

President and confirmed by the Senate. A newly established United States Fish and Wildlife Service which would succeed to the responsibilities and authorities of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service as now constituted and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife except as prescribed by Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1970, could address with new spirit the task assigned to its predecessor agencies. . . .

I concur with my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee (Mr. DINGELL) and the Department of the Interior and urge this House to act favorably on H.R. 13542.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13542, and urge its immediate passage.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to realign the administrative makeup of the offices under the direction of the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife of the Department of the Interior. Mr. Speaker, as a result of Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1970, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Office of the Director no longer exist. Also, there is no further need for the position of Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife since the holder of this office, which incidentally is now vacant, would perform the same functions that the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife now performs.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would have the net effect of eliminating one position in the bureaucracy while, at the same time, elevating the position of the present Director to the level now occupied by most other heads of Bureaus within the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly endorse the passage of this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANDRUM). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13542.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 6 legislative days in which to read and extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 13542.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LOAN OF PERSONNEL AND EQUIPMENT TO BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8101) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Defense to detail certain personnel and equipment to the Fish and Wildlife Service, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 8101

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the paragraph headed "Propagation of Food Fishes" of the Act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat. 494; 16 U.S.C. 743), is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "Fishes:";

(2) by striking out the last sentence thereof; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(2) (A) As used in this subparagraph, the term 'agency' means the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"(B) The chief executive officer of each agency may from time to time—

"(1) detail from the agency for duty under the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of the Interior, such commissioned and enlisted personnel and civilian employees as may be spared for such duty; and

"(2) consonant with the operational needs of the agency, loan equipment of the agency to the Director."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 8101 is to provide for the detailing of personnel and the loaning of equipment by certain Federal agencies to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in order to enable the Bureau to more effectively carry out its functions and responsibilities to manage and protect fish and wildlife resources.

Mr. Speaker, under present law, the Coast Guard is authorized to detail for duty to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife officers and men of the Coast Guard who can be spared from time to time. Under present practice, the Department of Defense has made available to the Bureau personnel and equipment of that Department from time to time.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, both the Coast Guard and the Department of Defense have been most helpful to the Bureau in the past. For instance, in many cases, routine practice and training flights have been coordinated with the Bureau in such a way that the Bureau has been able to obtain valuable information on waterfowl regulations, wildlife habitat, and illegal dredge and fill activities during some of these routine flights. And, Mr. Speaker, this has been accomplished with little or no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this legislation arises from the fact that many of these base commanders—even though

willing to make available such personnel and equipment—have been reluctant to do so because they felt that they lacked sufficient authority.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8101 would make it clear that such authority does exist with respect to the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.

In addition, H.R. 8101 would provide this same authority to the Atomic Energy Commission and to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8101 has the strong support of the Department of the Interior and it was unanimously ordered reported by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its prompt passage.

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

(Mr. GROVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 8101, which would authorize certain Federal agencies to detail personnel and to loan equipment to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

Under present law, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to detail from time to time, for duty under the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, any officers and men of the Coast Guard whose services can be spared for such duty. H.R. 8101 would amend the present law to authorize equipment to be loaned as well, and not only from the Coast Guard but also from the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It does not require the assignment of personnel and equipment, but is permissive, only coming into use when the personnel and equipment can be spared from their primary functions and duties. This is strictly on a loan basis—no permanent personnel assignments are contemplated.

The Department of the Interior sees great benefit in the passage of the bill. This extra personnel and equipment could aid greatly in controlling violations of fish and wildlife laws and in conducting special fish and wildlife inventories involving endangered species. These special inventories often require the use of specialized equipment for short periods of time. The use of military personnel and equipment in such short-term situations will obviate the necessity for the Department of the Interior to purchase expensive equipment which is only rarely used. This would be in addition to a substantial increase in the effectiveness and efficiency of management and protection programs. The bill would leave it to the discretion of the loaning agency as to whether to require reimbursement for any services rendered.

The enactment of this bill would be in keeping with national policy. The Na-

tional Environmental Policy Act of 1969, which came out of this committee in the 91st Congress, committed the Federal Government to using all practicable means and measures to coordinate Federal functions in order to protect the environment. The Endangered Species Act of 1973, also one of this committee's bills, directs all Federal agencies to utilize their authorities in furtherance of the purposes of that act.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge enactment of H.R. 8101.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8101, a bill to authorize the detailing of personnel and the loaning of equipment by certain Federal agencies to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, although the Coast Guard and the Department of Defense have been cooperating to a certain extent with the Bureau in the past, in some cases base commanders have either refused to provide this assistance or have reluctantly done so because they felt that explicit authority for them to provide this assistance did not exist.

Therefore, by making it clear that such authority does exist and by encouraging these agencies to provide this assistance when they can do so without interfering with their operational needs, this legislation will help the Bureau considerably in carrying out such functions as taking bird counts, checking on violations of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and apprehending violators of such acts.

Mr. Speaker, with proper coordination between the various agencies concerned, this assistance can be provided with little or no extra cost to the Federal Government. I think H.R. 8101 is good legislation and I urge its passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 8101, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize certain Federal agencies to detail personnel and to loan equipment to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of the Interior."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

TAX ON BOWS AND ARROWS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10972) to delay for 6 months the taking

effect of certain measures to provide additional funds for certain wildlife restoration projects, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10972

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 provide additional funds for certain wildlife restoration projects, and for other purposes", approved October 25, 1972 (Public Law 92-558, 86 Stat. 1172-1173), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1974" in sections 101(c) and 201(b) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1975".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to delay for 6 months the date on which the new 11-percent excise tax on the sale of bows and arrows would be imposed.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues will recall, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported legislation in the 92d Congress designed to provide additional funds for carrying out wildlife restoration projects and hunter safety programs. The legislation ultimately became Public Law 92-558. To provide those additional funds there was authorized to be imposed—effective July 1, 1974—an 11 percent excise tax by manufacturers, producers, and importers on the sale of bows and arrows, parts, and accessories.

Since title II of Public Law 92-558 amended the Internal Revenue Code, a matter over which the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction, our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries requested the views of that committee on the revenue aspects of the legislation.

After careful consideration of the legislation and the departmental reports, the Committee on Ways and Means provided our committee with language which was included in the committee report on the legislation.

Our committee followed the same procedure for the legislation under consideration today and on pages 4 and 5 of the committee report you will find a letter from Chairman MILLS and the ranking minority member of that committee, Congressman SCHNEEBELI, indicating their committee's unanimous support for the proposed postponement of the tax contained in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, under present law—the Pittman-Robertson Act—an amount equal to the 11 percent tax on shotguns, rifles, and ammunition is now deposited in a special fund in the Treasury known as the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund. In addition, an amount equal to the 10-percent tax on pistols and revolvers is deposited in that same fund. After deducting administrative expenses, the remainder of the fund is used to carry out wildlife restoration projects

with the States on a 75-25 matching fund basis.

Public Law 92-558 further amended the Pittman-Robertson Act to provide that beginning July 1, 1974, an amount equal to the new 11-percent tax on bows and arrows would be deposited in that fund.

However, because of the undue hardship that would be imposed on the archery industry of this Nation by requiring that its pricing schedule be changed from a calendar year basis to a fiscal year basis—as called for by the 1972 law—the archery industry asked that the effective date of the new 11 percent tax be postponed from July 1, 1974, to January 1, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing this legislation does is to accommodate this industry—which has gone all out in its support of this legislation—by postponing the effective date of the new tax to January 1, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has the support of the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Treasury, and it was unanimously ordered reported by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. I think it only fair that we go along with this industry in view of its past cooperation and I urge the prompt passage of this legislation.

(Mr. GROVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the passage of H.R. 10972, as amended. The primary purpose of this bill is to delay for 6 months—from July 1, 1974, to January 1, 1975—the imposition of the 11-percent excise tax on bows and arrows. Public Law 92-558, which was enacted from a bill before our committee at the last Congress, authorized the imposition of the tax on manufacturers and importers of bows with draw weights of 10 pounds or more and arrows 18 or more inches in length. The tax also applies to the parts of or accessories or attachments to taxable bows or arrows. The net tax receipts will be added to a special fund in the Treasury known as the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund.

The Archery Manufacturers' Organization first requested the delay proposed in H.R. 10972 because the archery industry operates and prepares pricing schedules on a calendar year basis. The shift from this procedure to a fiscal year basis required under the public law would, it was felt, impose an undue hardship on the industry. The Department of the Treasury and the Department of the Interior have indicated they have no objection to the passage of H.R. 10972.

The Ways and Means Committee, which retains jurisdiction over the tax aspects of this matter, unanimously agreed to the proposed postponement of this tax.

I also would like to point out the fact that the tax laws provide a general exemption from the manufacturers' excise tax on any article of native Indian handcraft manufactured by Indians on Indian reservations or in Indian schools. Therefore, any bows and arrows, or their parts and accessories, manufactured by