that the Press Release will be retracted and that I will receive an apology—a public apology—from the Organization.

I used to wonder how it would be possible for Labor to tacitly support the candidacy of its greatest enemy, the present incumbent of the White House, but now I know. It seems clear enough now that you guys would rather spend your energies supporting your enemies and attacking your friends. If that is going to do anything for the advancement of human decency, I've got a lot to learn about politics and life.

I don't think it is too much to expect from you—something less than outright lies—and I don't think it is too much to expect from you the simple courtesy of a reply to my letter. I might never hear from you and you might never retract the statement, or apologize to me. That's your judgment to make. But I want you to know that until I do hear from you and I do get a public apology, you can cross me off your list.

Don't darken my door and don't clutter up my mailbox, unless it is for the purpose of an apology.

Very truly yours,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

To date, Slaiman has never even acknowledged my letters. I have never received so much as a post card from him or those who joined in issuing the attack on me. John Mitchell used to be that arrogant, when I questioned him about the misconduct of a subsequently dismissed assistant attorney general. I never dreamed that Don Slaiman would be of the same disposition as Mitchell.

But I have thought about this, and on serious reflection have come to believe that those who occupy the penthouse precincts, be they business, government, or labor, share a common self-perception: They see themselves as great agents of power. They see themselves as instruments of history, exempt from the tumult and turmoil that lesser mortals live in. They become interested, even obsessed with acquiring, and most important, using all that power. It becomes more important to be part of history than to wonder what history's judgment will be; after all, if great men cannot be questioned, they come to think they are exempt from making mistakes or being wrong. So to the self-envisioned brokers of power, the important thing is having a role to play, not whether they are doing what is best or right, not to be concerned with its rightness or wrongness. Being a great man takes energy, and being a great man is what counts most.

It may be that having a grand office, all the accoutrements of power, playing such important roles, becomes as intoxicating to men like Slaiman as it did to Haldeman and Ehrlichman, whose arrogance very nearly destroyed free government in the land of the free. And maybe having a position of power is corrupting, as it was to John Mitchell, to whom the important thing was not how you played the game, but whether you won, Constitution, law, honesty, integrity, or any other virtue notwithstanding.

Maybe this is what has happened to Slaiman. Maybe I will never know, because I may never hear from him or the other panjandrums of big labor, who are so accessible to my most zealous and dedicated enemies, but whose doors are closed to the likes of me, just an ordinary, day in, day out friend of labor.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE VIOLATING FOOD STAMP ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of this body the recently announced decision by the U.S. Agriculture Department to establish the food stamp program in Puerto Rico in a manner that discriminates against poor people there and is in violation of the Food Stamp Act.

Earlier this week, USDA announced plans for starting the program in Puerto Rico, pursuant to the amendments Congress adopted last August. According to that announcement, USDA officials have decided to give a smaller amount of stamps to hungry Puerto Rican families than it provides to mainland families in an apparently cynical disregard for the needs of the island's poor and in an apparent unconcern for the plain language of the Food Stamp Act.

The act states, in its relevant part, that food stamp coupon allotments—the amount each participating family receives—must be set at such a level as would equal the cost of food on the island. The only restriction being that such coupon allotments cannot exceed the mainland levels. The method used by USDA in the past for such calculations involves determining the cost for the particular foods contained in its economy diet plan. Such, for example is the way the current mainland allotment figure of $142 monthly for a family of four was determined. Yet, according to USDA's recent announcement it has set an allotment of $122 monthly for four-person Puerto Rican families. Clearly, the only justification for this reduction in benefits would be if the island had lower foods costs than the mainland. Such is not the case, however. In fact, Puerto Rico has significantly higher food prices than many places in the mainland and these higher prices must certainly mean that the economy diet plan costs more than many places in the mainland. Accordingly, it is quite apparent that USDA has ignored the requirements of the law and has set a discriminatorily low standard for the island.

Turning to another, equally disturbing subject, the Department has also announced that it will delay implementing the program on many parts of the island until as late as March 1975. This is most difficult to understand since the amendments we adopted in August 1973 clearly required the implementation of the program in every political subdivision, including all the parts of Puerto Rico, by June 30, 1974. The only exception is allowed for those places where it is determined that it is impossible or impracticable to do so. Yet, incredibly, USDA has made no such showing to my knowledge.

To be specific, the implementation of food stamps on the island must be accomplished throughout the island by the June 30, 1974, deadline unless USDA and the Commonwealth are able to demonstrate affirmatively and specifically why such implementation is not possible. Lacking such a showing, they are in obvious violation of the law.

If it should develop that indeed such total implementation is truly not possible or practicable—even through the use of municipal governments, additional Federal and Commonwealth agencies and private persons—then the obligation still remains upon USDA and the Commonwealth to complete the implementation at the first possible moment. Even, were such a delay necessary, it should certainly not extend clear to March 1975 for San Juan.

Finally, when setting the income-eligibility standards it is obvious that, once again, USDA chose to ignore the will of Congress. Our 1971 amendment to the act instructed the Department to calculate eligibility by multiplying the number of persons in each household by the per capita income for the island, thus arriving at a maximum income figure for each household size.

It is clear that this was not done. Judging from the figures used in USDA's announcement, in fact, it seems that the eligibility standards are 14 percent lower than those used for U.S. households. This unlawful discrimination must be rectified immediately.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Representatives WALSH, HECKLER of Massachusetts, HELSTOSKI, CARNEY of Ohio, and over 50 House cosponsors, I have introduced legislation designed to equalize educational opportunities for all Vietnam-era veterans. This important measure will provide a direct tuition payment to vets for tuition costs that exceed the national average—of about $400.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was the result of a joint effort on the part of myself and my four colleagues on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee; it began, and continues, as an effort that crosses both State and party lines, indicated by the broad, bipartisan support the bill has gathered. An identical effort is underway in the Senate; the direct tuition concept there has the support of over 30 Senators, including Majority Leader MANSFIELD and Minority Leader SCOTT.

A few months ago, the Educational Testing Service, which was commissioned by the VA to do a report on the GI education bill, emphatically concluded that the GI bill for Vietnam-era vets falls far short of its World War II predecessor. The World War II program not only provided veterans with a monthly subsistence allowance, but took care of virtually all tuition costs, books, and supplies. The present GI bill, in contrast, provides vets with only a monthly subsistence allowance; this must be stretched to cover not only our high cost of living but also our high cost of education.

One of the most important findings made by the ETS study was that the single most important factor determining whether a vet uses his GI benefits is the State in which he resides. The monthly subsistence allowance that vets presently receive does not begin to cover the costs of schooling in high cost public education States. There are hundreds of thousands of vets, especially in States where public education wears a high price tag, who simply cannot afford to take advantage of their GI education benefits. Thus, the present GI education program does not afford equal educational opportunities for all our vets; this was not the case for World War II veterans who, in fact, were virtually free to pick and choose not only among public schools but among private as well.

The bill we have introduced seeks to amend the basic disparate structure of the current GI bill. It would authorize the Veterans' Administration to reimburse a vet for tuition costs above $419—approximately the national average tui-

tion—with the VA's payments not to exceed $600. Such a variable tuition payment would serve to equalize educational opportunities for all vets, regardless of where they reside.

Recently, the House passed legislation to increase by 13.6 percent the monthly subsistence allowance for vets and to extend the period of eligibility from 8 to 10 years. This was legislation which I and my colleagues on the committee who have sponsored this new bill actively supported, and indeed, helped to draft. It is unquestionably a step in the right direction, but we still have a way to go if we are going to bring the present GI bill anywhere close to a par with its WWII predecessor. The new bill we have introduced is designed to supplement the bill passed by the House, to bring us one step closer toward fulfilling the obligation we have to those who served.

I am pleased to report that Mr. HELSTOSKI, an original sponsor of this proposal and chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Education and Training Subcommittee, will be holding hearings on the direct tuition concept. It would indeed be appropriate if on March 29, the day set aside to honor the Vietnam veteran, Congress could present to the President a truly significant legislative package to upgrade the GI education bill.

Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD I would like to include a list of those Members who have cosponsored our legislation; we urge the rest of our colleagues to join us in this important effort.

The list of coponsors follows:

COSPONSORS OF VETERANS EDUCATION BILL

Mr. Wolff, Mr. Walsh, Mrs. Heckler of Massachustts, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Carney, Ms. Abzug, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Badillo, Mr. Bergland, Mr. Boland of Massachusetts, Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. Clay, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Cohen, Mrs. Collins of Illinois, Mr. Conte, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Cronin, Mr. Danielson, Mr. Drinan, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Eilberg, Mr. Esch, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Murtha.

Mr. Fish, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Grover, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Horton, Mrs. Holtzman, Mr. Kazen, Mr. Koch, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Maraziti, Mr. Minish, Mr. Mitchell of Maryland, Mr. Nix, Mr. Owens, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Peyser, Mr. Podell, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Regula.

Mr. Roe, Mr. Roncalio of Wyoming, Mr. Rose, Mr. Rosenthal, Mrs. Schroeder, Mr. Studds, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Winn, Mr. Mitchell of New York, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Sarasin, Mr. Seiberling, Mr. Gunter.

MY VIEWS ON IMPEACHMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the national debate on impeaching the President continues unabated. With increasing frequency I am being asked where I stand on this issue and, more specifically, how I will cast my vote when the question of impeachment comes to the floor of the House of Representatives.

I want to take this opportunity to explain again my views on impeachment and to let you know the reasons that have led me to arrive at the position I hold.

First of all—and this is most important—when I speak of impeachment I mean the presentation by the House of Representatives of charges against the President which render him unfit to further hold office. I do not mean the removal of the President from office. It is for the Senate to decide beyond a reasonable doubt whether to acquit or to convict the President of the House charges. Conviction in the Senate would, of course, remove the President from office. The House can only decide whether or not there is probable cause of an impeachment offense to warrant a trial on these charges in the Senate.

Impeachment, then, is the equivalent of a grand jury indictment in the sense that it is based on probable cause and it only charges the President with wrongdoing sufficient for removal from office. Unlike an indictment, however, an impeachable offense is not limited to a violation of the criminal law.

It certainly includes criminal offenses. Bribery, for instance, is a cause for impeachment. But much more is included as well. As Alexander Hamilton wrote in the Federalist Paper, the jurisdiction of impeachment includes "those offenses which proceed from the misconduct of public men, or in other words from the abuse or violation of some public trust. They are—political, as they relate chiefly to injuries done immediately to the society."

At the Constitutional Convention, James Madison gave an example of such a violation when he said:

> If the President be connected in any suspicious manner with any person, and there be grounds to believe that he will shelter him, he may be impeached.

In addition to protecting bad men, Madison believed that a President could be impeached for firing good men without cause. Abuse of political power, a habit of authoritarianism, neglect of duty, subverting the integrity of Government or betrayal of trust—the Founding Fathers saw all these grounds for impeachment, though they may not necessarily be grounds for criminal charges.

That the Founding Fathers did not intend to restrict impeachment merely to a violation of the criminal laws is well illustrated in article 1, section 3 of the Constitution which provides that conviction of impeachment shall extend no further than removal from office and disqualification to hold any other office. A party so convicted will still be liable to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment according to the law.

Impeachment is remedial, not punitive, because its purpose is not criminal proscription but removal from office. The fifth amendment's protection against double jeopardy does not apply in cases of impeachment; nor does the sixth amendment's guarantee of a trial by jury "in all criminal prosecution" because impeachment is not a criminal proceeding and so cannot be governed by the protection of criminal law.

In the past, the House has impeached for improper personal habits, intoxication and other delinquencies that show disqualification to hold and exercise office. In the case of Judge Pickering, who was charged with intoxication on the bench, the Senate voted for conviction. And lest anyone think that in the question of impeachment the Constitution may discriminate between a judge and a President, then I want to emphasize that it does not.

The framers of the Constitution feared despotism and had an entirely realistic view of human nature. While they saw the need for an independent chief executive, they were quite prepared to believe that a President might abuse his power. Having just rid themselves of one King, they did not want to create another.

As George Mason reasoned, "Shall any man be above justice? Above all, shall that man be above it who can commit the most extensive injustice." Impeachment is the means the Founding Fathers chose to insure that Presidents would be accountable for their actions.

Benjamin Franklin put it best when he said:

> Impeachment is the best way for the regular punishment of the Executive when his misconduct should deserve it, and for his honorable acquittal when he should be unjustly accused.

If, as the President insists, he has been maligned by the press and political enemies, then the impeachment inquiry will clear him in the eyes of history. On the other hand, if the Judiciary Committee inquiry finds probable cause that the President is guilty of wrongdoing sufficient to remove him from office, then impeachment by the House should follow.

In modern times Vice President GERALD FORD, when he was a Member of Congress, stated that:

> An impeachable offense is whatever a majority of the House of Representatives considers it to be at a given moment in history.

Former Attorney General Richard Kleindienst voiced a similar opinion when testiflying before a Senate Committee last year. He said:

> You don't need facts to impeach a President, just votes.

It certainly is clear from this that a President can be impeached and convicted for actions that are serious offenses against the public interest but not in and of themselves purely legal crimes.

However, if criminal violations do occur, then I believe that impeachment and removal from office are a necessary first step before an incumbent President can be charged with a criminal act. This is because a President most likely could not be indicted by the Department of Justice since that would violate the doctrine of separation of powers and interfere with his constitutional obligations to conduct the affairs of his office.

The question is not whether a President has performed well in office, or whether he is popular, or whether his policies are worthwhile. The only question is whether or not the President has performed through misfeasance or malfeasance some act which is criminal or a high crime and misdemeanor in the constitutional sense I have described—that is, a serious offense against the public interest.

Too many Americans are unwilling to admit even to themselves that a President can be guilty of wrongdoing. They do not want to look at the facts. They consider it unpatriotic or even traitorous to question the actions of a President. They think that by defending the President they are defending the United States.

This is sheer nonsense. It is the Constitution and not the President that is the supreme law. No one, not even a person who sits in the highest office in the land, is above the law. The Constitution, particularly the Bill of Rights, exists to protect the people from the excesses of government—and not the other way around.

There are those who argue that the law may have been violated but that it was necessary to do so in the interests of "national security." The Constitution knows no such term. A violation of the law on the pretense of saving a government such as ours actually works to destroy it. Illegal acts in the name of national security do not change the quality of the acts or their operation on other parties. To put it simply, the end does not justify the means.

Nor can it be argued that what may have been done by the Executive was excusable because the country was fighting a war abroad while contending with unrest at home. In such troubled times, the reasoning goes, the Executive was entitled to defend itself against those who had no regard or respect for the law. This is fallacious. The law applies to all, all of the time. Jeremiah Black, one of the finest attorneys in 19th century America, best expressed the reasoning behind this proposition in arguments he gave before the Supreme Court in 1866:

> I think it is precisely in a time of war and civil commotion that we should double the guards upon the Constitution. In peaceable and quiet times, our legal rights are in little danger of being overborne; but when the wave of power lashes itself into violence and rage, and goes surging up against the barriers which were made to confine it, then we need the whole strength of an unbroken Constitution to save us from destduction.

And so we come to the question of how Richard Nixon fits into all this. Serious charges have been leveled against the President accusing him of deep involvement in Watergate and all its related appendages.

The President is accused of participating in the coverup of the Watergate burglary and obstructing the course of justice by offers of executive clemency and large sums of money to silence the burglars, by suborning the perjury of his campaign officials, by the false assertion of "national security" to cover illegal wiretaps of political opponents and news reporters, by invoking the nebulous doctrine of executive privilege to deny and inhibit the Special Prosecutor's investigation, by the dismissal of Specal Prosecutor Archibald Cox without cause, and by the deliberate destruction of evidence in his sole possession material to the Watergate case.

The President is accused of employing extortion and the corrupt offering of Government favors to secure campaign contributions, as in the promise of $100,000 from the ITT Corp., $2,000,000 from the Associated Milk Producers, Inc., and $200,000 from Mr. Robert Vesco—illegal campaign contributions from corporations which were subsequently "laundered" through foreign bank accounts.

The President is accused of harassing persons designated as political "enemies" through the use of arbitrary IRS tax audits and FBI investigations.

The President is accused of personally approving a "domestic security plan" involving burglary, wiretapping, and the illegal opening of mail, in direct violation to the fourth amendment of the Constitution prohibiting unreasonable searches and seizures.

The President is accused of attempting to influence the outcome of the trial of Daniel Ellsberg by suggesting to the presiding judge, Hon. Matthew Byrne, that he might be appointed Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The President is accused of illegally profiting from the Federal Treasury through publicly financed improvements on his private residences in San Clemente and Key Biscayne.

The President is accused of attempting to evade proper payment of his Federal income taxes in an amount approximating a quarter of a million dollars through unallowable and illegal deductions.

And these are only some of the more significant charges. They do not come from labor unions, leftwing lobby groups or wild-eyed, super emotional radicals bent on destroying this country. Rather, the charges come from the cool deliberations of the U.S. courts, the Special Prosecutor's Office, the Senate Watergate Committee and other congressional committees. So far these investigations have uncovered startling revelations of fact that indicate Richard Nixon may well be guilty of impeachable wrongdoing. If nothing else, they cast suspicions on the President so grave that they demand that he come forth to clear himself of the accusations.

These charges certainly are sufficient to establish a prima facie case of Executive misconduct. And this is all the House of Representatives can do—determine if there is enough evidence to warrant a trial of the charges in the Senate. That is all impeachment is. In the Senate the burden of proof will have to go much further, approximating, if not in fact arriving at the conclusion that the President is guilty of impeachable offenses "beyond a reasonable doubt" before Mr. Nixon can be removed from office.

We must not overlook these accusations or the evidence which already exists to substantiate them merely because they involve the person who occupies the highest office in the land. No position is so high that it is above the law. If he is innocent he should welcome this opportunity to clear himself of these charges. If he is guilty we should all be better off for knowing the truth and acting accordingly. Failure to act would be an open invitation to tyranny by this and future Presidents.

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 11793

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 11793, the legislation establishing the Federal Energy Administration, comes to the floor for amendments, I plan to offer amendments concerning delegation of authority by the Administrator, safeguards for our environmental protection program in the administration of energy-lated programs, and data collection for resources on Federal lands.

The amendment which I will offer regarding delegation of the Administrator's authority has several provisions. First, it would limit his general delegation of functions to officers or employees of the FEA. Second, it would authorize him to delegate his implementation or enforcement functions to State or local governmental officers or boards of balanced composition. Third, it would provide that any plan or program for end-use rationing be implemented through State or local boards so constituted as to reflect the composition of the community as a whole. This last provision is most important. Only at the local level and only through boards which are truly representative of the community will it be at all possible to implement an equitable system of distribution, with due consideration given to those groups in the community who will suffer most from this energy shortage. Priority groups will be different in different communities and specific needs will vary in different localities. But the real hardship cases will be the same in most localities—those who must depend on automotive transportation to earn a living, the handicapped, the elderly, and the poor. These are the groups who rarely have a spokesman to voice their special needs. I would hope that when local rationing boards are established, such groups will be adequately represented.

The second amendment I will offer reflects my grave concern that our environmental protection safeguards may be sacrificed in our zeal to develop new energy programs. This amendment would establish an Environmental Protection Unit within the Federal Energy Administration to coordinate the functions and activities of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Federal Energy Administration. The provision for representation of environmental interests within the new FEA should facilitate such coordination and encourage the Administrator to consult with EPA before undertaking new programs which would adversely affect our environmental programs.

The third amendment, relating to data collection, would require the FEA Administrator, in addition to obtaining much needed data from the energy industry, also to collect such information concerning energy resources on federally owned lands. It would also direct other agencies of the executive branch to furnish such information to the Administrator upon his request. It has been estimated that 80 percent of our fuel reserves are on public lands. Yet, as FEO Administrator

Simon has admitted, we have no adequate data concerning these reserves. That information is vital if we are to know accurately what our reserve status is and if we are to develop our energy policies on the basis of the best available information.

The texts of the amendments follow:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ABZUG

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

Page 16, strike line 5 beginning with "except" and all that follows through line 7 "appropriate." and insert in lieu thereof:

"(2) The Administrator may delegate any of his functions to any officer or employee of the Federal Energy Administration as he deems appropriate. The Administrator may delegate any of his functions relative to implementation and enforcement of any law administered by him to officers of a state or political subdivision thereof or to state or local boards of balanced composition reflecting the makeup of the community as a whole.

"(3) In the event the Administrator implements any plan or program of end-use rationing, such plan or program shall provide for local implementation through state or local boards of balanced composition reflecting the makeup of the community as a whole."

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 11793, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MS. ABZUG

Page 30, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following new section:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

SEC. 11. There shall be established within the Federal Energy Administration an Environmental Protection Unit whose primary purpose shall be to coordinate activities between the Federal Energy Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency. The purpose of such coordination shall be to preclude the possibility that the energy actions undertaken by the Federal Energy Administration will be violative of environmental protection laws including, but not limited to, the National Environmental Protection Act and the Clean Air Act.

And renumber the succeeding sections accordingly.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 11793, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MS. ABZUG

Page 35, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new subsection:

(d) The Administrator shall collect from departments, agencies and instrumentalities of the Executive branch of the Government (including independent agencies), and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish, upon request of the Administrator, information concerning energy resources on lands owned by the Government of the United States. Such information shall include, but not be limited to, quantities of reserves, current or proposed leasing agreements, environmental considerations, and economic impact analyses.

LAND USE BILL IS NOT NEEDED

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in direct opposition to the provisions of the so-called Land Use Planning Act of 1974 as approved by the Senate and as recommended by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The action of the Rules Committee of the House in returning this measure to committee demonstrates the lack of confidence in the proposals that have been made.

I am not opposed to the concept that land use plans should be devised nor that proper use of our lands will result in a more beautiful, ecologically sound Amercia. Nor am I opposed to the notion that open spaces should be guaranteed, that the people of our country should have the best land use possible, and that Federal help should be given to these ends.

But I am diametrically opposed to the idea that the Federal Government should assume dictatorial powers over private property, dictatorial powers over State plans for land use, and dictatorial powers over the purse strings of our political subdivisions.

I do not for a moment feel that the sponsors of either the Senate or the House bill intended any such development. Nevertheless, I fear that is what could occur if either version of the bill were enacted into law. The bills purport to give the States a free hand, yet they set forth requirements to be met by the States in the development of what is called an adequate land use plan. If the State fails to satisfy the Bureau in Washington, it will lose not only land use planning funds, but possibly will be denied Federal funds which have no bearing on land use policy.

Last year, President Nixon attributed the failure of the urban renewal program in part to the fact that it had been administered by the Federal bureaucracy. In a radio address in January of 1973, he posed the question:

. . . How can a committee of Federal bureaucrats, hundreds or thousands of miles away, decide intelligently where buildings should take place?

My answer and the answer of many of my constituents is that they cannot. Yet, instead of learning from our past very expensive experience—expensive not only in terms of the billions of tax dollars expended but also in the thousands of homes and lives disrupted—we are now being asked to make this very same mistake again in the area of land use.

Traditionally, this country has believed that decisions on how privately owned land is to be used should be made at the local level. This only makes sense. Who has more interest in how a particular area is developed and who is better able to make the decisions regarding that development than the persons who actually live there? What better way is there to express one's disapproval of a particular action on land use than at the ballot box in a local election or by a personal appearance at a public hearing? It seems to me that it is the persons who live in the local area who are best equipped to know what the alternatives are, have the greatest interest in monitoring the land use decisions that are made and, consequently, will see to it that they are made.

In direct contrast to the faith that I have in each citizen of America to participate in making these decisions are the land use bill which have been passed by the Senate or recommended by the House committee. Instead of having these local decisions made at the local level, State planning boards would be constituted which will have to draw up land use plans in accordance with Federal guidelines. Instead of traveling to city hall, a person who wishes to protest these decisions would have to travel to his State or National Capital. I am greatly concerned about the extent to which the Federal Government would take over control of local land use under these bills.

The alternative to Federal control would be through State plans under which the whole problem of land use control would also be removed from home rule and placed under a State agency. But, my contention is that land use factors should be considered first at the local, not at the State or Federal level.

In like manner, why should not our citizens at the local level have a voice in deciding which and how much land should be reserved for their recreational needs, how and where expanding areas of their cities and towns are to grow and what areas should be designated as ecologically so sensitive that special consideration should be given to their development? Yet, these bills would give such responsibility to decisionmakers who generally will live many miles from the land and the people who will be affected by their decisions.

All of this is bad enough, but the most dangerous provision is the one which would allow a governmental agency in a sense to impound the land of a private citizen in the name of land use planning and deny him a voice in its use.

Mr. Speaker, the right of ownership of property is entwined in that very important concept known as personal freedom. Congress should not be asked to consider a bill which would make property ownership subject to the whim of some Federal bureaucrat.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, these bills run contrary to the fifth amendment to the Constitution which states in part—

". . . Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

I hold to the position that taking a man's land and rendering that land useless to him are one and the same.

I feel that there may be reason for a sound land use bill. Such a bill is not now before us. It is better to let these bills die and to make a new fresh approach which takes into mind not only sound land use but the rights of the public as well as the landowner.

A FREE MARKET: WAY TO END GAS LINES?

(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, a recent Wall Street Journal contains a most interesting editorial suggesting that if the United States abandoned its allocation program and relied on market forces the price of gasoline would be 59.9 cents per gallon—a price we are rapidly approaching despite our allocation program and various emergency measures taken by

many State governments. I believe the Journal's thesis is deserving of consideration and I fervently hope that the Federal Energy Office will immediately consider this alternative method of dealing with the current gasoline shortage.

Mr. Speaker, as the Journal itself says, no one can be absolutely certain that the price would settle within acceptable limits but if freeing the market mechanism were abused by the oil industry I am confident that this Congress would have not only the capacity but the willingness to act firmly to correct such abuses.

The Wall Street Journal article of the February 27, 1974, issue follows:

GASOLINE: 59.9 CENTS, NO LINES

Harassed motorists in the Northeast are tired of waiting to buy gasoline, and are making life difficult for assorted governors, Congressmen and energy czars. The politicians are intervening in the marketplace—ordering 3% more gasoline to that state, 5% to another, upping the price of gas 2 cents a gallon to supersede the former increase of 1 cent a gallon—all in the name of protecting the consumer from $1 a gallon gasoline.

Actually, if the politicians got themselves out of the picture entirely, the market for gasoline would clear at 59.9 cents. That is, of course, our estimate. Energy czar William Simon tells us his guess is 75 cents, the same figure cited by Harvard's Hendrik Houthakker, who has done as much work as anyone else on petroleum elasticities. George Perry of Brookings guesses 80 cents. Professor Houthakker cheerfully acknowledges that these figures are "very conservative," and in fact, "probably too high."

Consider: There are no gasoline lines in Canada's eastern provinces, where near-total dependence on imported crude oil has in effect maintained a free market. The market has cleared at a price of 70 cents per imperial gallon, which is a fifth larger than a U.S. gallon. In U.S. gallons, that is a price of 59 cents.

There also are no gasoline lines in West Germany. The price there is $1.21 a gallon, including an excise tax of 74 cents. Since U.S. taxes average 12 cents a gallon, U.S. motorists will be even with German motorists in competing for the world's oil supply when the U.S. retail price gets within 62 cents of the German one. That is, when the U.S. price reaches 59 cents.

Alternatively, base the calculation on crude oil prices. The oil industry works with an admittedly rough rule of thumb: With taxes and so on constant, a $1-a-barrel increase in crude prices will mean a 3.5 cents-a-gallon increase in gasoline prices. Starting with the more-or-less current U.S. prices of $7.50 for crude and 45.9 cents for gasoline, this means that 75 cents gasoline would imply crude at $19.14, and $1 gasoline would mean crude at $29.14. The cartel's recent price has been $10.50, which means gasoline at 53.4 cents. Kuwait recently specified still higher bids, through there were no takers. But if you make the crude price $13.10, you get gasoline at 59.9 cents.

A great many normally intelligent people find it hard to believe that the gasoline market would clear at 60 cents, or even 75 cents, because they have persuaded themselves that gasoline is the only commodity in history with zero elasticity of demand. So far as we can ascertain, the data base for this conclusion consists of $30,000-a-year government aides interviewing each other on whether they care what the price is. They care more than they admit—just watch the two-car families use the compact more than the station wagon—but in any event a very small percentage of gasoline is purchased by $30,000-a-year government aides.

Historical studies of gasoline elasticity do exist. Two months ago we guessed that the clearing price would be 57 cents, based on Professor Houthakker's earlier studies. These studies were based on small changes in both price and demand, and if anything our experience with sharper price changes over the last year or so suggest that the drop in demand as price increases is larger rather than smaller than the initial studies predicted.

Now of course, estimates are only estimates. No one can guarantee that the price will settle out at any particular level. For one thing, supply has been made uncertain by the crude oil allocation programs, which has disincentives to import oil. If the market were allowed to operate, the addition of U.S. buying power to the world scene would no doubt force prices up a few cents in Canada and West Germany. But it is very difficult to see how the U.S. price could rise much above the equivalent price in the rest of the world. Rather, strong evidence suggests a price not in the neighborhood of 75 cents, but of 60 cents.

This price is already being charged by some stations relying heavily on imported oil. That they continue to make sales is no measure of the elasticity, because domestic gasoline from other stations cannot be transferred and sold at 60 cents. But the fact that the price has already reached this level is suggestive in one sense: The gasoline problem will inevitably be solved by getting the price of gasoline up to the clearing price. In fact, Mr. Simon's whole operation is an effort to get the price up to clear the market as fast as Congress will allow.

In other words, all that agony for motorists, and all those letters to Congressmen and governors, are not the price of avoiding $1 gasoline now and forever. They are the price of postponing 60 cent gasoline from now until summer or fall. It's not much of a bargain. The rest of the world has no lines for gasoline; only the United States is punishing itself by straining to hold back the inevitable.

FROM THE HORSE'S MOUTH

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

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, last week, I heard many speeches from my colleagues concerning the need for passage of the emergency energy bill and particularly the price rollback features.

Very few of those speaking represented States that contain oil producers. Many obviously did not know the actual problems that are faced in producing oil.

I have just received a letter from a man that does know. I would like to share his letter with each of you:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILFORD: I am a small independent operator and petroleum geologist, and I read with dismay what Senator Jackson and his committee have recommended to the Senate regarding rolling back the price of domestic crude oil. It is completely ridiculous and obviously not well thought out. He and his group want to roll back the price of new domestic oil from approximately $10.00 a barrel to $5.25 a barrel, and in turn would pay $10.60 a barrel for imported Canadian oil, $12.00 a barrel for imported Middle East oil, $14.00 a barrel for Venezuelan oil, etc.

Obviously, no one has told Senator Jackson that there are two types of people in the oil business—major companies and the independents. The independent's livelihood depends upon the price of domestic oil since he does not deal in foreign oil ventures.

Everyone is concerned about the imbalance of foreign trade, yet Mr. Jackson's committee seems to be bent upon making our balance of payments even worse by paying high prices for imported foreign oil while lowering domestic oil prices.

Approximately three-fourths of all new oil found in the United States is found by independents and not major oil companies, since recently the majors have been spending most of their exploration dollars in foreign ventures. I am personally involved in many deals that would be marginal at a posted price of $5.25 a barrel. At $10.00 a barrel these projects that I and many others have in mind will be developed and result in additional reserves of domestic oil. Today I cancelled the drilling of a well in Taylor County, Texas because at a rolled-back price of $5.25 a barrel it is not an economic venture. Many other independents are delaying proposed drilling activities until they find out what action the Senate is going to take on Senator Jackson's committee's proposals.

Many secondary recovery projects in which I am involved will be initiated if the price of oil is not rolled back. If it is, these projects will be shelved until a higher price for domestic crude can be obtained (and it will be). So that you may be sure this is not just a "cry wolf" complaint and dealing in generalities, listed below are the secondary recovery projects of which I speak:

East Fort Trinidad, Houston County, Texas.
N.W. Farnsworth, Ochiltree County, Texas.
Fence Creek Unit, Sheridan County, Wyoming.
Gas Draw Muddy Sand Unit, Campbell County, Wyoming.
Mill-Gillette Muddy Sand Unit, Campbell County, Wyoming.

It is difficult to understand how the politics of running for office can be allowed to so severely add to the nation's energy crisis, but this is what Senator Jackson and his cohorts from non-oil states seem to be willing to do.

Many millions of barrels of oil will not be available if the price of new oil is rolled back lower than $9.00 a barrel. Most investors will not invest in the oil business and the domestic supply of crude will be severely curtailed because no new marginal reserves will be available if Senator Jackson and his committee have their way.

It is completely ridiculous to send our dollars abroad to the Arabs, Nigerians, Venezuelans, Indonesians, Canadians, etc., and pay well over twice the price per barrel of oil as we are willing to pay the independents at home.

Please try to convince these politicians that ruining the independent domestic oil business will not insure their election nor help the energy crisis.

Very truly yours,

J. E. MATTER,
Petroleum Geologist.

FAIR FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDED FOR THE HUNGRY IN PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, those of us close to agriculture believe all hungry Americans deserve a fair break.

According to legislative amendments that we passed in 1971 and 1973, the food stamp program must be implemented in every political subdivision of Puerto Rico by June 30, 1974. In 1971, we passed legislation that permitted Puerto Rico to get into the program. In 1973, we required that the food stamp program be extended to every area of the island by

the June 30 deadline just as we required it to be available to the poor in every political subdivision of the 50 States. The only permissible basis for delaying the program's implementation in an area is if the Commonwealth can clearly demonstate that it is administratively impossible to accomplish—even through subcontracting with agencies other than the Social Services Department, permitting the municipalities to operate the program, or through some other legitimate means. The gist of our requirement is that the people must be fed as soon as possible, with all eligible persons receiving food aid by the end of this fiscal year. However, USDA has just announced that only five municipalities will be given the program by the deadline. The others will have to wait for months and San Juan will not get stamps until March 1975. This is clearly contrary to the law.

It is noteworthy to point out that the Agriculture Secretary has also just promulgated benefit guidelines for the entire island. Although these schedules will not affect the date when Puerto Rico is supposed to implement the program, it will adversely affect the conditions upon which Puerto Ricans can participate in this important feeding effort.

Under our legislation, the benefit schedules are "to reflect the cost of obtaining a nutritionally adequate diet." This is precisely the same concept that underlies the Program's implementation in the 50 States. Accordingly, it was our intent that a comparison of benefit schedules—between the 50 States and Puerto Rico—reflect a comparison of food costs between these States and the island. Although we did not permit benefit levels in Puerto Rico or the territories to be higher than the ones set for the United States, we did not permit benefits in those territories to be lower if food prices in fact were higher. Moreover, we did not want the Agriculture Department to discriminate against the island or territories on the basis of lower food consumption patterns in those areas than in the United States. Naturally, persons in poverty-stricken areas have cheaper food consumption patterns than persons living in more affluent areas. But an area's impoverished economic situation, and hence that area's poorer food habits, should not be the basis for lower food stamp benefits. The purpose of the program is to help the poor, not to perpetuate their disadvantaged status and, therefore, the only relevant factor in comparing benefit levels between the States and Puerto Rico is the comparative food costs.

Contrary to our explicit statutory requirements, however, the Agriculture Secretary has established low coupon allotment standards for Puerto Rico that are violative of our purposes and intentions and that utilized discriminatory concepts that we clearly discarded. For example, a family of four in Puerto Rico will get only $122 worth of stamps monthly, while a mainland family of four gets $142. Too many needy people will be hurt by the Secretary's new regulations for this to pass unnoticed. I urge the Secretary to immediately rectify this situation and make sure that the discriminatory benefit standards be changed so that the poor in Puerto Rico are not shortchanged out of their food stamp rights.

Finally, I must also express my concern regarding the income-eligibility guidelines announced by the Agriculture Department for food stamp participation on the island. These standards average approximately 14 percent lower than mainland standards and do not appear to have been derived according to the statute which requires the Department to determine the average per capita income on the island and use it as the base for eligibility calculations by multiplying it by the number of persons in each household to determine the income criteria for different-sized families. If the Agriculture Department used any other formula in this regard, then it failed to follow the Food Stamp Act.

DIAL-A-BUS PROVES ITSELF IN SAN DIEGO

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, for 17 hours a day, the 65,000 residents of the San Diego Model Cities area are able to avail themselves of an unusual transportation service.

It is a special minibus system which offers a dial-a-bus service in addition to operating on regularly scheduled routes. And the emphasis is really on service, especially on making the operation relevant to the needs of the elderly, the destitute and others without constant access to a car.

Now in its second year, the San Diego system is funded with $284,000 in Model Cities money, a subsidy that enables passengers to ride without charge. Some 15,000 San Diegans a month do use the nine small buses which comprise the Model Cities fleet. Conventional bus service in the two Model Cities neighborhoods—Southeast San Diego and San Ysidro—is spotty and most of the residents have limited incomes, so the little buses plug several gaps.

More than 70 percent of the riders have incomes below $400 a month. When on call, the radio-dispatched buses are used to deliver the elderly, handicapped and sick to hospitals. They take job applicants to interviews. They deliver lunches to some 3,000 senior citizens each month, both to shut-ins at home and to recreation centers.

This program has been so successful that a similar dial-a-bus project in Linda Vista, a section of San Diego outside the Model Cities area, copied it.

It is hoped that eventually these systems might be assimilated by the regular transit system. The special, limited purpose carriers would thereby gain new stability. All types are essential in achieving balanced transportation in our crowded urban areas.

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 11793

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include here the text of three amendments I intend to offer to H.R. 11793:

Page 20, strike line 22 and all that follows through line 7, page 21.

Page 23, strike lines 18 through 20, inclusive.

Page 37, after line 4, insert the following subsection:

"(d) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit a report to the President and Congress detailing a plan for the creation of a Government corporation which, for the purposes of conserving scarce supplies of energy, insuring fair and efficient distribution of such supplies, maintaining fair and reasonable consumer prices for such supplies, and promoting the expansion of energy sources for the general welfare and common defense and security, would operate and maintain the property and facilities of any person in the United States whenever such property and facilities are utilized in the exploration, development, processing, refining, or required transportation by pipeline of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, and coal."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. BRASCO (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for this week, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts to address the House for 5 minutes after all other special orders and business of the House today.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BELL, for 60 minutes, on March 6, 1974.

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

Mr. RODINO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GIAIMO, for 10 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REGULA to insert his remarks in

the body of the RECORD following the remarks of Mr. PRITCHARD today.

Mr. MILFORD in five instances.

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

Mr. SANDMAN.
Mr. ERLENBORN.
Mr. ARENDS.
Mr. ASHBROOK in five instances.
Mr. HUDNUT.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. CARTER in two instances.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida in five instances.
Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON.
Mr. RAILSBACK in two instances.
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.
Mr. FRENZEL in two instances.
Mr. ABDNOR.
Mr. SHOUP in two instances.
Mr. RONCALLO of New York.
Mr. DEL CLAWSON.
Mr. SARASIN.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. THONE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VANDER VEEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.
Mr. BOLLING.
Mr. VANIK in three instances.
Mr. HELSTOSKI in 10 instances.
Mr. LONG of Maryland in 10 instances.
Mr. SIKES in two instances.
Mr. STOKES in six instances.
Mr. KARTH.
Mr. DANIELSON.
Mr. BINGHAM in 10 instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
Mr. TIERNAN in 10 instances.
Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances.
Mr. BREAUX.
Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 581. An act for the relief of Ludwik Kikla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1346. An act for the relief of Leticia (Escobar) Richardson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2337. An act for the relief of Dulce Pilar Castin (Castin-Casas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2510. An act to create an Office of Federal Procurement Policy within the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2705. An act to provide for the disposition of abandoned money orders and traveler's checks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VANDER VEEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 5, 1974, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1973, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following report for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85–804:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1974.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The following information is submitted pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–804 and implementing instructions contained in Federal Procurement Regulation 1–17.000.

For the calendar year ending December 31, 1973, the Atomic Energy Commission reports the following actions approved under the subject Act:

1. Residual Powers:

a. A determination dated June 18, 1973, was issued to contractually require contractors subject to the Davis-Bacon Act at the Rocky Flats facility to adhere to certain conditions of employment of the labor agreements between Swinerton and Walberg Company and various construction crafts in the Denver, Colorado, area.

b. Originally a Determination was issued on February 28 and subsequently revised on May 18 and August 22, 1973. These were issued to contractually require contractors and subcontractors, subject to the Davis-Bacon Act at the Nevada Test Site (including the Nuclear Rocket Development Station and Tonopah Test Range) to pay not less and no more than the money provisions and certain other conditions of the construction project labor agreements between Reynolds Electrical and Engineering Company, Inc., and various construction crafts in the Nevada area.

These Determinations are deemed necessary to promote labor stability, efficiency and economy in the performance of contracts and subcontracts at the sites which directly affect the national defense and security.

2. Other Items:

a. Amendments without consideration:

Amount requested	$26,941.86
Amount denied	26,491.86

b. Amendments without consideration:

Amount requested	$1,064.88
Amount approved	1,064.88

c. Amendments without consideration—Alleged defective specifications:

Amount requested	$64,330.00
Subsequently reduced by applicant to	52,330.00
Amount denied	52,330.00

Sincerely,

JOHN A. ERLEWINE,
General Manager.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1961. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting notice of his intention to exercise his authority under section 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to permit a grant to a charitable organization in Egypt, pursuant to section 652 of the act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1962. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a joint report on financial and technical assistance provided for nonmetropolitan planning districts during fiscal year 1973, pursuant to section 901 (c) of Public Law 91–524; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1963. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the 40th annual report of the Farm Credit Administration on the work of the cooperative farm credit system, including the report of the Federal Farm Credit Board, covering fiscal year 1973, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 2252(3) (H. Doc. No. 93–268); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1964. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report for the second quarter of fiscal year 1974 on the estimated value, by country, of support furnished from military functions appropriations for Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam and local forces in Laos, pursuant to section 737(b) of Public Law 93–238; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1965. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a semiannual report on funds obligated in the chemical warfare and biological research programs, covering the first half of fiscal year 1974, pursuant to section 409 of Public Law 91–121; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1966. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report for calendar year 1973 on special pay for officers holding positions of unusual responsibility, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 306(f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1967. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report for calendar year 1973 on special pay for duty subject to hostile fire, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 310(d); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1968. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a report on defense manpower requirements for fiscal year 1975, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 133, note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1969. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the status as of December 31, 1972, of foreign credits by U.S. Government agencies and international organizations in which the United States is a member, pursuant to section 634(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended [22 U.S.C. 2394(f)]; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1970. A letter from the Deputy Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the U.S. Information Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1971. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of January 31, 1974, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1972. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (8 U.S.C. 1154(d)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1973. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (8 U.S.C. 1254 (c)(1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1974. A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmit-

ting a report on amendments and modifications to contracts in connection with the national defense executed by the Commission during calendar year 1973, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1434(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1975. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a report of a building project survey for Columbia, Md., pursuant to section 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

1976. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the operation of the general revenue sharing trust fund during fiscal year 1973, pursuant to Public Law 92–512; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1977. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the annual report of the Social Security Administration for fiscal year 1973, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 904; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE 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:

[*Pursuant to the order of the House on February 28, 1974, the following report was filed on March 1, 1974*]

Mr. STRATTON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2771. An act to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay bonus structure relating to members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes with amendment (Rept. No. 93–857). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted March 4, 1974*]

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 726. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "The Impact of the Energy and Fuel Crisis on Small Business," House Report No. 91–1751 (Rept. No. 93–858). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 727. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Concentration by Competing Raw Fuel Industries in the Energy Market and Its Impact on Small Business," House Report No. 92–719 (Rept. No. 93–859). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 728. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Concentration by Competing Raw Fuel Industries in the Energy Market and Its Impact on Small Business"—volume 3, "National Gas Survey and Synthetic Fuel Development," House Report No. 92–1404 (Rept. No. 93–860). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 729. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the House report entitled "Concentration by Competing Raw Fuel Industries in the Energy Market and Its Impact on Small Business"—volume 2—"Tennessee Valley Area" House Report No. 92–1313 (Rept. No. 93–861). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 78. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of a Veterans' Benefits Calculator, with amendment (Rept. No. 93–862). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 397. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy entitled "Foreign Policy Implications of the Energy Crisis" (Rept. No. 93–863). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 55. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the proceedings of the 46th biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document (Rept. No. 93–864). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 56. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on the Child Abuse Prevention Act, 1973 (Rept. No. 93–865). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 58. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Report of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary (Rept. No. 93–866). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 59. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the compilation entitled "Disclosure of Corporate Ownership" as a Senate document (Rept. No. 93–867). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part I of the Senate committee print entitled "Confidence and Concern: Citizens View American Government—A Survey of Public Attitudes" (Rept. No. 93–868). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 64. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of congressional eulogies and other tributes to the late J. Edgar Hoover as a Senate document (Rept. No. 93–869). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HENDERSON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Resolution 807. 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. (Rept. No. 93–870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ULLMAN: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 13025. A bill to increase the period during which benefits may be paid under title XVI of the Social Security Act on the basis of presumptive disability to ascertain individuals who received aid, on the basis of disability, for Dececmber 1973, under a State plan approved under title XIV or XVI of that act. (Rept. No. 93–871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6395. A bill to designate certain lands in the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Ga., as wilderness; with amendment (Rept. No. 93–872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on Programs, Policies, and Operations of the Small Business Administration, 1973. (Rept. No. 93–873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on the Impact of Environmental Standards on Small Business (vol. 1, Asphalt), (Rept. No. 93–874). 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. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 13189. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study of the burden of reporting requirements of Federal regulatory programs on independent business establishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. REUSS, Mr. CLARK, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. GAYDOS, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Ms. JORDAN, Mr. KARTH, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. REID, Mr. ROE, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. STARK, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 13190. 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. CARNEY of Ohio:

H.R. 13191. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code by increasing the personal exemption from $750 to $850, to provide that a taxpayer may elect to credit in the amount of $250 for each personal exemption to which he is entitled in lieu of taking a deduction for each such exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH.

H.R. 13192. 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.

H.R. 13193. A bill to provide for loans for the establishment of construction, or municipal low cost, nonprofit clinics for the spaying and neutering of dogs and cats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. 13194. 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. FROEHLICH:

H.R. 13195. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain real property located within the Nicolet National Forest, Wis., to certain communities for use as solid waste disposal sites; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 13196. 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 Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 13197. 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. HEINZ:

H.R. 13198. A bill to impose during the present energy crisis an excess profits tax on the income of corporations engaged in the

production or distribution of petroleum or natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HICKS (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURGENER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LITTON, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROBISON of New York, and Mr. RONCALLO of New York):

H.R. 13199. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to make it an unlawful employment practice to discriminate against individuals who are physically disabled because of such disability; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HICKS (for himself, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STARK, Mr. THONE, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WINN, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. FORD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BINGHAM, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Miss HOLTZMAN, and Mr. RIEGLE):

H.R. 13200. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to make it an unlawful employment practice to discriminate against individuals who are physically disabled because of such disability; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 13201. A bill to amend section 1951, title 18, United States Code, act of July 3, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADIGAN:

H.R. 13202. A bill to establish the National Commission on the Prevention of Raw Material Shortages; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 13203. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to permit a taxpayer to take an income tax deduction with respect to the purchase and installation of solar heating and cooling equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 13204. 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. PARRIS (for himself and Mr. SARASIN):

H.R. 13205. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to temporarily reduce the excise tax on gasoline by 2 cents per gallon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 13206. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to extend its expiration date for 1 year; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. TREEN, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. HUBER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. BRAY, Mr. PODELL, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H.R. 13207. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide in certain circumstances the death penalty for kidnaping, and to establish rebuttable presumption with respect to certain unexplained disappearances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. REGULA, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. GUNTER, and Mr. GAYDOS):

H.R. 13208. A bill to amend title 18 United States Code to provide in certain circumstances the death penalty for kidnaping, and to establish a rebuttable presumption with respect to certain unexplained disappearances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. EILBERG, Mr. KYROS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 13209. A bill to provide further for uniform annual observances of certain legal public holidays on Monday, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 13210. A bill to prohibit the exportation of fertilizer from the United States until the Secretary of Agriculture determines that an adequate domestic supply of fertilizer exists; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 13211. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for cost-of-living increases in compensation, dependency, and indemnity compensation, and pension payments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 13212. A bill to make available to the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, certain lands necessary to the replacement of the Carlanna Creek Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Virgina (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. KYROS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. WINN):

H.J. Res. 926. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating May 13 of each year as "American Business Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to fuel rationing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

362. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the increase in price of liquefied petroleum gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

363. Also, memorial of the senate of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the energy crisis; to the Commitee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

364. Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

365. Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

396. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Conference of Lieutenant Governors, Atlanta, Ga., relative to power and energy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

397. Also, petition of Hon. Ben C. Duniway, Associate Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Judicial Circuit, San Francisco, Calif., relative to the report of the Commission on the Revision of the Federal Court Appellate System; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

398. Also, petition of Lawrence Timbers, Seattle, Wash., and others, relative to financial disclosure by Members of Congress; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

SENATE—*Monday, March 4, 1974*

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. WALTER D. HUDDLESTON, a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, the Light of all that is true, the Strength of all that is good, the Glory of all that is beautiful, we thank Thee for this moment in the day's occupation when we put aside all other thoughts and declare with our fathers that in God we trust, now and always. In this place of duty where the well-being of so many depends upon the wise judgment of so few, grant that we may think as the apostle on "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things." Then in our private lives and our public service, help us every day to live more nearly as we pray. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1974.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. WALTER D. HUDDLESTON, a Senator from the State of