UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 120—PART 11

MAY 9, 1974 TO MAY 16, 1974
(PAGES 13865 TO 15260)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1974

distinction be made, according to two nationwide polls conducted for the Commission by the deKadt and Sindlinger organizations.

Presumably it is the traveling public for whom we are both building and beautifying the highways. Their wishes, in my opinion, ought to be paramount. A very substantial majority of the public, according to these polls, do not desire the total removal of all information as to the location of these necessary services.

It is not some nebulous "billboard lobby" which Congress is attempting to please, Mr. Anderson's views to the contrary notwithstanding. It is the general public. They are the ones paying for the highways, and they are the ones whose wishes we should be attempting to accommodate.

SOCIAL SECURITY CONTRIBUTION FOR COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY

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

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which should not be necessary. It involves the withholding of social security contributions for the Community Action Agency in the Tidewater Virginia area, which should be corrected administratively. The organization failed, in effect, to request permission to collect social security taxes and to make employer contributions in behalf of its employees. Thus far, Internal Revenue insists on going through their ruling procedures under Revenue Procedure 72–3.

Mr. Speaker, the facts in this case are perfectly clear. On June 17, 1966, the District Director of Internal Revenue in Richmond issued a form indicating that the Southeastern Tidewater Opportunity Project organization was exempt from Federal income tax. The letter also stated, I am told—

> You are not liable for the taxes imposed under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act unless you file a waiver of exemption certificate as provided in such act.

However, neither the local social security office nor the local and regional Internal Revenue Service offices have been able to locate the exemption certificate.

Since the incorporation of the STOP organization, social security taxes have been collected from the employees and the organization has, as an employer, paid its share of social security taxes. Internal Revenue has continued to accept the taxes since 1966. The STOP organization has conducted summer programs since 1966 averaging some 2,200 temporary employees and enrollees, all of whom STOP considered to be subject to social security taxes. The organization has had thousands of employees and enrollees through their program since 1965. To attempt at this time to locate all of these employees and refund to them the funds which have been paid to Internal Revenue Service would be a bureaucratic nightmare and probably would be an impossible task.

I feel certain that if the situation were reversed and STOP had failed to collect social security taxes and to pay them when they were required to do so, that organization would not have to follow Revenue Procedure 72–3 in order for IRS to move against STOP.

The bill which I introduce today, simply stated, provides that the Southeastern Tidewater Opportunity Project of Norfolk, Va., shall be deemed to have filed on June 1, 1966, a certificate certifying that it desired to have the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act extended to services performed by its employees and that STOP on June 1, 1966, shall be deemed to have concurred in the filing of such certification. I have twice asked the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service to handle this matter administratively. Apparently IRS is unable to understand this simple problem. I hope, however, that the committee having jurisdiction will promptly report this legislation in order that we may save the cost of going through a procedure which should be unnecessary of attempting to locate the individuals, refigure and refund the contributions which these employees and the STOP organization have made.

MARYLAND MAKES DR. KING'S BIRTHDAY A LEGAL STATE HOLIDAY

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

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, Members of the Congressional Black Caucus and others have attempted to have the Congress pass legislation that would make the birthday of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a holiday. Such actions, however, have not been limited to the national legislature. State legislators across the country, noting the absence of any national legislation, have introduced bills in our State legislatures honoring Dr. King. I am happy to say that one such attempt, which was successful, occurred in the Maryland State Legislature. I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the consideration of Members of Congress, an article from a recent Baltimore Afro-American Newspaper:

Delegate Kenneth L. Webster said:

> This is one of the proudest moments of my life.

Delegate Webster sponsored H.B. 320, a bill to make Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday a legal State holiday.

> I am proud of the fact that Maryland is one of the first States to legalize Dr. King's birthday as a holiday. I am especially proud of the way the black community responded and fought to make this day our special day.

When H.B. 320 was heard the first time before the house ways and means committee, over 100 people jammed the meeting room—including a busload of ministers from Baltimore City and a contingent of community leaders from the city of Annapolis.

Two black members of the committee, Delegates Troy Brailey and Walter R. Dean, Jr., both noted that in spite of the moving testimony, there was some reticence about honoring a black man.

Delegate Walter Dean said:

> We really had to lobby. However, we had the sympathetic ear of our chairman, Delegate Benjamin Cardin (D-5th), who understood the symbolic value of the bill.

In spite of the sympathy for the bill, H.B. 320 failed on its first vote for passage in the House of Delegates by 1 vote.

Delegate Webster, defying conventional political wisdom, asked immediately for a recount. When the final vote was taken, H.B. 320 passed the house by an 11-vote majority. It was then sent to the senate.

H.B. 320 would not have passed the house if it had not been for intensive activity by many people.

Delegate Webster said:

> This was truly a community effort. This is clearly a bill that has been passed by the collective efforts of black people and their allies.

NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION SMOKESCREEN REFUTED

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, recent claims by the National Coal Association that the House coal strip mining reclamation bill is unnecessarily stringent portray a lack of understanding of what the bill requires.

The National Coal Association has stated that the requirement of returning the land to its approximate original contour is an impossible provision and that claim has been echoed by others. Their claims need to be refuted and the facts clarified.

Section 210(b)(8) is the pertinent language dealing with the term "original contour" and it is to assure that both the integrity of the topography of the land and the water drainage pattern is maintained.

In addition, section 705(22) gives the definition of "approximate original contour," stating the term "means that a surface configuration achieved by back filling and grading of the mined area so that it closely resembles surface configuration of the land prior to mining and blends into and is in accordance with the drainage pattern of the surrounding terrain."

I am including a letter from Louis A. Sigler, who is the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee consultant and former general counsel, to provide a legal interpretation.

His letter follows:

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1974.

HON. JOHN MELCHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The National Coal Association in a release dated May 1, 1974, regarding the House surface mining bill is under a serious misapprehension regarding one of the bill's provisions. The Association