

hasn't been worth the price in American blood and treasure.

But those who are in a big rush to write off 38,887 American war dead and \$81,407,000,000 of the taxpayers' money should consider the French experience. The French pull-out of North Vietnam 15 years ago precipitated a Communist slaughter that hadn't been duplicated since the mad days of Adolf Hitler.

Too hasty abandonment of South Vietnam, likewise, might produce another bloodbath.

Yet the Hanoi-directed militants, according to intelligence documents, are striving to turn the anti-war protest into a national demand for "quick and complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam."

Possibly to avoid treason charges, the American militants are not in direct touch with the Hanoi government. Most contacts, apparently, have been kept on a friend-to-friend or organization-to-organization basis.

The Hanoi-controlled South Vietnam Liberation Students' Union, for example, maintains an underground liaison with U.S. leaders of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Students' Committee for the End of the Vietnam War.

On the eve of the Vietnam moratorium, Tran Buu Kiem, the Students' Union chairman and former Viet Cong delegate in Paris, wrote a letter to his American disciples urging "the active and massive participation of the American youth and students in this fall struggle movement."

The letter, dated Oct. 6, called for a prompt American pull-out from Vietnam. Kiem contended that "the replacement of a score of thousands of troops is insignificant, as compared with about half a million U.S. youths still remaining in South Vietnam."

"Your interests and those of the American people and the United States do not lie in such a drop-by-drop troop pull-out, but in the quick and complete withdrawal of U.S.

troops from South Vietnam; not in the Vietnamization or de-Americanization of the war in South Vietnam, which is unpopular and costly in human and material resources, but in ending it. . . .

"If Mr. Nixon sincerely wants to live up to his promise to end the war, a promise which he made when he ran for office and when he took over the presidency," the Kiem letter continued, "there is no other way than to respond to the 10-point solution of the Republic of South Vietnam's provisional revolutionary government by quickly withdrawing all U.S. and satellite troops from South Vietnam without imposing any conditions and by abandoning the lackey Thieu-Ky-Khiem administration, leaving the South Vietnamese people to decide their own internal affairs."

"You are entering a new, seething and violent struggle phase. We hope that you all will pool your efforts in achieving great success in this fall struggle phase."

Ironically, most of the student radicals who are doing Hanoi's bidding in the U.S. would get worse treatment from the Hanoi police than they have received from the Chicago police.

For Hanoi has ordered a crackdown on local hippies who wear long hair, tight pants and flowered shirts. Hanoi police have been ordered to shear off long hair and slit tight trousers legs on the spot. Tight "cowboy pants" have been abolished by decree. Western records, poetry, and dances also are considered "counter revolutionary" and result in stern punishment.

As for unauthorized demonstrations, the youthful demonstrators not only would get their heads clubbed; they would be subject to the death penalty.

Another intelligence document, made available to this column, casts a revealing light on the North Korean role in stirring up opposition to the constitutional amend-

ment which will determine the future of South Korea. A national referendum will be held Friday to determine whether South Korea's bantam President Chung Hee Park can run for a third term.

"In connection with the constitutional amendment," declares the intelligence analysis, "the Pyongyang regime is trying to arouse popular views adverse to the constitutional amendment in an effort to create political chaos in the Republic of Korea. The Pyongyang regime is concentrating all efforts on its psychological warfare to encourage the recalcitrant elements in the South."

The attempt to extend President Park's rule for another term has been described, even in the western press, as undemocratic. The truth is that the Park government has adhered scrupulously to the democratic processes.

Once the referendum is decided by popular vote on Friday, South Korea's troubles may merely be beginning. The intelligence document estimates that North Korea will intensify its efforts to subvert South Korea next year, thus "taking advantage of the possible political chaos in the ROK during the 1971 election."

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 20, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, October 16, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Roger E. Landgrebe, Calvary Lutheran Church, Gary, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Unto You, O God, do we lift up our hearts in thanksgiving for the joy of life in the world which You have given us to dominate and subdue. The whole creation is Yours; but we seek Your help as we attempt to govern it and establish the welfare of our portion of its people.

We boldly request, yet humbly demand, Your presence here. Consume the minds of the men and women in this high Chamber so that the work they do here will be an instrument of Your law and a reflection of Your love. The opportunity is here, O Lord, to see You in a mirror dimly and also to effect wisely our confrontation with You face to face. O God, let it happen. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 2910. An act to amend Public Law 89-260 to authorize additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12781) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 16, 20, 24, 35, 40 to the foregoing bill.

#### REV. ROGER E. LANDGREBE

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is honored today to have one of the youngest ministers in the State of Indiana offer the opening prayer.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. Roger Landgrebe's ministry is located in my congressional district. The Reverend Roger E. Landgrebe is the youngest son of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from

Indiana, Mr. EARL LANDGREBE of the Second Congressional District of Indiana.

Although having entered the ministry but 3 years ago and having come to the city of Gary as the pastor of the Calvary Lutheran Church, he is known throughout the Calumet region for the outstanding work he is doing not only for his parishioners as a minister of the Calvary Lutheran Church but also for many charitable and civic activities.

He has participated along with various groups and organizations to help and aid not only some of the more economically unfortunate citizens of our community, but he has taken an active part in various drives for funds to support causes and programs which are highly necessary for the progress and general welfare of our younger folks in the Calumet region of Indiana. Unfortunately more of our young citizens have not emulated his career in church and religious work in which Reverend Landgrebe has been so successful. His civic and charitable work has been a great benefit to all our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Reverend Roger E. Landgrebe for being with us today and also to commend his father, our colleague, Congressman LANDGREBE, for the great work and success of his son as a minister and outstanding citizen in my congressional district.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I will be delighted to yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my gratitude to my colleague in the adjoining congressional district in Indiana, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN), for his kind words in behalf of my son. I really appreciate the remarks the gentleman has made.

I would also like to express my thanks and appreciation to our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, for extending this invitation to my son, and also my sincere appreciation to Dr. Latch for his fine cooperation and assistance.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 14001**

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 14001.

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

There was no objection.

**ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL ON SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS**

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in response to my question, Mr. Robert Myers, respected actuary for the Social Security System, stated that a 15-percent across-the-board increase could be made in social security benefits without increasing the taxable base or the taxable rate. The Social Security Administration fund is as follows:

**OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL, H.R. 14080**

Progress of the OASI and DI trust funds, combined, under present law and under the system as modified by the administration proposal, fiscal years 1970-73

[In billions]

Fiscal year:	Income administration		Outgo administration	
	Present law	Proposal	Present law	Proposal
1970.....	\$35.2	\$35.2	\$28.4	\$29.1
1971.....	38.6	36.8	29.6	32.9
1972.....	43.1	39.3	30.8	35.4
1973.....	47.4	43.4	32.0	36.5

Fiscal year:	Net increase in funds		Assets, end of year	
	Present law	Proposal	Present law	Proposal
1970.....	\$6.8	\$6.1	\$38.7	\$38.0
1971.....	8.9	3.9	47.6	41.9
1972.....	12.3	3.9	59.9	45.7
1973.....	15.4	6.8	75.3	52.6

<sup>1</sup> Assumes no automatic increase in benefit rates under the cost-of-living provision.

Source: Office of the actuary, Baltimore, Oct. 1, 1969.

As we can note, the President's proposal reduces the social security fund by \$22.7 billion from its projected asset value of \$75.3 billion to \$52.6 billion. We must closely examine the effect of this loss of revenue to the fund.

But the testimony clearly indicates the proposal for increasing social security by 15 percent is both sound and responsible.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, this week it was my privilege to be chosen as one of two Members of Congress to attend the International Secretariat for Volunteer Services Conference at The Hague in the Netherlands. Because I was out of the country, I regret I was not able to participate in the deliberations of the House on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of this week. I therefore respectfully request that my absence be excused due to official business.

**CALL OF THE HOUSE**

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 230]

- |                 |               |                |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Albert          | Findley       | O'Konski       |
| Arends          | Fisher        | Patman         |
| Aspinall        | Flowers       | Pollock        |
| Berry           | Flynt         | Powell         |
| Blatnik         | Fulton, Pa.   | Price, Ill.    |
| Brasco          | Fulton, Tenn. | Pucinski       |
| Bray            | Gallagher     | Quie           |
| Brooks          | Garmatz       | Railsback      |
| Brown, Calif.   | Griffin       | Rarick         |
| Broyhill, Va.   | Haley         | Reifel         |
| Burton, Calif.  | Hanna         | Reuss          |
| Cahill          | Hastings      | Rivers         |
| Camp            | Hays          | Rodino         |
| Carey           | Holifield     | Rosenthal      |
| Cederberg       | Hosmer        | Roybal         |
| Celler          | Ichord        | Ruppe          |
| Clark           | Jones, N.C.   | St. Onge       |
| Conyers         | Jones, Tenn.  | Saylor         |
| Corman          | Kirwan        | Scheuer        |
| Davis, Ga.      | Kyl           | Shipley        |
| Dawson          | Landrum       | Sisk           |
| Devine          | Latta         | Smith, Iowa    |
| Diggs           | Lloyd         | Steed          |
| Dingell         | Lujan         | Stokes         |
| Eckhardt        | McClery       | Taylor         |
| Edmondson       | McCloskey     | Teague, Calif. |
| Edwards, Calif. | McMillan      | Tunney         |
| Edwards, La.    | Martin        | Utt            |
| Evans, Colo.    | Mayne         | Waldie         |
| Fallon          | Meeds         | Wampler        |
| Farbstein       | Mills         | Watts          |
| Fascell         | Minshall      | Whalley        |
| Feighan         | Montgomery    | Wold           |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 332 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

**ACTION URGED ON PRESIDENT'S LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS**

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to urge my colleagues to consider the President's message on his legislative proposals and act upon them quickly. Partisan politics cannot become a stumblingblock in our responsibility to the welfare of the Nation.

Certainly, one of the most pressing issues facing us is the need for draft reform. The President's plan to update our draft procedures will give our young men greater freedom and security in planning their lives and careers. In reducing the period of vulnerability from 7 years to 12 months, the potential draftee will no longer have to face an unreasonable period of uncertainty in planning his future. The draft does not need to be a threat over 7 long years.

However, it must be manifestly clear that those who defer their period of vulnerability because of educational, or other legitimate pursuits, will become eligible for a 12-month period when they finish their education.

I also think it is important that we continue investigating other possibilities and methods for filling the military manpower needs of the country and the President. In the meantime, if we expect our young men to serve our country with dignity and honor, we owe them a fair shake in return.

I want history to point to the 91st Congress as one of positive action and accomplishment. I urge all of my colleagues, regardless of party, to carefully and thoughtfully consider the President's proposal for selective service reform and other basic reforms so vital to the welfare of American citizens.

**OEO INEFFICIENCY**

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, on September 26, a nationally syndicated news column reported that Office of Economic Opportunity bureaucrats had gone against administration policies by writing and distributing to various community action groups a manual advocating riots as a legitimate weapon of the poor.

Reacting to this alarming news, on October 3, I directed a letter to the OEO Director, Mr. Donald Rumsfeld, asking that individuals concerned be disciplined and that I be reassured against a recurrence of such an event.

I regret to say that to date I have not received a reply from Mr. Rumsfeld. It may be that those same bureaucrats who write such manuals also intercept the mail coming into the Office of Economic Opportunity. If this be the case, then it is understandable why I have not received a reply from Mr. Rumsfeld.

Hoping to avoid this possible contingency, I am entering these comments into the RECORD, which I will have delivered to Mr. Rumsfeld. I want to make certain that those same individuals who advocate riots do not also advocate losing correspondence from Members of

Congress. On the other hand, this may just be another striking example of the inefficiency of the OEO.

#### SUPPORT FOR POSTAL LEGISLATION

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address myself to the legislation affecting the postal employees of this country. I have and always will be a strong supporter of this group.

Recently, I had the opportunity to vote for a bill—H.R. 9825—which assures a decent retirement income for all civil servants. I believe this a good step in providing adequate benefits for the postal workers.

On Tuesday, I voted with 310 Members to pass H.R. 13000, the Federal Salary Comparability Act, to provide decent salaries for postal employees. This has been long-awaited legislation and one which will correct the inequities in the system. It is a known fact that the Post Office Department has had difficulty in retaining competent employees and we all know about the deteriorating service in the Post Office. One of the causes of these problems stems from the fact that the postal structure, as it now exists, makes an employee serve a period of 21 years before reaching the top pay level. H.R. 13000 changes this to a period of 8 years giving the postal workers a fighting chance of surviving the constantly rising cost of living.

I was glad to see that the Postal Service Act was defeated by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I would be the first to agree that the Post Office Department and its operations are badly in need of improvement. H.R. 11750 would have set up a postal corporation, thereby removing the postal employees from the protection and regulations of the Civil Service. I feel that these improvements can be effected within the present framework of the Post Office Department. Much concern has been expressed by my constituents regarding the creation of a postal corporation. The defeat of this bill assures the postal workers that all their years of service have not been in vain.

I commend the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on the fine job they are doing and they may be assured of my support on all legislation which proves to be in the best interests of the postal employees.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13194, EMERGENCY INSURED STUDENT LOAN ACT OF 1969

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13194) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize Federal market adjustment payments to lenders with respect to insured student loans when necessary in the light of economic conditions, in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education, and ask

unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS)?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman from Kentucky will take ample time to explain what transpired in conference?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, that is my intention.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will yield some time to those who may desire to ask questions?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 13, 1969.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the conference committee on H.R. 13194 has reached agreement. The conference report was worked out, as I recall, unanimously. In my judgment, it is an effective piece of legislation which greatly strengthens all student assistance programs.

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

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

Mr. SCHERLE. The report was not unanimous. I did not sign the report.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct. I ask that the RECORD be corrected accordingly. I think you were the exception.

Mr. Speaker, we reached agreement only after numerous hours of debate and lengthy discussion. May I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), whose untiring efforts and leadership in this endeavor have produced a major piece of legislation. And I wish to express my appreciation to all of the House conferees for their full cooperation and hard work. There were many many difficult decisions which had to be made, and it was because of the strong bipartisan effort that we were able to reach an agreement which is acceptable to 17 of the 18 House conferees.

With respect to the insured student loan program, I am particularly pleased to advise the House that the fundamental thrust of the original House bill is retained in the conference report. The three most essential elements of the House approach remain.

First, under the Senate amendment, only loans made between August 15, 1969, and June 30, 1970, were eligible for an allowance. Second, payments were only authorized during the same period. The conference report follows the House approach and authorizes the payment of a special allowance which may not exceed 3 percent on loans made between August 1, 1969, and June 30, 1971. Also,

any loan made during the eligible period will qualify for the special allowance during the life of the loan if in subsequent years market conditions warrant the payment of such an allowance.

Third, the amount of the allowance will be determined after the close of the period to which it applies rather than, as was the case in the Senate bill, prior to the beginning of the period to which it would apply. Under the House approach, which is retained in the conference report, the rate will be determined after a review of actual market conditions instead of being based on projections and guesswork as was required by the Senate amendment. In addition, the application of the rate retrospectively will be much more economical.

Mr. Speaker, the most controversial aspect of the Senate amendment related to the provision designed to limit discretionary authority of local lenders. The Senate amendment required the Secretary to prescribe procedures to the effect that lenders making loans eligible for an allowance pursuant to the act do not as a condition precedent or subsequent for making any such loan, require a student or any member of the student's family to carry out any business activity with the lender other than activity directly related to the administration and payment of such loan. The Conference agreement greatly modifies this Senate provision.

Under our agreement, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine, with respect to the student insured loan program as authorized under part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the act, whether there are any practices of lending institutions which may result in discrimination against particular classes or categories of students, including the requirement, as a condition to the receipt of a loan, that the student or his family maintain a business relationship with the lender, the consequences of such requirement, and the practice of refusing to make loans to students for their freshman year of study, and also including any discrimination on the basis of sex, color, creed, or national origin. The Secretary shall make a report with respect to such determinations, and his recommendations, to the Congress on or before March 1, 1970.

Second, if after making such determination the Secretary finds that, in any area, a substantial number of eligible students are denied an opportunity to obtain an insured student loan because of practices of lending institutions in the area which limit student participation, he shall take such steps as may be appropriate, after consultation with the appropriate State guarantee agencies and the Advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students, relating to such practices and encourage the development in such area of a plan to increase the availability of financial assistance opportunities for such students. He shall also, within 60 days after making such determination, adopt or amend appropriate regulations pertaining to the student insured loan program to prevent, where

practicable, any practices which he finds have denied loans to a substantial number of students.

In my judgment, these provisions of the conference report differ significantly from the original Senate amendment. It is true that in time the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, through amendment or adoption of regulations, prohibit the practice of limiting loans to customers, as he was directed to do by the original Senate amendment. But, if such regulations are prescribed, it will be because the Secretary has found the practice widespread and that it results in the denial of loans to a substantial number of students. In applying such regulations, the Secretary is given considerable latitude under the terms of the Conference Report. If such regulations become necessary and must be applied, the Secretary will be able to take into account mitigating and extenuating circumstances, such as the special problems of credit unions, where the application of such a regulation would not be practicable. Most importantly, the Conference Report deals with all lending practices which may result in discrimination rather than focusing on just one such practice.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the conference report responds not only to the emergency situation with respect to the insured student loan program, but also to the emergency situation which exists with respect to all student aid programs. As college costs and college enrollments continue to rise at an unbelievable rate, it is necessary that student aid programs be greatly expanded to meet the increasing needs. Thus, the conference report retains the Senate amendments providing increased authorizations for the national defense student loan program, the college work-study program, and one-half of the Senate increase for the educational opportunity grant program.

The need for these increases is clear. The total amount, which is now available for the three college-based programs, falls far short of the amounts requested and needed by colleges and universities across the Nation.

Presently the national defense student loan program is operating at the \$155 million level. This compares with a fiscal year 1969 operating level of \$190 million. The present level of operation is less than half of what institutions requested and over \$100 million less than what the regional panels approved.

It should be made clear that in retaining the Senate increases for NDEA student loans and the other two college-based programs, the authorizations established are not chosen arbitrarily. They are related to and approximate very closely total institutional requests for 1970 and Office of Education estimates as to total institutional requests for fiscal year 1971.

Under the conference report \$325 million will be authorized for student loans this year rather than the \$275 million which is presently authorized. The increase will provide loans for an additional 85,000 students. The fiscal year 1971 increases from \$300 million to \$375 million, will result in loans to an addi-

tional 100,000 students. If the student loan program were funded at the authorized level contained in the conference report, 689,500 students could obtain loans this year and 781,400 could obtain loans next year.

By increasing the fiscal year 1970 authorization for the college work-study program \$25 million, we will make it possible for an additional 58,000 students to participate in the program. The increase to a \$320 million authorization next year will provide work-study opportunities for 748,500 students, almost 100,000 students more than could be provided opportunities under the existing authorization of \$285 million. In connection with the work-study program, it should be noted that the new authorization for fiscal year 1970 is identical with the total institutional requests for work-study funds, but that the proposed authorization for fiscal year 1971, is still \$15 million short of what the Office of Education estimates will be total institutional requests.

The situation with respect to the educational opportunity grant is similar. Under the conference report, \$125 million will be authorized for initial year grants as compared to the present authorization of \$100 million. With the increase provided, 227,300 students will be able to receive initial year grants. The authorization for fiscal year 1970 is increased from \$140 million to \$170 million. This will result in an additional 50,000 initial year awards. Here too, the authorization we have agreed upon represents a substantial increase, however, the fiscal year 1971 authorization will still be approximately \$5 million less than the Office of Education estimates colleges and universities will request.

Mr. Speaker, approval today of this conference report will be another indication of the determination of the Congress that no student be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial barriers. Like the original House bill, the conference report provides for an effective solution to problems we have experienced with the insured student loan program. And, in addition, it modifies the college-based student aid programs to provide needed increases in authorizations so that the programs may operate at a level which is commensurate with the need. I urge every Member of this House to support the conference report.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the amount in the conference report for fiscal year 1970 was raised \$125 million?

Mr. PERKINS. Which programs is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. GROSS. Title IV, the higher education.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. The report increases the authorizations for national defense student loans, educational opportunity grants, and college work study. The total increase is over \$200 million.

Mr. GROSS. It is \$200 million?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. In the fiscal year 1970?

Mr. PERKINS. No; over a 2-year period. To break it down, we increase NDSL loans for fiscal year 1970, from \$275 million to \$325 million, and for fiscal year 1971, from \$300 million to \$375 million.

Mr. GROSS. Let us stay with fiscal year 1970. Is it not true that more than one-quarter of fiscal year 1970 is already gone?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct, but let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that it is estimated, an additional 85,000 students could borrow under the increase of \$50 million. The demand for national defense student loans is well known. Applications from institutions across the country far exceed the amounts presently available.

May I say to the gentleman, I did not vote in conference for this increase.

We cannot deny the need for an increased authorization. I would certainly hope that the appropriation would match the increased authorization.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman then is for this rather substantial increase?

Mr. PERKINS. The reason I did not vote for the increase in conference is that I tried to maintain the House position. Nevertheless, I am convinced we need more money for national defense student loans. Nothing could be clearer.

Mr. GROSS. What about the budget? This is really budget busting; is it not?

Mr. PERKINS. I did not understand the question.

Mr. GROSS. What about the budget for 1970?

Mr. PERKINS. As I recall, we have only appropriated \$229 million of the \$275 million authorization.

Mr. GROSS. I am wondering under the circumstances whether this is overfunding or whether it is changing the criteria to take care of just about everybody?

Mr. PERKINS. Taking into account the great need, we are not overfunding. We have authorized above what the Bureau of the Budget has gone on record in favor of spending. I am hopeful that they will change their minds on this issue.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of the full committee for his patience and also for his determination one and at the same time to see the conference report through to a successful conclusion. I also express my thanks to two staff members, Mr. Gaul and Mr. Hogan, who worked in preparing the conference report.

This conference report is a compromise. It probably does not represent 100 percent the views of any one conferee. But in my judgment the purpose of the House bill was accomplished.

That purpose was to encourage lending institutions to make more funds available to students.

The chairman has already outlined the major compromise agreements that were reached by the Senate and the

House. I should like to turn my attention to an amendment that seemed to me the most important if the House position were to be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment to limit the discretionary authority of lenders participating in the insured loan program was clearly the most controversial item before the Conference Committee. There were a number of assumptions underlying the Senate amendment which would have denied the Federal guarantee to banks which followed the practice of limiting loans to persons having a customer relationship with the lender.

It was assumed, but not known in fact, that numerous lenders engaged in such practices. It was assumed that such practices were evil. It was assumed that such practices were inconsistent with the objectives and purposes of the insured loan program. And it was assumed that implementation of the Senate amendment would result in greater availability of insured student loans. The validity of each of these assumptions should be and was questioned in our conference by House conferees. In so doing, I believe we have reached an agreement which can be characterized as a positive step forward rather than a negative reaction, and one which indicates that we are more interested in assisting students rather than in chastising the banks.

We direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to review the total insured loan program for the purpose of determining the extent to which any discrimination of any kind exists that was not intended in the law—by any and all lending institutions: Banks, credit unions, and administrators of pension funds. The Secretary is to be guided by his concern for the students and not by any desire to chastise the banks. The problem that this bill is addressed to is the one of inducing lending institutions to make loans to students. It is not a vehicle for expressing animosity toward the banks. There is no assumption in the conference report that any particular practice is wrong, rather, may I repeat, we direct the Secretary to determine whether the practice results in the denial of loans to a substantial number of students who are eligible for these loans under the law.

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on this very point in the discussion in the other body on the adoption of the conference report, the chairman of the conference, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) said this:

The language of the conference report carries out the original intent of the Senate that lenders should not require students or their families to conduct business activities with the lender as a condition for receiving a student loan.

I would ask the gentlewoman whether or not that is an accurate assessment of the conference report.

I would say, parenthetically, I do not believe it is fair to say that the intent of the original Senate amendment was carried out in the conference report. We

do require a finding and make no prejudicial judgment about the rights or wrongs of a practice carried out by lending institutions.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The gentleman from Wisconsin is entirely right, in my judgment. I think those who interpret the law should be disabused of the very narrow reading given to it by Members of the Senate. It is not, in my opinion, the purpose of the conference agreement to chastise banks and prohibit certain ones from having the Federal guarantee if they required a prior business relationship in making a student loan. Quite the opposite.

Also we broadened the scope of the study that the Secretary is to make to include many kinds of discrimination, which I want to discuss in just 1 minute.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have not yet mentioned what I consider to be the most disconcerting aspect of the original Senate amendment. As proposed, the amendment touched only one aspect of a more general and, quite frankly, more serious question—Are insured student loans available equally to all eligible students? It seemed to many of us that if we were going to prohibit certain lending practices because they were viewed by some as discriminatory and inconsistent with the purposes of the act, then it was important that we look at all lending practices under the program.

The question arose as to whether we should prohibit restrictive lending policies relating to customer status, while at the same time tolerate policies not only of banks but also of certain State guarantee agencies which limit the availability of loans for freshmen students, or for out-of-State students, or State residents attending a private institution rather than a State college.

We thought also that we should concern ourselves with the fact that under the insured loan program, only 36 percent of the borrowers are female, whereas under the NDEA student loan program, 45 percent of the borrowers are female; and the fact that under the NDEA student loan program, 18 percent of the borrowers are nonwhite, but that under the guaranteed student loan program, only 10 percent are nonwhite.

And what of the wide disparity which exists among States with respect to the availability of guaranteed loans? Participation in the insured student loan program in North Dakota represents 37.8 percent of full-time college enrollment in that State—and in New York and New Jersey, over 20 percent. Yet in one State, participation is only at the 2.5-percent level, and in the District of Columbia, it is even less.

Mr. Speaker, all of these problems require study, and I am pleased to report to the House that the provisions of the conference report require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make determinations with respect to each of these issues and not in only one area.

The language of subsection 6(b) gives the Secretary extremely wide discretion

in deciding whether he should take action upon any finding of objectionable discrimination. He is directed only to take "such steps as may be appropriate—to encourage the development—of a plan to increase the availability of financial assistance opportunities for such students." The language is so broad that it would support the Secretary, if he should find, for example, that banks which prefer their own customers have a much better record in making loans than do banks which do not have such a preference.

I do want, however, to state as strongly as possible, that the language of this bill does not constitute any prejudgment that practices by banks are per se bad.

In this connection, it is important to observe that the banks have an important stake in choosing among applicant borrowers. There are many more requests for loans—than the funds available during these days of tight money and high interest. The lending institution carries the cost of administration and collection costs and must face the risk of loss of interest. The Federal guarantee applies only to the principal. The loans can run for as long as 10 or 15 years, and the loss of interest after such a substantial period can be a matter of real concern to the bank. Collecting from students who may be scattered over the world is quite different than collection problems for borrowers of other kinds of loans who reside in the geographical area served by the bank.

Similarly, in the reinsurance program, by which the Federal Government reinsures State-guaranteed loan programs, the Federal guarantee runs only to 80 percent of the principal insured by the State. In four States, the State guarantees only 90 percent of the loan principal, and in one State only 80 percent. In those States under the reinsurance program the lending bank faces a possible loss of part of the principal as well as a loss of the interest. It is also important that in the reinsurance program the Federal Government guarantees only 80 percent of the State guarantee. The effect is to confront the State also with the possibility of loss, and to that extent the State may be concerned that the lending banks exercise their good judgment in selecting borrowers.

The last clause of subsection 6(b) directs the Secretary within 60 days after making the determination, which in another section is required to be made on or before March 1, 1970, to issue regulations to prevent "where practicable" any practices which he finds have denied loans to a substantial number of students. I do not agree with those who would impose limited reading of the words "where practicable." Fortunately, the words themselves are clear. The words would have to be ambiguous before inquiry could be made about legislative intent. The words here clearly give the Secretary discretion to consider any facts which are relevant to his decision regarding the adoption of regulations to prevent discriminatory practices. I can, for example, conceive of nothing more relevant to the wisdom of issuing such regulations than consideration of

whether prohibition of discriminatory practices would increase or decrease the number of loans. Any regulation which would result in a decrease in the number of loans would, in my judgment be impracticable.

The Secretary shall by rule or regulation—where practicable—take steps to prevent any discriminatory practices which he finds result in the denial of loans to a substantial number of students, whether it be discrimination based on sex, creed, color, or discrimination against freshmen students, or discrimination against persons not having a customer relationship, or discrimination against out-of-State residents, or discrimination against State residents attending private institutions.

Mr. Speaker, some have called this legislation "the bankers' bill." With the original Senate provision I have been discussing, some described the legislation as the "antibank bill." Mr. Speaker, the conference report is neither—it is precisely what it should be—a bill to increase the availability of financial assistance for needy college students.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the distinguished gentlewoman of our committee upon her leadership on this and upon her very important clarification of the conduct of the conference.

I would also like to ask her, as we have asked her privately, if in the coming months we will look into the entire area of student assistance, not only student loans. I hope that our committee might examine this total question.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that this entire area must be looked at. This Higher Education Act expires and the subcommittee will be turning its attention to this question in November and December this year. We hope that early in 1970 we can come up with another bill.

Mr. ESCH. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN).

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the conference report. I think that the conference report maintains the basic elements of the bill as passed by the House concerning the allowance of up to 3 percent over the 7 percent statutory limitation now paid to lenders in the guaranteed student loan program.

The three-month period for the computation that was in the House bill is retained in the conference report. The fact that the computation would be made at the end of the period is retained in the conference report as it was in the House bill. And the fact that the computation would be made on the average unpaid balance during the three-month or quarter period is also maintained, so that the substance of the bill as passed by the House is in the conference report.

I think the gentlewoman from Ore-

gon (Mrs. GREEN), who has just addressed the House in the well, has properly directed herself to the one question which was the most plaguing to our conference committee, and that was the question of the so-called Kennedy amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the main reason the conference took so long in reaching agreement was the so-called Kennedy amendment. This amendment, as passed by the Senate, would have required the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to prohibit lending institutions from requiring a student or any member of the student's family to carry out any business activity with the lender other than the activity directly related to the administration of the loan. Now, no one is for discrimination. At first glance, this might look like a reasonable requirement for the Secretary to carry out. But the House conferees were convinced that we did not have nearly enough information to pass judgment on any practices of lending institutions before we knew the extent of such practices and their consequences. No hearings were held in the Senate on this amendment, so we did not even have the benefit of expert testimony about the possible effects of this amendment if it were to be passed.

I believe the House was able, against strong resistance from the Senate conferees, to achieve a reasonable compromise on this issue. In the bill reported by the conference, we do not make an a priori judgment that there exists substantial discrimination on the part of lending institutions, nor that such practices, to the extent they exist, are necessarily detrimental to the purposes of the program. As a matter of fact, several letters from lending institutions indicated that they would drop out of the program if the Kennedy amendment became law. We do not know to what extent that actually would have occurred. I think no one was certain of the ramifications of the amendment.

What is certain is that this program is unique among the various financial aid programs. It uses a small amount of Federal money and the guaranty of the Federal Government to generate large sums of money—a total of 1.5 billion dollars so far—from the private sector. The program is totally dependent on the voluntary participation of lending institutions. Our objective should be to increase the number of institutions in the program. This seems to me to be the best way to increase the availability of student loans to larger numbers of students.

The Senate agreed in conference to our amendment which calls for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine to what extent any discrimination against any particular class or category of student does in fact exist. If he finds that a substantial number of students in any area are denied the opportunity to obtain an insured loan because of discriminatory practices on the part of lending institutions, he is then instructed to take appropriate steps to encourage the development of a plan in that area to meet the financial needs of such students. The solution, it is important to note, allows the Secretary to work with all financial aid programs, not just

the insured loan program. This approach is the most reasonable if we are truly concerned about helping students attend college.

The Secretary is also required, if he determines that a substantial number of students in an area have been unable to secure loans because of discriminatory lending practices, to "prevent, where practicable," such practices. The phrase "prevent, where practicable" is to give the Secretary broad discretion in adopting or amending regulations pertaining to the student loan program. For example, it would not be practicable to prevent credit unions from requiring membership in their organization as a condition for receiving a loan. Nor would it be practicable to require banks to lend to any and every applicant from outside his normal banking area. I believe that the intent of a majority of the House conferees, at least, was to consider not practicable any action on the part of the Secretary which would drastically reduce the number of participating lenders, and therefore reduce the total number of loans available to students in an area.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we should recognize the valuable contribution over 19,000 lending institutions are making to our society by participating in this program. Many extend loans as a public service when they could get a significantly higher return on the same money through different types of loans. Many lending institutions have gone ahead in making loans this past 2 months, trusting that the Congress would pass a bill similar to that which is before us.

I sincerely hope that we will, with this bill, attract hundreds of additional lending institutions and that all of them will carry out the intent of this program by making as much money available as possible and without any special preference given to one category of students over another.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support enactment of the Emergency Insured Student Loan Act of 1969 and I commend the work of the conferees.

The Nixon administration, too, deserves real credit for proposing the creative innovation embodied in this legislation as "special allowances." Thousands of students will be able to go on with their educational program because of this meaningful remedy to the interest problems associated with loans under present economic conditions.

But as significant as this step is, it is responsive only to part of the need. The real "gut issue"—one which must be met head-on if we are to make a breakthrough of the kind needed in this next decade—is the way we can and must increase lender participation.

It is becoming abundantly clear that this cannot possibly be achieved without attention to the liquidity problems facing lending institutions in connection with student loans. Some of us are already at work on the establishment of a secondary market mechanism for student loans and I am anticipating legislation on the subject soon.

Tax policy must also, in my opinion, be given increased attention as a vehicle

to help achieve the country's educational needs. I certainly support the administration's proposed amendment to the tax reform bill providing a special tax deduction to financial institutions as an incentive to make socially desirable loans such as student loans, and so forth. This is a giant step in the right direction.

In addition, we need a comprehensive approach to tax incentives for students investing in their own education and meaningful tax relief for those paying dependents educational expenses and/or establishing funds for this purpose. I am carefully exploring these possibilities.

While it is justifiably appropriate for us to feel satisfaction with the passage of this legislation, much remains to be done in order to provide maximum educational opportunity for all our young people. This must be the goal for which today's legislative accomplishment is the launching pad.

As a personal aside, I have had several opportunities to discuss the whole array of student assistance programs with the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN). I admire their grasp of the whole field and appreciate their willingness to consider suggestions. I commend their continued leadership in this area.

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

Mr. ERLBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Words were used by the chairman of the full committee on labor and public welfare in the other body in this way:

The words "where practicable" are intended to give him leeway in devising regulations for credit unions, or other lenders who in their charters or bylaws restrict their activities to members, and do not do business with the general public.

Based on what the gentleman from Illinois just said in his very eloquent statement, do you agree that this interpretation is attempting to give the Secretary the kind of leeway the other body has discussed?

Mr. ERLBORN. I think that interpretation is much too narrow. That is certainly one of the things the Secretary can do in his discretion as to what is practicable. It was rather our intention, and I hope we are making legislative history here today, to show that the words "where practicable" have a much broader meaning. Basically, what we want to do is to see that the passage of this law will encourage participation of lenders in this program rather than to discourage their participation, which the Kennedy amendment would have done without any question.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman's clarification of that point. I think it is very important. I concur with him, as one of the House conferees that the analysis given of this in the other body is much too narrow on this point. It is much broader and I think the language of the amendments adopted by the conference committee clearly indicates a broader definition.

Mr. ERLBORN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ERLBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I commend the gentleman for his statement in connection with the bill. As indeed, I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon, for his fine elucidation of a number of points of importance in the bill.

There is one particular question I would like to ask the gentleman in the well which is along the line of the testimony that you have now been giving.

Is it not true in the study which is to be made by the Secretary of the situation that exists so far as the banks and these loans are concerned, it was specifically added in the conference that he would look not only at the practices but look into the consequences of certain practices.

Is it not also true, I would like to ask the gentleman in the well, that the major purpose in insisting on the study include consequences is correlative and contributory to the basic purpose of the bill, namely, increasing the student loans?

Mr. ERLBORN. The gentleman is correct. I think it was understood throughout the conference that the Members of the House were not ready to make the judgment that the Members of the other body apparently made, that certain practices existed on a widespread basis and that the consequence of those practices was bad.

We are asking the Secretary to make a study to determine whether certain practices do exist, and, if they do, their consequences. This is very important because I do not think we can take any responsible action in the light of those practices unless we know what their consequences are. That is what we are asking the Secretary to determine, and then to take action based on that certain knowledge.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I would like to ask the gentleman whether it is his opinion that the purpose of this bill is to attempt to regulate banks, or whether the purpose of this bill is to help students get loans, and in this idea of the consequences it would be hoped that the Secretary's actions would be aimed at practices which would stop students from getting loans which are needed, but if he feels a practice helps students to get loans, he would not move in an attempt to prohibit or interfere with those particular practices.

Mr. ERLBORN. I agree with the gentleman. As I stated in the conference, I would hope that our action is intended to help students and not to slap the banks.

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

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

Mr. AYRES. I wish to join my colleagues in commending the chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, and those on our side who worked with them in the conference to bring out what I believe to be a very satisfactory conference report. After all, the intent of the original legislation was to make it

possible for deserving students to get loans. That is what we have done.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Emergency Insured Student Loan Act of 1969 will prove to be a very significant step forward in providing a greater number of students with the necessary financial resources for a college education. The insured loan program, without this bill, would be in substantial danger because of the unusually high interest rates now demanded by lending institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a strong supporter of the GI bill for many years. The Congress can be proud of its record in helping veterans secure a college education. Likewise, we can be proud of our other programs to assist students in continuing their education—especially the NDEA loans, economic opportunity grants, the college work-study program, and Government-insured loans. Each of these programs was aimed to meet a particular need. Each has a specific purpose. And together they form a balanced and impressive effort on the part of the Federal Government to assist hundreds of thousands of students.

Now it is important for us to remember the unique purpose the guaranteed student loan program was designed to fill. This particular program was specifically aimed at helping to reduce the burden of meeting higher education expenses for middle-income families. Large amounts of private credit would be generated by having the Federal Government guarantee individual loans, thereby attracting lending institutions to participate, on a voluntary basis, in meeting the needs of these families. This approach has been successful in generating approximately \$1.5 billion of private funds for student loans.

It is interesting to note that, so far, 55 percent of the federally guaranteed loans have gone to families with adjusted incomes of less than \$6,000. Seventy-nine percent of the loans to families with adjusted incomes of less than \$9,000. So this program is assisting thousands of students who would most likely find it otherwise impossible to attend a college or university. Because the great majority of loans are going to such families, I have no problem with the Federal Government paying lenders a special allowance, up to a maximum of 3 percent as this bill provides, to allow them to continue extending loans to these very needy students.

Mr. Speaker, our objective should be, if we believe in the concept of this program, to do whatever we can to encourage even more lenders of all types to participate in this program. I do not mean to provide lending institutions with possibilities for making large profits on Federal money. Most lending institutions have been willing to participate as a public service, but they do need to be assured of at least breaking even on this program. I believe this bill allows the Federal Government to adjust the return to the lenders, in a fair and equitable manner, whenever economic conditions require in order to see the program continued and hopefully expanded.

I think the House conferees were successful in reaching a fair compromise

on a Senate provision which would have restricted certain practices of some banks—and maybe even resulted in the withdrawal of many banks from the program altogether—before we knew the extent and consequences of those practices. Part of that compromise, about which the House was most emphatic, will require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to explore ways of using any of the several student financial aid programs to help meet the needs of students who are unable to secure an insured loan in their home areas.

Mr. Speaker, the House conferees shared the strong concern of the other body that a substantial number of students might be discriminated against by some banks for any of several reasons. But we felt just as strongly that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should not endanger the total program by taking action prior to the knowledge of the real need for any action.

I believe all of us want to see this program administered in such a way that the greatest possible number of eligible students are able to secure an insured loan. This bill is directed toward the goal.

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

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I particularly want to pay tribute to the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Illinois, and the gentlewoman from Oregon for having done so much in the subcommittee, the full committee, here in the House, and in the conference. The fact that the conference report came back to us is due to the leadership given by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), and the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), all of whom were persevering and dedicated.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMÁS).

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I should like to pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), and the distinguished chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), for their leadership, as well as, indeed, to the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle.

The bill before us today represents a reasonable compromise to which Members of both the majority and the minority side can, I think, in good conscience, give their support. It is a compromise to which Members on both sides made significant contributions.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment only briefly on some aspects of the conference report before us which I think are worthy of attention.

One of the significant developments in this session of the Congress to which I think a number of observers have given

attention is that Congress has seized the initiative from the President in respect to some of the many important public issues that face us in this country. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, turn the attention of Members back to what happened earlier in this Congress, when this House went on record by a 2-to-1 majority in support of the so-called Joelson amendment, which provided for an increase in appropriations earmarked for education substantially above what had been recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, and \$1 billion above the President's proposed budget for education. The Joelson amendment and the increased money for education which it embodied received such extraordinary support, both from Republicans and Democrats in this House—my memory tells me that there were only 120 votes against the appropriations increase—is, I believe, a prime indication of the initiative in Congress to which I have made reference.

What we in the House of Representatives were in effect saying is that the elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States believe that we should, as a nation, be giving much greater priority to education than the President has been willing to do.

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

Mr. BRADEMÁS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I was encouraged by the gentleman's comments on the Joelson amendment and I am discouraged by what is happening to it or not happening to it in the Senate. I hope Members on both sides of the aisle will encourage the other body to act a little more expeditiously in regard to this bill. We are already 4 months into the fiscal year. I wonder if the gentleman from Indiana would join me in urging that.

Mr. BRADEMÁS. I would be delighted to do so, and I will be glad to mention those views to my colleagues in the Senate if my colleague from Michigan will communicate his judgment to his friends in the administration, and then maybe we could have a little pincers movement on this matter.

Mr. ESCH. I will be happy to.

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I want briefly to make another point on the bill before us. It increases authorizations for three major student programs—college work-study, national defense loans, and educational opportunity grants and thereby represents another instance of Members of Congress indicating their deep sense of concern that we are not doing enough to support education, in this particular case, to support student assistance programs.

I quite realize, Mr. Speaker, this is an authorization bill, and that we are not here appropriating money, but I suggest respectfully that in agreeing to these increased authorizations Congress is once again, as we did in the Joelson amendment, saying that we think education is profoundly important.

Mr. Speaker, a final point I want to make has to do with the special allowance that is written into this bill for the purpose of encouraging banks, credit

unions and other lending institutions to make more loans to students. I think all of us worked on this bill from the outset—and it was a bipartisan bill—in the hope that we could make possible greater sources of student financial assistance, especially for middle-income students in America.

We all know that we are in a tight money situation which has caused a number of lenders to back away from participating in the insured loan program. I believe that they now have a justification for moving ahead and for being more zealous in providing student assistance loans.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one other point in this respect. The pattern of participation in the guaranteed loan program across the country has varied considerably depending not only on the interest rate structure, but also on the enthusiasm and initiative and leadership of private lenders in the various communities and States around the country. In certain States, the banks, for example, do a splendid job, and in other States the banks have been doing very little.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the action of the House today in passing this legislation will be taken as an indication to the private lenders of the country of the hope of Congress that those institutions will now regard what we are doing as a vote of confidence in their willingness to loan money to students, and that the banks and other lenders will, in turn, respond by much more zealously and enthusiastically initiating loans to the students of our country.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

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

Mr. SCHERLE. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana said if we pass this bill, we are approving something in the nature of a vote of confidence in the bankers. I know of no reason why there should be a vote of confidence in the bankers in this instance when they can collect 10 percent interest on guaranteed loans.

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to respond.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am not asking a question of the gentleman from Indiana. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) has control of the time.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, reluctantly I support the conference report on H.R. 13194 on the so-called emergency student loan bill. However, I am very disappointed with the position taken by the House conferees.

The purpose of a conference, supposedly, is to achieve a compromise. Unfortunately, in my humble opinion, the House conferees surrendered to the other body on the only points of difference that really mean anything. We salvaged absolutely nothing out of the House bill.

Aside from mere technicalities that do not matter one way or another, the Sen-

ate-passed bill differed from the House version in three major respects.

First, unlike the House bill which amended the Higher Education Act to provide a loan adjustment payment to lending institutions at any time these adverse interest rate conditions occur during the life of that act, the Senate bill is completely separate legislation. This leaves the strong suggestion with the lending institutions that these adjustments are not to be a regular part of the insured loan program whenever necessitated by high interest rates, but are completely apart and may not be renewed after 2 years. I think this is very unfortunate, because the whole purpose of this provision is to reassure lending institutions that they will at least break even on student loans.

The House bill was strictly limited to the matter of the adjustment allowance. Everyone will recall that the student loan bill was brought before this House under suspension so that no amendments could be offered. However, the Senate amended the bill in ways never considered by the House or even by our subcommittee on education. The second major point on which the House capitulated was on one such amendment. The Senate bill contained a provision to prohibit participating banks from restricting insured loans to their own depositors. There were indications that rather than accept such a restriction the banks would simply withdraw from the program and devote their loan funds to more profitable purposes. This, of course, would defeat the purpose of the entire legislation. Also, banks alone would not be affected, but credit unions which by law must require borrowers to be members, and labor unions who make loans to students, but usually only to the children of members.

The House agreed to a compromise on this provision, but the compromise simply orders the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a determination of the effects of such practices and then authorizes the Secretary to do by regulation what the Senate bill would have mandated by legislation.

The point is that none of these provisions was included in the House bill, and for a very good reason. There was not one iota of testimony before our committee concerning the subject of this provision, and, I might add, virtually nothing before the Senate committee. We were forced to legislate in the dark simply to get a bill passed.

The third major difference was the provision in the Senate bill which amended three other student assistance programs to increase their authorizations for fiscal 1970 and 1971 by a total of \$240 million. The other body never held one single day of hearings on these authorization increases.

These figures not only are far in excess of the budget, but they virtually double the higher student aid figures already voted by the House in the 1970 HEW appropriations bill.

In the extremely unlikely event that the Senate actually agreed to the appropriation of such funds and the House concurred for fiscal 1970, we would have ended any chance to hold to the budget.

A far likelier result of this reckless action is to raise false hopes that virtually unlimited student aid will be available this year.

This bill was passed in the House without any opportunity for amendments and now is brought back to the House with increased authorizations totaling nearly a quarter of a billion dollars.

Mr. Speaker, on every item covered in the Senate bill and not found in any form in the House bill, the gentleman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN)—the distinguished chairwoman of the Special Subcommittee on Education—had planned extensive hearings. That is the proper course—that is normal procedure—find the facts and then legislate on that basis. The work planned by the gentleman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) should not have been preempted by a conference committee.

I hope this body takes a long, hard look before it again agrees to consider proposed legislation of this magnitude under a gag rule.

In order for this badly needed student loan program to serve its purpose, I will reluctantly support this bill. The initial delay in passage of this legislation lies with those unwilling to let this body work its will.

But, Mr. Speaker, what really is disturbing is the great semantic game that the House and Senate has played by calling this the Emergency Student Loan Act.

How much of an emergency was there when this conference took 5 weeks to conclude?

How much of an emergency was there when we are already 5 weeks into the present school year?

Or was the term "emergency" used merely as a means into lulling the House into failure to take proper action on this bill in regard to those students who are involved in disorder on our campuses?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding to me and wish to commend him for his very significant role in connection with securing adoption of this conference report.

I rise in support of this bill and urge this body adopt the conference report today.

I think it is of major importance to keep clearly in mind that the purpose of this bill is to help students secure loans to assist their education. There is no requirement that any bank participate in the student loan program involved in this bill. In the modern money market any bank can make loans which will yield it a more substantial return than will be possible to obtain from student loans. Even with the special allowance provided for in this bill that will be true. But this special allowance will, we earnestly hope and expect, cause many banks in the country to participate in making badly needed loans when the economics of the present money market might well otherwise have kept them from doing so.

I call that fact to the attention of

my colleagues once again as we prepare to vote on adoption of this conference report. As I have indicated on this floor before, I own some bank stock. This stock is in Oregon banks and was originally acquired a considerable number of years ago because of my desire to support and be involved in an industry of very considerable importance to the citizens of my State. Although I have never inquired and do not know, I expect and indeed hope that both such Oregon banks have made loans to students to help them secure a desired and desirable education.

The amount of gain that either of these banks will make under the provisions of this bill is apt to be quite small, and the gain, if any, accruing to my stock ownership extremely small. But I feel that the gain to students and to the cause of education will be very substantial.

For that reason I rise in support of this bill and I urge my colleagues to adopt this conference report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for just 1 minute?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As I understand it, nothing has changed in this legislation since it was first considered in the House except to make it worse. There is no anti-demonstration amendment. The interest rate on these Government-guaranteed loans still goes to 10 percent with 3 percent of it paid for by the taxpayers. The only thing that has changed in this legislation as it left the House has been to bust the budget by about \$230 million or \$240 million.

Mr. PERKINS. To be exact, \$240 million. There is \$100 million for fiscal year 1970 and \$140 million for fiscal year 1971. However, we feel that outside of the increased authorizations, the House prevailed.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report and was proud to serve as a conferee. The House position has been essentially upheld. The increase in the authorization for three higher education programs was not a part of the House bill but a majority of the House conferees receded on this point.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the August 1, 1969, starting date for the incentive payment is not what I would have liked. July 1 as the House bill adopted was preferable. But I am persuaded the August 1 effective date will treat equitably both students and lending institutions. The record of banking institutions in Wisconsin, for example, is excellent in this past August—having granted more loans this year than last year. This record of willingness to assist students is a good one and it is a part of the reason why this conference report is so urgent. We dare not let down the commitment to both the students and lending institutions.

The length of time needed by the conference to resolve our differences is unfortunate but with adoption of the conference report today the insured loan program can continue and grow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr.

Boggs). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHERLE. 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 pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 326, nays 10, answered "present" 2, not voting 93, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]  
YEAS—326

Adair	de la Garza	Johnson, Pa.
Adams	Delaney	Jonas
Addabbo	Dellenback	Jones, Tenn.
Alexander	Denneny	Karth
Anderson,	Dennis	Kastenmeier
Anderson,	Dent	Kazen
Anderson, Ill.	Derwinski	Kee
Anderson,	Donohue	Keith
Tenn.		Dorn
Andrews, Ala.	Dowdy	Kleppe
Andrews,	Downing	Kluczynski
N. Dak.	Dulski	Koch
Annunzio	Duncan	Kuykendall
Ashbrook	Dwyer	Kyros
Ashley	Edwards, Ala.	Langen
Ayres	Elberg	Leggett
Baring	Erlenborn	Lennon
Barrett	Esch	Lipscomb
Beall, Md.	Eshleman	Long, La.
Belcher	Evins, Tenn.	Long, Md.
Bell, Calif.	Fallon	Lowenstein
Bennett	Fish	McCarthy
Betts	Flood	McClure
Bevill	Foley	McCulloch
Biaggi	Ford, Gerald R.	McDade
Blester	Ford,	McDonald,
Bingham	William D.	Mich.
Blanton	Foreman	McEwen
Blatnik	Fountain	McFall
Boggs	Fraser	McKneally
Boland	Frelinghuysen	Macdonald,
Bolling	Frey	Mass.
Bow	Friedel	MacGregor
Brademas	Fuqua	Madden
Brinkley	Gallifanakis	Mahon
Brock	Gallagher	Mailliard
Broomfield	Gaydos	Mann
Brotzman	Gettys	Marsh
Brown, Mich.	Gialmo	Mathias
Brown, Ohio	Gibbons	Matsunaga
Broyhill, N.C.	Gilbert	May
Buchanan	Goldwater	Mayne
Burke, Mass.	Gonzalez	Melcher
Burleson, Tex.	Goodling	Meskill
Burlison, Mo.	Green, Oreg.	Michel
Burton, Utah	Green, Pa.	Mikva
Bush	Griffiths	Miller, Calif.
Button	Grover	Miller, Ohio
Byrne, Pa.	Gubser	Minish
Byrnes, Wis.	Gude	Mink
Cabell	Hagan	Minshall
Caffery	Halpern	Mize
Carter	Hamilton	Mizell
Casey	Hammer-	Mollohan
Celler	schmidt	Monagan
Chamberlain	Hanley	Moorhead
Chappell	Hansen, Wash.	Morgan
Clancy	Harrington	Morse
Clausen,	Harsha	Morton
Don H.	Harvey	Mosher
Clawson, Del	Hathaway	Moss
Clay	Hawkins	Murphy, Ill.
Cleveland	Hébert	Murphy, N.Y.
Cohelan	Hechler, W. Va.	Myers
Collier	Heckler, Mass.	Natcher
Collins	Helstoski	Nedzi
Colmer	Henderson	Nelsen
Conable	Hicks	Nichols
Conte	Hogan	Nix
Corbett	Hollifield	Obey
Corman	Horton	O'Hara
Coughlin	Hosmer	Olsen
Cowger	Hull	O'Neill, Mass.
Cramer	Hungate	Ottinger
Culver	Hunt	Passman
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Patten
Daddario	Ichord	Pepper
Daniel, Va.	Jacobs	Perkins
Daniels, N.J.	Jarman	Pettis
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Philbin

Pickle	Satterfield	Udall
Pike	Schadeberg	Ullman
Pirnie	Scherle	Van Deerlin
Poage	Scheuer	Vander Jagt
Podell	Schneebell	Vanik
Poff	Schwengel	Vigorito
Preyer, N.C.	Sebellius	Waggonner
Pryce, Tex.	Shipley	Watkins
Pryor, Ark.	Shriver	Watson
Purcell	Sikes	Weicker
Rallsback	Skubitz	Whalen
Randall	Slack	White
Rarick	Smith, Calif.	Whitehurst
Reid, Ill.	Smith, Iowa	Whitten
Reid, N.Y.	Smith, N.Y.	Widnall
Rhodes	Snyder	Wiggins
Riegle	Springer	Williams
Roberts	Stafford	Wilson, Bob
Robison	Staggers	Winn
Rogers, Colo.	Stanton	Wolf
Rogers, Fla.	Steiger, Ariz.	Wyatt
Rooney, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.	Wylder
Rooney, Pa.	Stokes	Wyllie
Rostenkowski	Stratton	Wyman
Roth	Stuckey	Yates
Roudebush	Sullivan	Yatron
Roybal	Symington	Young
Ruth	Taft	Zablocki
Ryan	Talcott	Zion
St Germain	Thompson, N.J.	Zwach
St. Onge	Thompson, Wis.	
Sandman	Tiernan	

NAYS—10

Abbt	Gross
Abernethy	Hall
Blackburn	Landgrebe
Burke, Fla.	Lukens

O'Neal, Ga.
Thompson, Ga.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Pelly	Quillen
-------	---------

NOT VOTING—93

Albert	Fisher	Powell
Arends	Flowers	Price, Ill.
Aspinall	Flynt	Pucinski
Berry	Fulton, Pa.	Quie
Brasco	Fulton, Tenn.	Rees
Bray	Garmatz	Reifel
Brooks	Gray	Reuss
Brown, Calif.	Griffin	Rivers
Broyhill, Va.	Haley	Rodino
Burton, Calif.	Hanna	Rosenthal
Cahill	Hansen, Idaho	Ruppe
Camp	Hastings	Saylor
Carey	Hays	Scott
Cederberg	Howard	Sisk
Chisholm	Jones, Ala.	Steed
Clark	Jones, N.C.	Stephens
Conyers	Kirwan	Stubblefield
Davis, Ga.	Kyl	Taylor
Dawson	Landrum	Teague, Calif.
Devine	Latta	Teague, Tex.
Dickinson	Lloyd	Tunney
Diggs	Lujan	Utt
Dingell	McClary	Waldie
Eckhardt	McCloskey	Wampler
Edmondson	McMillan	Watts
Edwards, Calif.	Martin	Whalley
Edwards, La.	Meeds	Wilson,
Evans, Colo.	Mills	Charles H.
Farbstein	Montgomery	Wold
Fascell	O'Konski	Wright
Feighan	Patman	
Findley	Pollock	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Albert with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Hastings.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Wold.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Meeds.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Flowers.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Burton of California with Mrs. Chisholm.

Mr. Evans with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Steed.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Price of Illinois.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the conference report just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11039, PEACE CORPS ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11039) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 14, 1969.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there were three points of difference between the Peace Corps authorization which passed the House and the bill which passed the Senate.

First. The House bill authorized \$101,100,000 for fiscal year 1970. The Senate authorization was \$95,800,000.

The conference split the difference between these figures so that the authorization is \$98,450,000.

Second. The House bill prohibited the use of any Peace Corps funds to bring volunteers from other countries to the United States under the Volunteers to America program or any other such program.

This amendment was adopted on the floor of the House.

The Senate bill authorized the use of Peace Corps funds for this purpose.

The Senate receded. The prohibition in the House bill remains in effect.

Third. The third difference was an authorization in the Senate bill to contribute up to \$300,000 for an international Peace Corps.

The House conferees opposed this provision. We finally reached agreement that contributions could be made for an international register of volunteers, which would provide information to interested organizations or governments as to the availability of volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we have brought back from conference is identical to the House bill except in two respects.

We split the difference on the funds authorized so that the figure is \$2,550,000 below the amount that the House approved.

We also authorized contributions of Peace Corps funds, not to exceed \$300,000, for an international register of volunteers.

I believe that we have served the House well, and I urge the approval of the conference report.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why did the House conferees agree to this \$300,000 for—what is it—a register of volunteers?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. The figure is just a ceiling. It is not an authorization. It is a \$300,000 ceiling on the amount of Peace Corps funds that can be used for this purpose. I do not believe they will be using that much.

Mr. GROSS. Ceilings around here have a habit of representing the amount of spending, do they not?

Mr. MORGAN. I have seen many authorizations pass here which turned out to be much higher than the appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. Why should we spend \$300,000 to provide information to interested foreign organizations or governments as to the availability of volunteers?

Mr. MORGAN. This is just a register. The \$300,000 or less can be spent only to establish this register, which will be a list of names. We did it to avoid getting involved in an international Peace Corps, which was in the bill that passed the other body. You recognize that we stood fast on the amendment prohibiting any contribution to the Volunteers to America, which was written into the House bill on the House floor.

Mr. GROSS. This might well be construed as being only a little less worse than the other?

Mr. MORGAN. This is much less than the provision in the Senate bill. We have not authorized an international Peace Corps. This authorizes only a register

where, when people are available, their names can be furnished to organizations or governments who want volunteers.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. In furtherance of what the gentleman has been saying, let me say to my good friend from Iowa that this does represent a real diminution of the authority proposed in the Senate bill. They would have authorized this amount of money to carry on programs, which was the word that was used. So, as one of the compromises in this bill, we, trying to uphold the House position, changed that and we were successful in protecting our position. We limit it only to maintenance of a register. I would say further that the \$300,000 figure is obviously an upper limit, and I for one would doubt that any substantial expenditure of that amount of money would be or could be used.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I suppose with the explanation of my friend from Indiana we can always be thankful for small favors, but I do not consider it very much of a favor to earmark \$300,000 for this purpose.

Let me ask the gentleman one final question, if I may.

How many foreign countries, since the House bill was passed, have kicked out the Peace Corps or threatened to kick it out?

Mr. MORGAN. I think there has been one, possibly, Mr. Gross, since the House passed the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Only one recently. As the Peace Corps is kicked out of foreign countries I assume the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will, since he is always amenable to reason, be more than glad to cut back on the appropriations for this organization.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR).

Mr. ADAIR. I rise in support of the conference report on the Peace Corps bill. The House conferees worked very diligently to uphold the position of this body, and I am satisfied that the result is a bill which will make possible an effective and improved Peace Corps program in fiscal year 1970.

Chairman MORGAN has explained in detail the changes made in conference. The dollar figure of \$98,450,000 represents a compromise between the House and Senate figures, and is the smallest amount authorized for the Peace Corps since 1964.

However, I believe that this bill will enable the very competent Peace Corps Director, Joseph H. Blatchford, to continue his efforts to improve the agency's efficiency and effectiveness.

The Peace Corps, under Mr. Blatch-

ford's leadership, is moving in a deliberate and reasonable manner toward an emphasis on quality rather than quantity. I agree with this approach. It is far better to have fewer volunteers with more skills that meet the needs of the host countries, rather than to emphasize the numbers of volunteers. Also this approach is more consistent with this year's Peace Corps bill, which recognizes the need for fiscal restraint while endorsing the continuation of this worthwhile program.

I urge your support of the conference report.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority whip the program for the balance of this week and the program for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. In response to the gentleman's inquiry, we will continue now with the consideration of the Export Control Act which comes to us under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. We will conclude that bill today and there is no further program for the balance of the week.

In further response to the gentleman's inquiry, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday we will have the call of the Consent Calendar.

We have also scheduled for consideration on Monday two bills under suspension of the rules as follows:

H.R. 14030, to extend the authority to transfer peanut acreage allotments; and H.R. 14195, the Federal Contested Elections Act.

For Tuesday there will be the call of the Private Calendar and, also, for Tuesday and the balance of the week, the first bill to be considered is H.R. 13827, Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969, under an open rule, with 3 hours of general debate.

This bill is to be followed by the consideration of H.R. 13950, the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, again under an open rule with 3 hours of general debate.

Following the disposition of that bill there will be for the consideration of the House H.R. 14001, the Selective Service Amendment Act of 1969, subject to a rule being granted.

I understand the committee completed action on that bill this morning. We would hope that a rule will be granted and that we will be able to consider that bill next week.

As the gentleman knows, conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In view of the light schedule of business on Monday, would it be possible to consider the rules for the first two bills listed for Tuesday and the balance of the week?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further; no, I am afraid not. We have notified the Members that we will only consider suspensions on Monday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. There is no prospect for the consideration of any appropriation bill next week?

Mr. BOGGS. No, there is not. There are none ready at this time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

#### EXPORT CONTROL ACT EXTENSION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 575 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 575

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4293) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now printed in the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and

amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 575 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 4293. A bill to provide for the continuation of authority to regulate exports. As introduced by the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill called for a simple 4-year extension of the existing Export Control Act. It was reported with an amendment to provide for a reduced 2-year extension in order to afford Congress an opportunity for reexamination within a relatively short period. The 2-year extension was considered preferable in view of the significant changes which have taken place and continue to take place in our foreign policy since the Export Control Act was passed in 1949. The shorter extension was also deemed necessary because of the possibility of future changes in the U.S. balance-of-payments position, the increased availability to Eastern European countries of goods restricted for export by the United States, and the rapid expansion of Soviet and other Eastern European markets, which now present a significant opportunity for American businessmen.

For the purpose of reducing costs to American exporters, the bill was further amended in committee to direct the administration to revise reporting, recordkeeping and export documentation requirements, consistent with effective enforcement and compilation of useful trade statistics. This amendment would save American exporters an estimated \$100 million annually, and was deemed especially appropriate in view of recent developments in documentation, computerization, and containerization of merchandise.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 575 in order that H.R. 4293 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) has ably stated, House Resolution 575 makes in order for consideration H.R. 4293 under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for an additional 2 years—through June 30, 1971. Additionally, the bill directs the administration, in carrying out the enforcement provisions of the act, to design and develop reporting techniques which reduce the cost to American exporters with respect to recordkeeping and export documentation required by the act.

The Export Control Act of 1949 grants to the President the authority to prohibit or curtail exports from the United States. The act authorizes such control for three purposes: national security, foreign pol-

icy, and shortage of supply. Under these limitations, current export policy includes embargo on exports to Communist China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba and, strict limitations on export to Russia, and Eastern European countries. In furtherance of foreign policy, to cite one example, an almost total embargo on exports to Southern Rhodesia has been in force for several years.

The administrative mechanism of the Export Control Act is carried out by the Department of Commerce which controls U.S. exports through issuance of an export license, to qualified exporters.

The 1949 act has been extended periodically since 1949. The most recent was enacted in 1965 when a 4-year extension was provided.

The bill provides for only a 2-year extension, primarily because the committee wishes to undertake a total evaluation of the program in the near future. Additionally, language was written in the bill requiring improvement in reporting, recordkeeping, and documentation because testimony from U.S. exporter interests indicate that the present recordkeeping system was excessively expensive to carry out. An estimated \$100 million can be saved by American exporters, without loss of any necessary information, with an improved system of recordkeeping.

Supplemental views have been filed by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY). He notes that in 1949, when the Export Control Act was first adopted, the situation in Europe was substantially different than today. He believes we should reevaluate the program in light of changed circumstances. We are no longer the only technically advanced nation in the Western World. By eliminating or strictly limiting the sale of nonstrategic goods to Communist or unfriendly countries, we limit our export market severely. Additionally, continued pressure on our allies to follow our lead in this matter has placed a strain on our relations with friendly nations. He points out that trade of Eastern Europe with non-Communist nations in 1967 was almost \$14 billion. The United States has virtually cut itself off from this trade between allies and Eastern Europe. He believes in view of the situation, Congress should structure the act to bring it in line with reality.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA) has also filed supplemental views indicating that he believes the act should be amended to authorize the President to exercise control over drug exports, which are likely to be unlawfully shipped back to the United States. He has contacted the Attorney General and, if a favorable report is received, he will offer such an amendment.

The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MRZE) has also filed supplemental views. He points out that restrictions in the current law require, as a condition to obtain a license for exporting wheat and feed grains, that 50 percent of such export be shipped in U.S.-flag vessels. He points out the high cost of using American vessels. In the last few years, shipments of wheat and feed grain has fallen off—at the same time it is rising in other countries. He notes that in the last

3 years not a single bushel of wheat has been sold subject to cargo shipment regulations. This has the effect of neither protecting our merchant marine nor assisting our agricultural producers in disposing of surplus. He believes policy should be revised.

Supplemental views have also been filed jointly by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BEVILL), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GRIFFIN), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE). They point out that the Export Control Act authorizes the President to prohibit the export of material to any country without notification to, or approval of, the Congress. They believe such a complete embargo is tantamount to economic warfare, and therefore, the consent of Congress should be required. They propose to offer an amendment along these lines at the appropriate time.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) has also filed supplemental views. He, too, believes that the economic and political realities of today and in the 1970's are fundamentally different than the situation during the postwar period. He proposes an amendment that requires the President to take into consideration the availability of a proposed export product for any nation we have a defense treaty commitment with in determining whether an export license should be granted for its sale abroad. He believes that to the extent our friends and allies operate under liberalized trading agreements, that we should revise our thinking in the matter rather than unilaterally removing ourselves from competing with them. He believes that this may be of assistance in arriving at mutual agreements with our friends and allies on which items should be made available and which restricted.

I have no further requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4293) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports.

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4293, with Mr. ABERNETHY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Banking and Currency met and, by a vote of 35 to 0, reported H.R. 4293, as amended, to extend and amend the Export Control Act of 1949.

The act provides the President with the authority to prohibit or curtail exports from the United States for reasons of national security and foreign policy, and to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand.

In the course of the hearings before the subcommittee on international trade, chaired by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY), the question was raised whether the export control programs might be continued under other legislative authority, such as the Trading With the Enemy Act, and whether extension of the Export Control Act was necessary.

It was pointed out, in response that the Trading With the Enemy Act contains different criminal sanctions for violations than those found in the Export Control Act, and makes no provision for the civil penalty provided for in the Export Control Act.

A good deal of the flexibility available to the administration in the conduct of the control program would thus be lost.

Originally the bill H.R. 4293 called for a simple extension of the Export Control Act for 4 years.

As a result of 5 days of hearings, the subcommittee recommended an amendment which would provide for a 2-year, rather than a 4-year extension, in order to afford the Congress an opportunity for review within a relatively short period.

Extensions of this length have been more typical in the past since initial enactment of the act in 1949.

In view of possible changes in the near future in our foreign policy vis-a-vis Eastern Europe and in our foreign trade and balance of payments it was felt that a 2-year extension is more appropriate at this time.

A second amendment provides that reporting, recordkeeping, and export documentation requirements should be designed to reduce costs to the extent feasible consistent with effective enforcement and compilation of useful trade statistics. Testimony by both administration and public witnesses indicated that recent innovations in documentation and computer techniques point up the need for the Department of Commerce to revise and update its procedures for obtaining compliance with export control regulations and for collecting export statistics.

Superfluous requirements, according to testimony received are costing American exporters an added \$100 million annually. Hence, the committee is pleased to recommend legislation which would help to make American exports more competitive, without subsidy, particularly at a time when our trade surplus is all too slender.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4293, to extend the Export Control Act for 2 years. I think it is essential that Members understand what this legislation is and what it is designed to accomplish.

The Export Control Act provides the statutory basis for control over the great bulk of U.S. exports. Its policy objectives are to control exports to the extent necessary for reasons of national security, foreign policy, and short supply.

First. Section 3(a) of the act provides for denial of any requested authorization to export commodities or technical data from the United States "to any nation or combination of nations threatening the national security of the United States if the President shall determine that such export makes a significant contribution to the military or economic potential of such nation or nations which would prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States." In administering the act, the Department of Commerce pursues certain key principles to fulfill this directive:

Controls are exercised over U.S. commodities and technology having significant national security aspects.

Particularly close control is exercised over the export to the Eastern European and Asiatic Communist countries of commodities and technical data that the United States and our COCOM allies have agreed to subject to multilateral control.

Control lists are continually reviewed to retain or tighten controls when warranted, and to relax or remove controls when no longer warranted.

Applications for licenses on individual export transactions are approved or denied following a determination on whether they would be detrimental to the national security and welfare. Such a determination is based on a full study of such factors as the nature of the item involved, the availability abroad of comparable commodities and the likely end-use or end-user, whether civilian or military.

The act permits peaceful trade with Eastern European countries, and its administration by the Department of Commerce is designed to facilitate such trade.

Second. Controls over exports are exercised, as necessary, to further U.S. foreign policy objectives and to fulfill U.S. obligations resulting from international agreements. At present, controls under this provision are exercised on exports to the Middle East, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Cuba, the Far East Communist countries, and on nuclear-related commodities in support of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and U.S. nuclear nonproliferation policy.

Third. The controls are used to the extent necessary to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand. At present, only nickel and copper products are under short supply control.

The bill as reported would add a new subsection (d) to section 6 of the act. This provides that reporting, record-keeping, and export documentation requirements shall be designed to reduce costs to exporters to the extent feasible consistent with effective enforcement and compilation of useful trade statistics. Action to revise these requirements is to be included in the first quarterly report issued after revisions are made. This requirement that the Department of Commerce revise and update its techniques for obtaining compliance with export control regulations and for collecting export statistics gives recognition to the developments which have and are taking place in documentation, computerization, and containerization of merchandise facilitating the movement of goods in our export markets. It is anticipated that the change will facilitate our trade and save our exporters substantial sums of money.

The act, in its present form, provides needed broad flexibility for the President to cope with any contingency. It is essential to give the President such flexibility during these troubled times.

I urge Members to support H.R. 4293.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY).

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Export Control Act was enacted in 1949 as a temporary measure and as a necessary weapon in the evolving cold war. At that time Western Europe, still economically weak from the ravages of the Second World War, appeared to the Congress to be in realistic danger of attack from the monolithic Sino-Soviet bloc under the leadership of Stalin; and it was further believed, comparing our industrial might with both Eastern and Western Europe at that time, that goods withheld from the Soviets by means of controls on American commodities could not be elsewhere obtained.

Responding to the aggressive, monolithic communistic structure which confronted the free world in 1949-50, two separate administrative agencies were established to impose restrictions on free world trade with Eastern Europe. One was our own Office of Export Control and the other was the combined COCOM apparatus by which Western Europe, Japan, and the United States sought cooperatively to withhold certain goods and commodities from the Communist-bloc countries.

It is normal for a country to impose export controls in case of war or other overriding national emergencies. Our 20-year export controls are not of that character. With specific exceptions—as when there are shortages of particular commodities because of strikes or other reasons—the whole machinery of U.S. control has been directed to one end—to severely limit exports to the Communist countries.

This is illustrated by the fact that these two mechanisms, the Office of Export Control and the COCOM, both designed to restrict trade with the Communist nations, have never been closely coordinated. For example, commodities

such as milk and cream, not controlled by COCOM, require a validated license for export to some countries of Eastern Europe, but not for export to Poland and Rumania. The wide differential in goods we control unilaterally, but which are not controlled by COCOM, continues in the face of the congressional mandate set forth in section 2(2) of the Export Control Act that:

It is the policy of the United States to formulate, reformulate, and apply such controls to the maximum extent possible in cooperation with all nations with which the United States has defense treaty commitments, and to formulate a unified commercial and trading policy to be observed by the non-Communist-dominated nations or areas in their dealings with the Communist-dominated nations.

The Subcommittee on International Trade received testimony indicating that we continue to unilaterally control hundreds of categories of goods on political grounds. Testimony taken by the subcommittee indicated that even now, 2,029 commodity categories are under control for such countries as Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the U.S.S.R., while 1,753 of these are controlled for Poland and Rumania, at the same time that COCOM has designated 552 categories for control.

The United States has demonstrated an almost compulsive tendency to regard the denial of trade with Communist nations as a primary instrument or weapon of the cold war, whether trade be in strategic or nonstrategic goods. The countries of Western Europe and Japan, on the other hand, have sought through COCOM to prevent strategic exports to Communist bloc nations, but they have regarded trade in nonstrategic goods and commodities to be not only in their commercial interest but also a means of reducing East-West tensions.

West European allies have seen the embargo as playing into the hands of Stalin. It enabled him to consolidate control in the Communist bloc and forced the small Eastern European countries closer to the Soviet Union. On balance, they have seen the embargo as resulting in a strengthening of the military-industrial sector of the Communist bloc. Under the circumstances, it has been advantageous to the Kremlin.

The United States has exerted a tremendous effort to enforce the embargo. U.S. measures have been so stringent that we have risked American political good will with our allies. West Europeans have further resented the accompanying American economic intelligence work within their countries. They have found U.S. pressures alien to a voluntary alliance.

What has been the net effect of this costly and, to our allies, abrasive effort? Any realistic appraisal must admit that the Soviet Union has become a highly industrialized, technologically sophisticated nation with a military force capable of engaging any adversary in the world. The embargo has failed to shift the balance of power. Communism has not been, and it is now even less likely to be, blockaded out of existence.

The Soviet economy, unlike the smaller

East European countries, is practically self-sufficient. Total Soviet imports represent a mere 4 percent of the country's gross national product. It is rich in natural resources. Modern science permits great flexibility through substitute alternatives. A bottleneck approach simply does not work with a nation of such natural endowments and technological level. Besides, the embargo items are not unknown to the Communist intelligence network and, in some respects, the list has aided Soviet planners with important information for determining what commodities to purchase, produce, or stockpile.

At this stage of development, the United States has at least as much to gain as the Communist countries from mutual trade and the barring of this trade today is hurting us more than them. This is true because they can find substitute suppliers for almost everything important, while we cannot find substitute markets in a time when we need more exports desperately, and the concept that we have almost all the advanced know-how and products while they have very little is out of date. As far as the export controls are concerned, we have already lost much leverage for concessions from the Communist countries. At the same time, the controls on commercial goods continue not only as an irritant to our allies but as a loss in business to U.S. firms.

If there is any question about this, we need only consider the fact that the trade of Eastern Europe with the non-Communist world in 1967 was almost \$14 billion, of which Western Europe and Japan accounted for almost \$9 billion. The United States is virtually a non-participant in this trade; while we account for about 16 percent of world exports, we have only about 3/10 of 1 percent of the exports to Eastern Europe. It is worth mentioning, too, that East-West trade has more than doubled during the past 10 years and has grown faster than trade either within the Eastern European bloc or among the Western countries themselves. Over the past decade, world trade has been growing at about 8 percent a year, while East-West trade has been growing at about 12 percent. But because of the frozen trade policy pursued by the United States, we have forfeited any advantage from this increased commerce, and in so doing have given other trading nations a most unique and enviable competitive position.

From the standpoint of our national security and the conduct of our foreign affairs, which of course remain paramount in our consideration of export controls, as well as from domestic economic considerations, we have moved into a period in which the Congress should maintain a close, in-depth review of our export control laws with a view to reshaping them in light of political, economic, and technological changes taking place in Western Europe, Japan, and the Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

Just as the special drawing rights needed to be created in order for the world economy to grow and for the U.S. economy to grow with it, so,

too, must long standing nontariff barriers to our export trade, including those we have ourselves created, such as our export controls, be more closely and more frequently scrutinized as to their necessity.

Hence, the committee voted unanimously to reduce from 4 years to 2 the time for which the act should be extended.

Mr. Chairman, the direct exclusion of so many of our exports from the Eastern European market has not been without added side effects which have contributed still further to the deterioration of our competitive position in world trade. The desire to severely limit exports to the Communist countries has, over the years, spawned a system of enforcement implemented by an extremely elaborate machinery and a great deal of involved procedure without regard for the cost, both to the government and to the exporter. The elaborate enforcement procedures have continued after better means of control have been discovered. For a long time, proposals for simplifying the policing of the Export Control Act met with little or no action by the Office of Export Control.

Until the Committee on Banking and Currency voted unanimously in favor of the amendment offered in committee by my distinguished colleague from California, Mr. REES, providing that reporting, recordkeeping, and export documentation requirements shall be designed to reduce costs to the extent feasible consistent with effective enforcement and compilation of useful trade statistics, the way in which the enforcement of the current Act was being carried out was costing American exporters an added \$100 million annually just to process one outmoded document, the shippers' export declaration. Until then, the American export community had been meeting for over a year and a half with the Office of Export Control in attempts to do away with one wasteful practice.

The Subcommittee on International Trade heard convincing testimony on this problem from the export community. And in testimony before the subcommittee, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Kenneth Davis admitted that—

Recent developments in documentation, computerization, containerization of merchandise, and continuous movement of goods require revision and updating of our techniques for obtaining compliance with export control regulations and for collecting export statistics.

Yet it was not until the Committee on Banking and Currency by a unanimous vote recommended adoption of the amendment that Secretary of Commerce Stans announced important changes, effective October 1 and November 1, in export documentation requirements consistent with the amendment and the testimony of public witnesses.

Prior to these changes, which are described in the Federal Register—volume 34, No. 180—for September 19, it has been necessary to prepare a separate document to accompany every export shipment with a value of over \$100. The cost of preparing and processing each shippers' export declaration has been

estimated at more than \$160. The export shipments from the United States number between 9,000,000 and 10,000,000 annually, valued at more than \$30 billion. This means that many millions of separate pieces of paper have had to be separately prepared to satisfy the Office of Export Control's requirements. This method of policing each individual shipment labored under the misapprehension that all shipments violate the Export Control Act until and unless proven otherwise.

In this philosophy of enforcing the act, the Office of Export Control in its 83d quarterly report, covering activities for the first quarter of 1968, discussed the results of its work. For the preceding fiscal year, when more than 6 million shippers' export declarations were caused to be prepared, it is stated that:

During 1967 the Department's Office of Export Control opened 169 preliminary inquiries and 210 new investigations. Last year these investigations resulted in the referral of 29 cases to the Department's Office of the General Counsel for consideration of administrative or criminal-civil actions. The Department's Office of the General Counsel referred six of these cases to the Department of Justice for consideration of criminal prosecution.

During 1967 the Department recalled to the United States one shipment valued at \$13,854. In this instance, there were reasonable grounds to believe the shipment would ultimately be diverted to a proscribed destination.

Under statutory authority separate from the Export Control Act, the Bureau of Customs is empowered to seize and have forfeited to the U.S. commodities thereunder. During 1967 District Directors of Customs seized 208 shipments, which the Customs Bureau appraised at \$29,276.

During 1967 this civil penalty was invoked once, against a carrier, who was fined \$1,400 for minor violations of the export regulations.

From this experience it seems obvious that the method of policing practiced until now did not pass the test of practicability. It was almost like diverting the entire military attention of the United States to another possible annoyance in Anguilla.

Effective October 1, exporters will not be required to file shipper's export declarations for general-license shipments—those not requiring a validated export license from the Office of Export Control—to free-world countries when the shipments are valued at \$250 or less. This change alone could eliminate 1½ million documents a year, or almost 20 percent of the total now required. At the same time, it would affect statistically only about 1 percent of the dollar value of U.S. exports.

Effective October 1 high volume exporters meeting requirements established by the Office of Export Control and Bureau of the Census have the option of filing monthly export declarations instead of a declaration for each export shipment to free world countries of goods under Department of Commerce jurisdiction. Reports may be filed in specified written summary form or provided appropriately on computer tape or punched cards that are compatible with systems used by the Bureau of the Census.

This change will reduce paperwork on

export shipments as the number of qualified exporters availing themselves of this option increases.

Under a proposed rule change to become effective November 1, exporters no longer will be required to submit export declarations to the Bureau of Customs for authentication before loading merchandise moving under Department of Commerce general licenses to free world countries by air or sea. Instead, they may submit the documents directly to carriers that agree to review the declarations for acceptability before loading and to forward them subsequently to Customs.

This proposed change could affect between 85 and 90 percent of all declarations covering shipments to foreign countries other than Canada, which already is exempt from the preauthentication rule. The effect could be to reduce the expense of documentation processing and runner time, reduce storage and demurrage costs caused by delays in paperwork, and speed export shipments.

Mr. Chairman, without danger to our national security, this represents an important step to our efforts to expand our country's commercial exports. The action of the committee to which this reform is related constitutes a congressional mandate, the rejection of which now could only be interpreted as a repudiation of a significant measure to expand peaceful trade.

I urge adoption of the committee amendments when they are offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What is the definition of "peaceful goods"?

Mr. ASHLEY. That of course is an administrative judgment which is reached through a committee system of representatives from our defense establishment, representatives from the Congressional establishment, representatives from the Department of State and so forth. They arrive at these definitions.

In response to the gentleman's question, I think he will be amused to find that some of the goods we are excluding include the following: insecticides, weed killers, waxes; cotton tire cord, tobacco cures, water purifiers, prepared knots and tufts, cotton or wool, for broom or broom making.

These are some of the commodities that are included in the restricted list.

Mr. GROSS. Would tools and machines to make automobile crankshafts be "peaceful goods"?

Mr. ASHLEY. It would depend, I suppose, on their ultimate use. If they are used for automobile making, I doubt if they would be considered strategic, that is, with respect to COCOM, but I would have to look at our own export control list to make sure.

Mr. GROSS. Could you use an internal combustion engine to power a tank or an airplane?

Mr. ASHLEY. The gentleman is quite

right. If I understood his question, he is quite right. There is simply no real effort on the part of our Export Control Office to distinguish between those goods and products such as brooms and wigs, which are obviously only for peaceful use, and other products which might perfectly well have a use of strategic importance to the consumer.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MIZE).

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the Export Control Act and the basic reason for its extension without crippling amendment is to provide the President with flexibility in controlling commercial trade with the Communist bloc. Under the terms of the act, the President has authority to license trade or to restrict it if the national security is involved. Those who support the act, without amendment, look to the Executive branch to make crucial day-to-day decisions on individual commodities and products if our security is not to be jeopardized.

Since the list of items which properly should be embargoed frequently changes—sometimes quite rapidly by congressional standards—the Export Control Act of 1949 provides the best protection by calling upon the Department of Commerce to continually review and regulate our trade flow with the East.

Many feel the Department of Commerce exceeded its authority under the act, however, in 1963. While negotiating a massive wheat sale to the Soviet Union, representatives for the then President Kennedy required at least 50 percent of the shipment to be transacted on American-flag bottoms. The U.S. merchant fleet was unable to accommodate the surge in business at that time, so the requirement was waived on much of the 1963 consignment. But the Department, acting under extreme pressure from shipping interests, and certain unions promulgated regulations which made the 50 percent cargo preference, and other part-cargo requirements, a continuing obligation and prerequisite to trade in several agricultural commodities.

In 1963 wheat was in very short supply in the bloc countries. Today, regrettably, the Soviet Union has a surplus of wheat along with every major producing nation in the world. Competition for wheat sales is intense. Under restrictions imposed by cargo preferences and part cargo requirements, the United States has been priced out of the market in bloc countries, to the positive detriment of shippers and farmers in the United States.

In supplemental views to the committee report on the extension of the Export Control Act, I urged the Nixon administration to repeal these discriminatory regulations. Issued under apparent authority vested by the Export Control Act, they bear little relation to the language or legislative intent of the act. Students of these preferences contend that they are wholly unsupportable and illegal as artificial restrictions to purely commercial trade.

I call attention to my supplemental views, and sincerely hope that other Members will join me in urging the De-

partment of Commerce to repeal the cargo preferences on wheat and feed grains trade with certain bloc countries:

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF HON.  
CHESTER L. MIZE

The Department of Commerce should discontinue its practice of imposing discriminatory shipping requirements as a condition to obtaining a license to export wheat and feed grains to several East Europe destinations. These restrictions became effective at the time of a 1963 Presidential decision to sell a large quantity of wheat to the Soviet Union. Since that time, they have remained in force, and having effectively denied a significant market to U.S. grain shippers and farmers.

Since the 1963 Soviet wheat purchase, the Department of Commerce has administered the Export Control Act in such a fashion that at least 50 percent of all wheat and feed grains sold to several Eastern European countries is required to be shipped on U.S.-flag vessels. Testimony before committees of both Houses of Congress has convinced me that these restrictions, imposed on all such sales whether or not they are "Government sponsored" or purely private commercial transactions, are in violation of at least 30 commercial treaties in force between the United States and other nations of the world.

In addition to the questionable legality of the Commerce regulations requiring cargo preferences on grains, there has been an unacceptable practical result. The preferences deny U.S. grainmen markets which they desperately need in a period of world oversupply and buyer's market.

The preferences make the U.S. price unacceptably high. From U.S. gulf ports to Black Sea ports, U.S.-flag shipping rates average about \$18 per long ton on ships of over 20,000 tons displacement. Comparable foreign vessels will ship the commodities for about \$7 per long ton. This disparity in shipping rates has been the reason, by and large, for the failure of American sales in the years the preferences have been in force. During fiscal years 1965 through 1968, the United States shipped just under 2.5 million bushels of wheat to affected destinations. During the same period of time, Canada shipped 551 million bushels; Australia shipped 53 million bushels; and France shipped 102 million bushels. The United States was able to make sales in countries where the restrictions do not apply. In those same years, our sellers shipped 138 million bushels to Poland and Yugoslavia.

I considered offering an amendment to the Export Control Act placing a specific prohibition against the preferences. However, I declined to do so because the origin of the restriction is not in a congressional act but in a decision made by the executive branch. The preferences, therefore, should be removed by the executive branch.

In the past 3 years not a single bushel of U.S. wheat has been sold to any nation subject to cargo preference shipments. Thus, any supposed protection or benefit for the U.S. merchant marine is wholly illusory. The 75,000 members of the maritime union have had no shipments to carry; therefore, they have had no work guaranteed them by the preferences. On the other hand, 1 million U.S. wheat-farmers and thousands of shippers and consignors have been frozen out of a market in which they otherwise would have been competitive bidders.

Meanwhile, the U.S. surplus of wheat has risen to over 800 million bushels, and could soon reach 1 billion bushels. This year, severe allotment cuts for wheat farmers were necessary due to oversupply at home and abroad.

The preference wrongfully interfere with sales of nonstrategic goods. They contribute to the financial burdens of the United States, for they require grain to be stored at home, at Government expense, when it could be

sold abroad. Most important of all, they contribute to the crisis of our faltering agricultural exports, which is partially responsible for disgracefully low market prices for commodities in the United States.

Elimination of cargo preferences would in no way curb the flexibility which the administration desires in the Export Control Act. Just as before, any shipment to any Eastern European country could be prohibited for reasons of national security or foreign policy or domestic short supply. Cargo preferences in no way contribute to the stated legislative goals of the Export Control Act.

I support the administration's desire for flexibility. To this end, I have supported a straight extension of the act, without amendment. But I call upon the executive branch to eliminate discriminatory restrictions on purely commercial trade. They are probably illegal; they are certainly unsupportable from a budgetary point of view. They are clearly not in the best interests of all the people.

I should observe that cargo preferences on "Government-sponsored shipments" have historic precedent. Those shipments, such as food-for-peace consignments, are entirely independent of any criticism I have advanced here. As national policy, we have decided that Government-sponsored shipments should be consigned to a large extent on U.S.-flag ships. I have no basis for opposing that policy—there is good evidence to show that without those preferences, the U.S. merchant fleet would become insolvent through inability to compete on the high seas.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MIZE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MIZE), and join him in urging the Department of Commerce to eliminate discriminatory cargo preferences and part cargo requirements on shipments of wheat and feed grains to selected Eastern European destinations.

The executive branch has the authority, under the terms of the Export Control Act, to restrict or prohibit shipment of any commodity or product to any bloc country for national security reasons. I would urge nothing to deny the President that authority.

Cargo preferences, however, are based upon Commerce regulations using the Export Control Act as apparent legislative authority. There is, of course, nothing in the language or legislative history of the act which calls for cargo preferences on commercial shipments of wheat and feed grains. The preferences are in violation of commercial agreements this Nation has an obligation to honor. They are applied to commodities determined to be nonstrategic. Their effect has been to deny a lucrative market to U.S. farmers and shippers that they otherwise might well enjoy as competitive bidders.

During the past 3 years, there has been no U.S. sale of wheat or feed grains to any Nation covered by the preferences. Meanwhile, our Canadian, Australian, and French competitors have conducted a lively trade in wheat with those very countries.

I congratulate the gentleman from Kansas for his forthright and well-reasoned supplemental views calling for elimination of cargo preferences on pure-

ly commercial sales. There could be no more appropriate time for such action, for never has competition for commodity sales been more intense among exporting nations. U.S. farmers have an 800-million-bushel carryover in wheat that must, in substantial part, be sold abroad if prices in the market place are to be improved. One million U.S. wheat producers, and thousands of consignors, have a direct financial stake in the elimination of cargo preferences on purely commercial sales.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also wish to associate myself with the most important remarks of the gentleman from Kansas and to express the hope that they can be implemented. This is most important to our agricultural foreign trade.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MIZE. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from the great State of Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my fellow Kansan on the Banking and Currency Committee (Mr. MIZE) in calling on the Department of Commerce to discontinue discriminatory shipping requirements as a condition to obtaining a license to export wheat and feed grains to Eastern Europe.

Since 1963, the Department has required at least 50 percent of all wheat and feed grains sold to selected Eastern European countries to be shipped on U.S.-flag vessels. The unintended result has been a complete cessation of such sales. U.S.-flag shipping rates average about \$18 per long ton compared to about \$7 per long ton on foreign vessels. Thus, this executive branch decision has made the U.S. price for these commodities unacceptably high, and not a single bushel of U.S. wheat has been sold to the nations in question for 3 years.

The publicized justification for this regulation was the protection of our merchant marine. However, since the regulation has eliminated all of these sales, there obviously can be no benefits to shipping interests.

The practical effect has been the freeing of a potential export market for our 1 million U.S. wheat farmers. Our wheat surplus may soon reach 1 billion bushels, a situation which has led to drastically low domestic market prices and severe allotment cuts for next year's crop.

There is no legitimate reason for continuing this regulation. It has not worked, and it has caused much damage to an important segment of our economy. It should be discontinued.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Kansas (Mr. MIZE) and I want to congratulate him for calling attention to the discriminatory Executive order which requires at least 50 percent of all wheat and feed grains sold to Eastern European countries be shipped in American bottoms.

Since this restriction has been in ef-

fect, since 1963, I have objected to it as an intolerable situation without justification. Spokesmen for the maritime industry have insisted that this restriction is essential in order to maintain this country's merchant fleet at a level necessary for defense purposes. I presented this view to then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara in 1966 when he appeared before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and he replied:

I will say without any qualification that I see no excuse for insistence on the use of U.S. bottoms for shipping anything other than military goods as a foundation for maintaining a merchant marine capability for defense purposes.

That same year Secretary of State Dean Rusk told our subcommittee the solution must be worked out "between the maritime unions and the maritime industry."

The fact is, the net result of this restriction has been our merchant fleet has been shipping 50 percent of nothing because these countries are not inclined to pay the premium price this restriction imposes on U.S. wheat and feed grains.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my colleagues in urging President Nixon to rescind this Executive order.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity to comment on the remarks of my distinguished colleague, CHET MIZE, concerning a matter of vital importance to the wheat industry.

I am greatly concerned that the Commerce Department has used the Export Act since 1963 to place wheat and feed grains in a special category for export regulations.

I have been unable to find any evidence that the existence of the 50-percent shipping requirement helps the U.S. merchant fleet or any other segment of our economy. I believe that it is a self-defeating device that has limited U.S. agricultural trade opportunity and has weakened our position in world trade.

Agricultural producers should be given equal opportunity to compete in world markets without restrictions presently imposed by the Department of Commerce policy. With intense competition in world trade, this regulation has resulted in the elimination of U.S. wheat and feed grain markets in Eastern Europe. The important role of wheat and feed grains in our critical balance-of-payments situation is another important consideration in reviewing this regulation.

This discriminatory trade practice tends to defeat our efforts to improve trade relations with the Eastern European nations.

The existence of this regulation actually undermines our attempts to get other industrial powers to remove non-tariff barriers to trade.

I think it is significant that the entire agriculture community has urged in recent hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that the Department of Commerce discontinue this practice of imposing discriminatory shipping regulations as a condition to obtaining a license to export wheat and

feed grains to several East Europe destinations. The list is most impressive: The American Farm Bureau Federation, National Association of Wheat Growers, Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, Grain Sorghum Producers Association, National Corn Growers Association, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, National Grange, North American Grain Export Association, U.S. Feed Grains Council, National Grain Trade Council, and the Chicago Board of Trade.

Although an amendment to the Export Control Act would not be an appropriate vehicle for removing this discriminatory trade practice, I want to emphasize my strongest possible support for the request of my good friend and colleague, CHET MIZE, that the Department of Commerce discontinue this trade practice involving our wheat and feed grain industry.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK).

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we consider extending the Export Control Act which will otherwise expire at the end of this month.

After hearing the remarks on the floor and examining the existing law, I am in favor of letting it expire. The absence of any law would offer greater national security than this law.

The American people have been led to believe that this law restricts trading in strategic materials with Communist nations. It apparently does no such thing. What it does is conceal from the American people the names of those who are thus trading with the enemy under Government license. The tenor of the debate makes it plain that big industrialists and not small businessmen are the Americans so favored.

The American people know who the enemy is and reserve the right to regard and treat them as such. The Government should guarantee that they are, in fact, able to exercise this basic right—by publishing the names of firms who are doing business with Communist countries. If the people, then, wish to build any bridges they may do so voluntarily. But if the man and woman who has a son in Vietnam would prefer to see to it that none of their personal dollars go to a firm trafficking with their son's potential killers, they may. Perhaps, in this way, the Government will bring official policies into line with the expression of the national will.

If this law did what it was intended to do—restrict shipment of strategic material to Communist nations—I would certainly be in favor of its extension and its strict enforcement. If we allow it to expire it is possible that a new law which will actually do what Americans thought this one was doing can be enacted.

It is amazing that most of the debate here today indicates this law is being clandestinely manipulated to conceal the identity of the large business interests who deal with the enemy. Members have reported that licenses are refused to small businessmen to export items in the nature of brooms, milk, and cheese. But on the other hand, we find that the offi-

cial export control report of the Department of Commerce tells of the licensed export of sophisticated industrial machinery including automatic piston machine, automatic crankshaft machine, and industrial furnaces, as well as cold-rolled carbon steel sheets, electronic computers, and scientific and electronic instruments and equipment made in the United States going behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Chairman, I include in my remarks at this point excerpts of the report to which I referred:

#### EXPORT CONTROL REPORT

##### EXPORT LICENSING TO EASTERN EUROPE

###### Commodity applications approved

License applications for commodities valued at \$36.8 million were approved for export to Eastern Europe during the third quarter 1968. Principal destinations were the U.S.S.R., \$15.2 million, and East Germany, \$9.3 million. This third quarter total compares with \$44.1 million approved in the previous quarter and \$23.1 million approved in the third quarter 1967.

Industrial machinery accounted for \$15 million of the total value approved, principally to the U.S.S.R., \$11.3 million, and Rumania, \$1.5 million. The passenger automobile plant being built by FIAT in the U.S.S.R. was the destination for \$10.8 million of these goods, including automatic piston machines, \$5.1 million, automatic crankshaft grinders, \$2.3 million, and industrial furnaces, \$1.3 million.

Agricultural commodities valued at \$12.3 million were licensed for export, primarily to East Germany, \$7.4 million; Hungary, \$2.7 million; and Czechoslovakia, \$1.5 million. These commodities were corn, \$8.5 million; yellow grain sorghums, \$2.3 million; and flax, \$1.5 million. Chemicals worth \$5.3 million were approved for export to Eastern Europe. The U.S.S.R. was the destination for \$3.3 million of these, including aluminum oxide worth \$1.4 million.

Cold-rolled carbon steel sheets valued at \$1.4 million were approved for export to Rumania. Other approvals for Eastern Europe included electronic computers, peripherals, and statistical machines, totaling \$1.7 million; and scientific and electronic instruments and equipment, totaling \$1.2 million.

##### EXPORT LICENSING TO CUBA

The Department approved exports to Cuba worth \$12,533 during the third quarter 1968. These exports consisted of insecticide sprayers, worth \$11,960, for the Pan American Sanitary Bureau's yellow fever program; clothing, personal effects, drugs, and medicals, valued at \$523, for American citizens detained in Cuba; and \$50 worth of parts for a teletype printing machine used in connection with refugee flights from Cuba.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he is familiar with the fact that in this quarterly report under the Export Control Act they talk about the licensing of these commodities to Eastern Europe. The report says, moreover, that industrial machinery accounted for \$15 million of the total value approved, principally going to the U.S.S.R., and that the passenger automobile plant being built by Fiat in the U.S.S.R. was the destination for \$10.8 million of these goods, including automatic crankshaft grinders, \$2.3 million; and for industrial furnaces, \$1.3 million.

I would like to ask the chairman if these matters were brought up in any of the committee hearings on the bill and what was done by the committee to try

to put some teeth into this law to stop this practice?

Mr. BARRETT. I shall yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) in order to respond to the gentleman, but before I yield to him I would state to the gentleman from Louisiana that this was all nonmilitary, nonstrategic material.

Mr. RARICK. I believe I have the floor, Mr. Chairman. Excuse me just 1 minute and let me make this comment. Some of my boys are serving in Vietnam. Recently we have heard a lot about the fact that the Russians are now putting tanks into North Vietnam and also Russian helicopters.

If we have been shipping to them automatic piston machines and automatic crankshaft grinders, these are sophisticated machine tools. Machines which make pistons and crankshafts do not care what type of machinery the pistons and crankshafts will operate. When they are placed into items of military hardware, such as tanks and helicopters, might that not be classified as strategic—even military?

If you are going to build gasoline engines to be used in automobiles, they can be taken out of the automobiles and used to power helicopters, tanks, or other of military equipment. We know that Volkswagen engines are used—by amateur mechanics, even—to power light aircraft.

I include at this point in my remarks news stories relating to the presence of Soviet bulldozers and helicopters in Vietnam:

##### RUSSIAN BULLDOZER CAPTURED

A SHAU VALLEY.—A Russian-built bulldozer has been uncovered in the A Shau Valley.

The enemy equipment was found recently by Lt. Col. Joseph L. Hadaway, commanding officer of the 3rd Squadron, 4th Cav., 9th Infantry Division while flying over the area in search of Communist trails and bunker complexes.

The bulldozer was partially buried and hidden by brush on the valley floor. It is a model resembling the U.S. Army's D-6 dozer both in size and estimated capability.

Hadaway contacted the 59th Engr. Co. (Land Clearing) to make the actual recovery of the vehicle.

The commander directed the engineer unit's bulldozers as they cut a road to the Russian-made equipment. After recovery, the dozer was taken to FB Rendevzouv.

Lt. Col. Stuart Wood Jr., commander of the 27th Engr. Bn. remarked, "It's rather surprising to come upon a piece of enemy equipment which is more or less the counterpart to some of your own. Possibly, it was building a road just like ours—only from the opposite end.

"We've decided to make the machine operational, if possible," he added.

The task of putting the vehicle in operating condition again is under the direction of Lt. Robert A. Goodell, the battalion maintenance officer.

He commented that the dozer was in fairly good shape. "I think our main problem is going to be replacing unrepairable parts. I don't know if the Russian equipment uses metric threads," he said.

##### SOVIET-BUILT COPTERS USED BY NORTH VIETS

SAIGON.—The North Vietnamese are now using a small but significant force of Soviet-built helicopters in Laos and Cambodia, U.S. officers reported Wednesday.

Some of the helicopters are the world's

largest, capable of speeding troops and cargo from North Vietnam to bases in those two countries adjacent to South Vietnam.

The choppers operate at night at near tree-top level along the route of the Ho Chi Minh trail stretching down from Vietnam through Laos and into Cambodia.

Officially, the U.S. Command has no comment on the reports. A ranking officer admitted, however, that such reports had been cropping up and that it was known the North Vietnamese had a force of Soviet-built helicopters available.

There has been no visual sighting of the helicopters from the Vietnamese side of the frontier. The reports have come from agents from radar sightings and at least one prisoner of war who reported being brought from North Vietnam to Cambodia in a troop-carrying helicopter.

Most of the helicopter sightings have been by radar. So far as is known, none has been shot down.

"They operate almost every night," one U.S. officer reported. "They prefer to operate when there is no moon or when the weather is overcast. On moonless nights we get 20 to 30 reports."

##### BIGGEST IN WORLD

They are put down in American intelligence reports the same way that flying saucers are listed, as "unidentified flying objects."

One type in operation is the M16, code named "Hook" in American military parlance, U.S. officers say. The biggest helicopter in the world, it can carry up to 120 people or around 2.2 tons of cargo.

It gets its name "Hook" because a hook often is suspended from the helicopter to carry additional cargo.

Another type believed in operation is a "Flying Crane" helicopter capable of transporting tanks such as the Soviet-built PT76 models that hit a U.S. Special Forces Camp at Ben Het recently.

Ben Het is in the central highland just across from a densely jungled area of northern Cambodia largely controlled by the North Vietnamese. This is the farthest south that enemy armored vehicles have entered into combat.

In addition to the giant choppers, the Russians are believed to have furnished liaison and light observation helicopters.

Military officers do not expect the enemy to move troops by helicopters to the Vietnamese side of the border. With American control of the air, anything more than a hit-and-run mission would be suicidal.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN).

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to propose an amendment to the bill under consideration, a bill to extend the Export Control Act of 1949. As you are aware, with the authority granted to the President under the Export Control Act, he can declare an economic embargo against any nation as he sees fit through the institution of certain procedures described under section 3 of this act. He does not have to inform the Congress of his action or ask the Congress for their consent. The power to regulate commerce with foreign nations is invested with the Congress by the provisions of our Constitution. It is an abdication of our duty to allow the President to institute such proceedings without some action by the Congress.

A complete embargo is tantamount to a declaration of economic warfare. I do not believe that the President should be allowed to declare economic war upon any nation without first receiving the consent of the Congress. At this time,

when the Congress is concerned over the foreign commitments of this Nation, it should be giving equal attention to economic commitments. An economic embargo is a national commitment and, therefore, the Congress should pass upon it. Today I am proposing an amendment which will require the President to obtain the consent of Congress before he can maintain any long-term economic embargo. We are aware that international situations can arise in which immediate executive action is required. A prime example would be the Cuban missile crisis.

I stipulate in my amendment that the President can impose an embargo for 60 days without first receiving the consent of the Congress, but if consent is not obtained within the stated period the embargo is immediately lifted and cannot be reimposed for at least 12 months without first obtaining congressional authorization.

During the past few years, we have seen an ever-increasing share of the power of Congress over international relations delegated to the Chief Executive. As representatives of the people of the United States, the Congress has a responsibility to pass upon matters of economic importance which affect the international trade policies of the United States. I believe that my amendment is a step in restoring some control over this vital area of the foreign commerce policies of the United States.

All Members of this body know that the international trade policies of our Nation have a direct impact upon the daily affairs of our citizens whether they be laborers, managers, or investors. The Members of Congress, as spokesmen for these citizens, should exercise authority in the area of international economic policy commitments.

Therefore, I urge the Members of this body today to favorably consider my amendment when it is read for approval.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to take time during general debate on this bill, but I do so in order to ask the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) a few questions about the significance of his proposed amendment.

As I understand the gentleman, his is an astonishing attempt to try to restrict what the Export Control Act actually delegates to the executive branch, and I wonder what he is attempting to accomplish.

In the first place, the amendment, as I understand it, refers to an embargo on exports, which are supposed to be substantial or total in their effect. But the act itself does not even use the word "embargoes." It is basically an export control act, trying to restrict certain goods of a national security nature from countries that might use them in ways hostile to us.

True, we have delegated that responsibility to the Executive. As I understand it, the gentleman does not trust those in the

executive branch to carry out their responsibility to prevent certain goods from falling into the hands of an enemy. Does he feel there must be an automatic lapsing of those controls, unless the Congress takes affirmative action?

I will be glad to yield to the gentleman to answer the question.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Yes, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLACKBURN. This act, of course, deals with the whole spectrum of export policy and there can be no greater export control, of course, than total prohibition against an export to any nation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. May I point out to the gentleman—

Mr. BLACKBURN. In that regard, if the gentleman will allow me to continue, I think my amendment certainly addresses itself well to this act.

Now the implication that I or the Congress does not trust the Chief Executive, I think is an improper implication. It is not a question of trust—it is a question of responsibility.

As I read the Constitution, the responsibility for the regulation of foreign commerce does rest with the Congress. I think it is a matter of policy to which we address ourselves today; the question, to what extent should the Congress have a right to delegate completely its responsibility to the Chief Executive.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say that all the gentleman's amendment would accomplish, if I understand it correctly, would be to hamstring the Executive in what the legislative body has said we would like the Executive to do. That job is to define what kind of goods should not be exported to certain countries, if this amendment were approved, it would not be possible for a decision on export controls to stick unless we took affirmative action to support the Executive.

Yet, if we take affirmative action, we have added nothing to what the Executive has already done. If we take negative action by saying in effect that we think certain goods which those in the executive branch think are strategic are not then these goods could go to those who might possibly be enemies or might possibly use the goods in ways that are inimical to our national security. To suggest that this act itself covers any kind of control over exports or embargoes is not—I hope—quite true. At least I hope the gentleman's amendment does not attempt to interfere with the embargoes that the United States has agreed to. Would it apply to embargoes applied at the United Nations with respect, quite frankly, to Rhodesia? I had assumed that perhaps that was the objective that he was seeking, to prevent the Executive from applying such an embargo.

Under this act is there authority for the Executive to act in this area or not?

What he seems to be driving at is trying to change or check on the nature of goods that can be exported, or the countries that may be exported to. I do not see what would be accomplished by this kind of hamstringing. Actually, it would require affirmative action by Con-

gress regarding a great deal of complicated lists that have been developed, and which change from time to time. It is all very well to suggest that the Congress should have certain prerogatives with respect to international trade. Congress has been exercising its prerogatives. In this case it has delegated certain responsibilities to the Executive, an action which I think is entirely appropriate.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman again.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Well, I suspect that you and I just have a difference of opinion, and I respect your right to differ with me.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say that I am unclear what the objective is of the gentleman—whether he really thinks that by undoing what the executive branch is attempting to do in restricting imports is going to accomplish very much, except perhaps to release goods that otherwise would not be allowed to leave our shores, and to release them to those that I would assume the gentleman would not want to benefit.

Mr. BLACKBURN. If the gentleman will yield, in the first place I do have some confidence that this body will exercise its responsibility with good judgment. I think if the administration makes a reasonably good case for its export policies that they will be supported by this body. But I for one do not, to put the parallel, mistrust the Executive with what I consider to be exercising the responsibilities of this body.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is the gentleman attempting in any way to interfere with national commitments that have been made at the U.N., or with respect to the total embargo placed on certain goods from Rhodesia?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I would be willing, to be very candid with the gentleman, to do so, but I do not think the amendment could have that effect, because this embargo to which you refer was placed as a result of the U.N. Participation Act. But the President in his proclamation also cited the Export Control Act as a part of the authority that he was utilizing.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. So does the gentleman think that this amendment in some way could tie the President's hands with respect to international commitments which have been made and which have been endorsed on several occasions by the United States at the United Nations?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am not going to try to look that far into the future. I, for one, am perfectly willing to look into some of these commitments and determine for myself, and I will ask Congress to make the determination.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman is not answering my question. If there is any possibility that this might in any way restrict obligations which this country has entered into at the United Nations; if that might be the effect, I think that is an automatic reason for opposing it most strongly.

Mr. BLACKBURN. If the gentleman will yield further for a quick response, I do not interpret this as having any

effect on the United Nations Participation Act.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not believe the administration has had any opportunity to evaluate the effects of this particular amendment.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, we are here today discussing the extension of the Export Control Act. Probably the most significant aspect of that law is its strategic goods provisions. The strategic goods provisions of the Export Control Act are in the law because we wish to control and deny receipt of certain exports to certain nations whose interests are inimical to our own. Probably when we look at it from that standpoint it would be more appropriate for us to call this act the "Unfriendly Nations Receipt Control Act," because that is the basic objective of the act. By these provisions of the law we intend that nations whose interests are inconsistent with ours will not get goods from our exporters which will help them and be detrimental to our national security.

But that law, in order to be effective, must do more. It must have an impact above and beyond our own exporters if we are going to deny receipt of goods to unfriendly nations, to Eastern Europe and to the Russian bloc nations.

The 1949 enactment of the Export Control Act reflected circumstances and conditions that existed at that time. Our friends and allies in 1949 were not competitive in the export market because they did not possess the necessary level of sophistication in technology, nor the productive capacity, to be competitive. Therefore our unilateral controls through the Export Control Act were adequate for controlling receipt of goods by unfriendly nations.

Today is a different story. Our friends and allies are aggressive traders. They oppose controls on trade with the East and do not restrict their industries in the export of goods to the extent that we do ours.

The net effect is ironic. Our Export Control Act provides our friends and allies with an unchallenged market and denies to our industries a market for their goods.

This harms our balance of trade, yet does nothing to further the objectives of the Export Control Act, because elimination of our source of supply to the East does not prevent the receipt of the same goods from Western Europe, Japan, and other free world nations.

Modification, I think, is needed. When we talk about modification, we have two routes we can take. The first I consider to be the realistic approach, and the other is an approach which I think is politically unacceptable.

I reject as politically unacceptable modification which has as its policy liberalization of our definition of strategic goods and trade therein. I reject as unrealistic a continuation of the present policy which does not accomplish our objective, but penalizes our industries and our workers and really harms our balance of payments situation.

In view of this I propose to offer two amendments. Briefly stated the first will give much more flexibility to the President in determining what items can be controlled. Presently the "findings" of the Export Control Act deal only with "materials." My language would add to the word "materials," the words "information and technology," so that the President under the Export Control Act would have the right to control the export of not only materials, but information and technology which would be detrimental to the national security of the United States. Therefore, the President is given broader authority to control by this amendment.

My second amendment is probably the crux of the strategic goods question. It provides very simply and, I might add, very realistically that the President in determining the impact upon our national security of an export, shall look at the availability of that export elsewhere—not elsewhere in the East, but available elsewhere from a friendly nation, a nation with which we have a defense treaty commitment.

At this time I will not expand further upon the amendments.

I think the previous administration was wrong in thinking we could at this point in time, with the problem in Vietnam, get the American people or even the Congress to think politically acceptable, legislation which would liberalize the definition of strategic goods and trade therein.

At the same time, I think it is unrealistic for the present administration to advocate a straight extension of the act, when they don't deny that most of the things I have said are true, and in fact admit that they are using availability elsewhere" as a factor in making some of their present decisions. I think Congress should approve use of that factor and do it now.

(Mr. LIPSCOMB (at the request of Mr. WIDNALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill before the House of Representatives at this time, H.R. 4293, is to extend the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, for an additional period of time, until June 30, 1971. I support this legislation.

It is because of the Export Control Act of 1949 that we have a program under which items and data proposed to be exported from the United States are systematically evaluated to determine whether their shipment to various destinations would be in keeping with our national interests.

The export control program is an important element in our national defense effort. It is necessary that we have the machinery to help prevent shipments of equipment and data which can help to build up the economic and military potential of Communist nations. This is why it is so essential that the act be extended.

The bill would also amend the Export Control Act by adding a clause stating that in every way feasible reporting requirements under the act should be kept

at a minimum to reduce as much as possible the cost for reporting, record-keeping and export documentation consistent with effective enforcement and compilation of useful trade statistics. Attempting to help reduce nonproduction costs is a worthwhile goal in that it could help ease the economic impact of the program on exporters and to that extent such a provision would in my view not be objectionable and in fact could represent a useful addition to the Export Control Act.

I would trust however that in carrying out such a provision the Department of Commerce, which administers the Export Control Act, would exercise every due care to be absolutely assured that the effectiveness of the program is not diminished through weakened reporting requirements. Certainly, too, it should by no means be viewed as a reason or excuse to halt issuance of the Department publication entitled "Export Licenses Approved and Reexports Authorized" which is issued on a daily basis. Several years ago an attempt was made to halt this publication and from all appearances the basic reason for that proposal was to withdraw the document from public scrutiny so the people would not know what is going on in this area, such as what kind of export licenses are being issued, to what countries exports are authorized for shipment, value of the goods, equipment or data sold, and so forth. The attempt should not be repeated.

Though the primary purpose of H.R. 4293 is to provide essentially a straight extension of the Export Control Act this legislation touches on issues much more involved than just the matter of extending the program. It is regrettable that over the years, in spite of the need for a strong export control program because of the threat posed by Communist aggression, the Export Control Act has been administered in such a way that increasingly less stringent policies have been followed in policing the flow of goods to the Communist nations. With the export Control Act due for extension, there have been persistent efforts to seize the opportunity to try to modify the language of the act in such ways which would have the effect of further diminishing its effectiveness in restraining shipment of commodities, goods, and data to the U.S.S.R. and other Communist nations. These efforts must be turned back.

It has been alleged, for example, that modifications are needed because the act is outmoded, that it is too restrictive, and so forth. These allegations in my view are simply without merit.

While restrictions on exports are also for the purpose of controlling short supply items and for foreign policy generally, the central purpose of the Export Control Act of 1949 is to control exports because of their significance to our national security. The act contains a declaration that the "unrestricted export of materials without regard to the potential military and economic significance may adversely affect the national security of the United States."

It provides that rules and regulations

adopted to carry out the act "shall provide for denial of any request of application for authority to export articles, materials, or supplies including technical data, or any other information, from the United States, its territories and possessions, to any nation or combination of nations threatening the national security of the United States if the President shall determine that such export makes a significant contribution to the military or economic potential of such nation or nations which would prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States."

This language sets forth the very minimum we must maintain as a test to apply in determining whether proposed exports should be cleared for shipment overseas.

I certainly do not agree that the act is outdated or outmoded.

During these critical times there is a continuous need for a strong export control program. Secretary of Commerce Stans in a recent letter to me stated:

It is the Administration's position that this is not the time to significantly reduce our export controls unilaterally.

The argument is sometimes advanced that there is a large potential market in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern European countries for U.S. goods and commodities and that we are missing the boat economically so to speak if we do not practically scrap the Export Control Act and expand trade with those countries. This approach is misleading and is not based on reality. The hearings on the legislation to extend the Export Control Act contain repeated warnings that the potential for trade between the United States and Eastern Europe should not be exaggerated. A Commerce Department spokesman said that it is not likely to amount to more than 1 percent of our total annual trade in the foreseeable future, even with significant lowering of barriers to commercial East-West trade. It was testified that the prospects for an increase in nonstrategic trade with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union under present conditions are modest at best.

Also, the impact of our export controls in limiting the volume of our trade with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe has frequently been exaggerated. It is pointed out that in fact there are serious trade impediments on the part of the Eastern European countries. These include the inconvertibility of their own currencies on world money markets, the limited amounts of convertible currency they have to buy our goods, the fact that they are bilateral trade agreements extensively, the limited appeal in the United States of the kinds and qualities of goods and technical data they produce, the controls the Communists have on all aspects of their foreign trade that result from their totalitarian system of government.

Now, if we are not talking about a wide range or a large volume of goods, precisely what kind of trade is involved in references made to trade with the U.S.S.R. and Eastern European nations which comes under the controls by virtue of the Export Control Act of 1949?

What is involved to a considerable degree is sophisticated equipment, com-

modities, and technical data because the U.S.S.R. and other Communist nations are attempting to utilize the United States as a shopping center to obtain advanced equipment, techniques, factories, and supplies.

This means such items as electronic equipment, machine tools, petroleum equipment, mining equipment, chemical facilities, industrial processes, computers, and whole factories. Allowing Communist nations to buy such things here means that they can fill gaps in their industrial and economic makeup, or obtain prototypes to eliminate timely and costly research. In other words, they would capitalize on our industrial, scientific, and related achievements. At the same time it allows them to continue channeling inordinate amounts of their resources into military efforts, their space programs, and other high-priority programs which the Kremlin has decreed are needed to help advance the cause of communism around the world.

In this regard, it is sometimes stated that if we do not sell items to the U.S.S.R. and other Communist countries they will obtain them anyway from other Western countries. This argument for lessening export controls is invalid on a number of counts and likely will remain invalid for a long time to come.

A professor of economics, Prof. H. E. Michl, of the University of Delaware, during the hearings on this legislation assessed this argument very well when he said, in part:

The . . . argument of those who support increased trade, that we should supply these countries because if we don't they will obtain the goods from other countries of the West, is weak and, even if true, is immoral. It is not a fact that the East can obtain from other countries of the West the items they want most—items that embody sophisticated technology. Even when such items are available elsewhere they are frequently of inferior quality or are subject to long delays in delivery. To supply our enemies with goods and equipment which they can use against our troops in Vietnam or in future wars for the sake of a small decrease in the deficit of our balance of payments is, in my opinion, indefensible.

The Export Control Act should be extended. It should not be weakened. We must also require that it be administered in such a way so that we have maximum assurances that equipment, technologies, commodities, and data going to the U.S.S.R. and other Communist nations are not detrimental to our national security and welfare.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BARRETT. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) for a very important report.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PODELL was allowed to speak out of order.)

WELL, WHADDYA KNOW? THE METS ARE WORLD'S CHAMPS

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, when the greatest city in America, New York, goes in for any major effort, it goes all out, producing the best or most unique of almost anything it turns its hand to. Such is the case in political campaigns, some mayors, and professional football

and baseball teams. Not too long ago, a fearsome aggregation of behemoths from somewhere in Maryland encountered Joe Namath and the New York Jets. The Jets are now world's champions of professional football.

Today we have had a repetition of this wonder in professional baseball, for the New York Mets just became the world's champions as they have swept their fourth straight game in this year's world's series, and that another team from somewhere in Maryland has bitten the dust at the hands of our metro's Mighty Mites. New York City should change its name to "Championship City," because it is truly the city of champions.

The team beaten today by the Mets was a mighty mover and shaker in its day, striking terror into the hearts of all opposition. Astronomical was the number of runs they scored. Baseballs sailed out of stadiums wherever they went, and the moan of the opposing pitching coach was heard in the land and across their league, whose name also escapes me. Batting averages were stratospheric. Earned run averages were microscopic.

Enter David from the peaceful rural hamlet of New York City: The New York Mets of the National Baseball League. Words cannot describe the caliber of their play. An amalgam of the Bums and Giants, who followed the holy grail of more cash into the far-off interior, the Mets occupy a special place in all New York hearts. They are loved by the sufferin' fan. To the stupefaction of all save New Yorkers, the Mets won the pennant in 1969, demolishing a not-so-Brave team from somewhere in straight sets. The world series stage was set for their dismemberment, and the horse-laugh of the out-of-town sportswriter, oddsmaker and fan was heard across the Republic.

Today the New York Mets are world's champs. Shades of Bedford Avenue and the "Duke." That I should have seen this day—that other team—are they still in the league?

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

Mr. PODELL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Was that statement cleared by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FRIEDEL)?

Mr. PODELL. It was concurred in after the ball game by the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, we are again engaged, as we have been eight times in the past 20 years, in deliberations as to whether the Export Control Act of 1949 ought to be extended. Actually, there does not seem to be too much controversy about its extension—most of us seem to agree that it ought to be extended. The controversy rather is centered primarily around whether it ought to be significantly changed in the light of the present realities of international trade, especially trade with the countries of the Communist bloc, against which the act is primarily aimed.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that in 1949 legislation designed to control and curtail the export-

tation of American goods and knowhow to the Soviet bloc, and especially to the Soviet Union, was well-advised. In 1949, you will recall, the memory of the Soviet Union's tightening of its grip on Poland and gaining control of Czechoslovakia the year before, was still fresh in everyone's mind. The cold war had escalated to fever pitch.

In addition to these political grounds for the economic isolation of the Communist countries, such a policy of isolation implemented by the United States appeared feasible also on economic grounds. The countries of the Soviet bloc, ravaged by the destruction wrought upon them by war operations, had barely begun to dig out from under the ruins and to rebuild their economies. In this process, they were in great need of supplies, raw materials and capital goods, from abroad. Most of their traditional suppliers, the countries of the industrialized Western Europe, had been themselves devastated by war and could not be, initially, counted upon to satisfy even partially the needs behind the Iron Curtain. The only potential supplier, economically strong and untouched by the ravages of war, was the United States. In 1949, then, interdicting or controlling U.S. exports to the bloc was tantamount practically to interdicting or controlling all significant exports to the bloc.

With the gradual recovery of Western economies, greatly helped by the Marshall plan, the exclusivity of the United States as the potential source of supplies for the bloc, gradually began to wane. True, the American program of export control was supplemented at an early stage by the international export control program, operating through the Consultative Group-Coordinating Committee network, whose effectiveness was further enhanced by the threat of sanctions embodied in the Battle Act of 1951. Yet, this threat of sanctions, tied as it was to Western Europe's dependence on American foreign aid, became less and less effective as our allies regained their economic strength and grew more and more independent of our assistance. Their economic recovery on the one hand provided the Soviet bloc with alternative sources of needed supplies and knowhow, and on the other hand, made any international export control system increasingly less subject to the U.S. pressures and more contingent on the willingness of our allies to cooperate in it.

Thus a situation exists today, Mr. Chairman, where our allies, who are at the same time members of the international export control system, follow, by and large, a considerably less restrictive and less discriminatory export policy toward the countries of the East. While they all support in word and deed the international program of strict control over clearly strategic materials and information, they also conduct with the countries of the Soviet bloc brisk trade in other commodities which the international consensus as expressed through the Coordinating Committee does not consider of prime strategic importance yet which the United States still persists

in subjecting to its own unilateral export controls.

I should like to emphasize that this international consensus is reached by agreement of all the COCOM members, including the United States, as to what types of export controls ought to be placed internationally and on what categories of commodities. Thus the United States seems to follow an inconsistent, not to say clearly schizoid policy in this respect. In international forums it is of the opinion that certain commodities are not strategic enough to be controlled as far as their exports to the Soviet bloc are concerned, while in its own bailiwick it still maintains controls over their exportation.

We may now ask ourselves, Mr. Chairman, what the net result of this somewhat confused and confusing export control policy has been. Has it really achieved the purpose for which it had originally been designed? I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it has not, at least not in the extent or the manner that would be really significant. I am quite willing to agree that by pursuing with the Soviet bloc a considerably more restrictive trade policy than our industrialized allies have, we have been expressing in a tangible way our special disapproval of the international policy of the Soviet bloc in general and of the Soviet Union in particular. But this can be classified only as an act of political import with but scanty bearing on economic realities.

In the extensive hearings before the Subcommittee on International Trade, of which I have the honor of being a member, the point was stressed repeatedly that our export control policy may have, indeed, initially retarded somewhat the economic recovery of the Soviet Union and its satellites and limited the subsequent technological development of some sectors of their economy. On the other hand, the same interdicting policy also spurred them, especially the Soviet Union, into relying almost exclusively on their own resources and developing a high level of industrial and military technology, perhaps even much higher than they would have felt the need to develop under less adverse and hostile circumstances. Let us admit that, if the intent of the U.S. export control policy has been one of preventing the Soviet Union from becoming a first rate world power, both economically and militarily, the policy has failed. I fear it has failed dismally.

Whatever significant or insignificant gains our policy may have made, it also placed our producers and exporters at a distinct disadvantage, for they could not and still cannot export to the Soviet bloc countries a whole array of commodities that our allies have been selling to them for years, all within the international regulatory framework to which the United States itself had agreed. I would like to point out the paradox of the situation. By its official action the United States permits a British, or German, or French, or Japanese manufacturer to make a sale which it does not permit one of our own businessmen to make. The bloc is not thereby deprived

of a Western commodity, but the American manufacturer of the same commodity has no chance at all of profiting from it.

It is high time, Mr. Chairman, to put an end to such an anomalous situation. There is, of course, no question about relaxing controls over the exportation of strategic commodities and know-how that would jeopardize our national security. But trade in peaceful goods, goods which our allies have been selling to the Soviet bloc with our consent for years, can only be of benefit to all concerned.

I would be, of course, overly optimistic if I expected that a relaxation of our export controls would or even could result in an immediate large increase in the trade between the United States and the Soviet bloc countries. I am fully aware that developing and expanding such trade ties takes time, especially in a situation where a lot hinges also on the policies and practices of one's trading partner. But I am firmly convinced that progress cannot be made unless the unreasonable fetters placed on such trade by our side are first removed.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I also intend to support any other legislative action that would be directed at eliminating any unreasonable and unwarranted restrictions on our exports.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, and no further comments on the New York Mets, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 9; 50 U.S.C. App. 2032), as amended, is amended by striking out "1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "1973".*

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, strike out lines 3 through 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SECTION 1. Section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 2032) is amended to read as follows:

#### "TERMINATION DATE

"SEC. 12. The authority granted in this Act terminates on June 30, 1971, or on any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate."

#### AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHLEY

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. ASHLEY: Page 2, immediately after line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 2021) is amended (1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and (2) by inserting the following new subsection immediately after subsection (a):

"(b) Expanded trade in peaceful goods

and technology with all countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations can further the sound growth and stability of the United States economy as well as further our foreign policy objectives."

"Sec. 3. Section 2(3) of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to encourage trade in peaceful goods and technology with all countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations, except to the extent that the President determines such trade to be against the national interest."

And redesignate the succeeding section accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is time to give full congressional recognition to the value in expanding trade in peaceful goods and technology with the Soviet Union and the other countries of Eastern Europe; and I believe it is time our export control laws and policy implemented this objective.

The Export Control Act should be amended to include a finding that expanded trade in peaceful goods and technology with all countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations can further the sound growth and stability of the U.S. economy as well as further our foreign policy objectives. The act should be further amended to include a declaration that it is the policy of the United States to encourage trade in peaceful goods with all countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations, except to the extent that the President determines such trade to be against the national interest.

Let me emphasize that I am talking about trade in peaceful goods. The United States and COCOM nations would continue to maintain lists of products of direct military relevance which, indeed, should not be sold or transferred to Eastern Europe. These include direct military items, items in the atomic energy field, and a list of nonmilitary items which are considered to be closely related to the military capabilities of the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations of Eastern Europe. These items are embargoed and are not sold at all or if sold, are sold only after full consultation with the members of COCOM. This would continue to be the situation.

Briefly stated, the basis for this new finding is no more than a return to the historic and traditional policy of the United States to engage in world commerce with nations with whom we are not at war. Our Nation has many obligations but none is more important than our responsibility to the cause of peace. This cause, as we know from our history, can be promoted by contacts—including trade—with nations with whom we have very real ideological differences. It is equally clear that inflexibility and refusal to communicate and explore contacts can only foster deeper antagonisms and bring us closer to war.

There logically follows from this a new, additional congressional declaration in section 2 that it is the policy of the United States to encourage trade in peaceful goods and technology with all countries with which we have diplomatic

or trading relations, except those countries with which such trade has been determined by the President to be against the national interest. There has been an entirely unwarranted stigma attached to legitimate trade with Eastern Europe which has inhibited many firms from actively pursuing trade opportunities which would cumulatively serve our national security, foreign policy, and economic welfare. It is time to remove what may be even so much as a hint or trace of any such stigma.

As I indicated in my remarks in general debate, the Subcommittee on International Trade received testimony indicating that we continue to unilaterally control hundreds of categories of goods on political grounds. Testimony taken by the subcommittee indicated that even now, 2,029 commodity categories are under control for such countries as Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the U.S.S.R., while 1,753 of these are controlled for Poland and Rumania, at the same time that COCOM has designated 552 categories for control.

Hundreds of these commodities which we continue to control are viewed as peaceful, it seems, by everyone but our Office of Export Control. Consider, for example, the following which continue to be controlled: milk and cream; wheat, rice, barley, corn, rye, oats, grain sorghum; oil seeds, flaxseed and vegetable oils. The grains among these are subject to such restrictive requirements that they are virtually impossible to sell competitively from the United States.

Other examples of categories embrace all types of the following: Waste and scrap and reclaimed rubber, coloring materials, varnishes, insecticides, disinfectants, weed killers, waxes, farm tractor tires, sponge rubber and foam rubber goods, cotton tire cord, fiber glass yarn, glass in balls, rods, or tubes, cast iron soil pipe, hand tools for pipe threading, shoe lasts, ovens, furnaces, cane and maple syrup evaporators, crop dryers, forage dehydrators, tobacco curers, pulp and paper mill machines, water purifiers, softeners, filters and other machines for water treatment and sewage disposal, weighing machines and scales, propellers and paddle wheels for watercraft, electric steam cabinets for turkish baths, face and hand dryers, storage batteries, electrical traffic control equipment, electrical components and parts for machinery and appliances, electrical apparatus and parts, nonmilitary buses, parts and accessories for nonmilitary vehicles, prepared knots and tufts, cotton or wool, for broom or brush making, vacuum bottles, jugs and chests, and miscellaneous manufactured articles, not elsewhere classified.

Here are some of the items destined for Eastern Europe which, in just the past few days, required a specific export license:

A \$184 control instrument for office building air conditioning in Czechoslovakia.

Door seals for passenger cars, valued at \$3, in the U.S.S.R.

Synthetic leather, valued at \$27,000, for the making of shoes in East Germany.

A motion picture sound track, valued at \$980, for Czechoslovakia.

Yellow corn, for animal feed, valued at \$6,100,000, broken into two licenses, for East Germany.

Chemical analysis equipment, valued at \$3,987, for wine products research, authorized for reexport from Switzerland to Hungary.

It should also be understood that thousands of items for which licenses to ship to non-Communist countries have been approved must be amended if the value of the shipment for one reason or another, changes. For example, a licensed shipment of resistors to Taiwan, changed in value from \$312,458 to \$317,649, required approval of an amended license.

In this attempt to police the world, the Office of Export Control requires validated licenses for the reexport of thousands of items from one free world country to another. Just the other day, it was necessary for one of our exporters to obtain specific permission to send \$4,382 of industrial chemicals from Belgium to Argentina. A license was required to send \$100 of synthetic resins from West Germany to France, and to send an oscillator valued at \$600 from West Germany to Italy.

Mr. Chairman, is it any wonder that our international business firms find it increasingly difficult to compete in the world economy? It costs more than \$160 just to process the shippers' export declaration. The licensing process itself is costly. Its use to inhibit the flow of peaceful goods in these times is indefensible. My amendment to the Export Control Act would mandate the Department of Commerce to shear the unwarranted shackles that have been put on our export trade. I urge its adoption.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the many fine American military personnel of Swedish descent serving valiantly in Vietnam must be tragically disappointed by the ungrateful and morale-defeating attitude of the mother country, to which they bear close ethnic and emotional ties, for her harsh snub to the United States. Sweden, the European haven for American deserters and draft dodgers, has just announced plans to support Hanoi to the tune of \$40 million in loans and grants over a 3-year period. State Department information indicates that these moneys are scheduled to begin flowing to Hanoi next July 1.

Before Sweden can give these millions to an avowed enemy of the United States, we should insist this "professionally neutral" country repay the balance of her multi-million-dollar loans from the Export-Import Bank, which is wholly American supported. Even though amendments to the Export-Import Bank legislation demand a complete credit cutoff to any country aiding North Vietnam, those provisions do not go into effect before the fact. Consequently, Sweden could continue to borrow hard-earned American dollars until next July. It had obviously never occurred to Sweden that the U.S. Congress could be far-

sighted enough to enact legislation which would automatically stop any further dollar drain through the Export-Import Bank in situations like this. Sweden did not know there was a limit to just how much of an international patsy the American taxpayers could be forced to be.

The new Swedish Prime Minister, Olof Palme, former Minister of Communications, will be responsible for implementing this policy and has already announced his intention to increase Swedish aid to Cuba. His "credentials" include participation, with a North Vietnamese diplomat, in the anti-American torchlight parade which triggered the recall of the American Ambassador from Stockholm, and Palme's appearance in the highly controversial and allegedly pornographic Swedish film "I am Curious, Yellow."

The United States has always considered Sweden a friend worth aiding, both financially and with favorable trade agreements; but it is the height of folly for this country to support those who give aid and cash comfort to our enemies. Since when is friendship a one-way street?

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE) was the author of an amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act which cuts off loan applications to countries who give aid and comfort to the enemy. Is the same restriction in this bill and if not, should it not be?

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYLIE. In specific answer to the question of the gentleman from Iowa, the Export Control Act of 1949 does not contain language to which the gentleman has referred and which was incorporated in the act known as the Export-Import Bank Act of the United States.

As the gentleman suggested, an amendment was offered and adopted which would prohibit a loan from the Export-Import Bank to any country with which we are engaged in armed conflict, or to any country dealing directly or indirectly with any country with which we are engaged in armed conflict. The same restriction is not in the Export Control Act of 1949 specifically. Although I am told by persons in the Department of Commerce that the executive branch has imposed economic sanctions along the lines that the gentleman from Iowa has suggested and, as a matter of fact, no export trade is authorized with North Vietnam, Cuba, North Korea or Red China.

As the gentleman pointed out, however, Sweden has borrowed money from the United States through the Export-Import Bank which is wholly owned and wholly controlled by the United States, and Sweden is, in turn, loaning the same money—I suppose it is the same money—to North Vietnam.

Now, I compliment the gentleman from Iowa—

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. I would prefer that the

gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE) be permitted to complete his statement.

Mr. WYLIE. I would just like to say that I compliment and agree with the gentleman from Iowa.

It seems to me that to trade with those who aid the war potential of an enemy nation that is at this moment killing our boys in Vietnam is a travesty and is morally indefensible.

The Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C.A., App. 2021-2032) in section 2, declares that exports should be controlled "to further the foreign policy" of the United States and enhance our national security. It further states that the United States should apply the controls in cooperation with allied nations in trading with Communist dominated countries.

The President is given broad authority to implement these policies by prohibiting or curtailing exports from the United States.

Common knowledge indicates that many of our allies and other friendly nations engage in active trading with our Communist enemy in North Vietnam. This trade strengthens the industrial base of North Vietnam and relieves pressure on their domestic economy, thereby helping place North Vietnam in a position to manufacture some of its own war materials.

I would like to urge the President to exercise every effort, legally and morally, to convince our friends and allies to refrain from trading with North Vietnam. If these efforts fail, I would suggest that the President take appropriate steps to curtail or halt all U.S. trade with those nations that trade with North Vietnam.

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

(On request of Mr. ASHLEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHERLE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the record should be made clear. If the gentleman from Ohio is saying that the Export-Import Bank issued credit to Sweden, which in turn was loaned by Sweden to another country, then the gentleman has a rather remarkable misunderstanding of the Export-Import Bank. The Export-Import Bank finances domestic manufacturers in their sales abroad, so the statement by the gentleman from Ohio would be manifestly wrong.

Mr. SCHERLE. Along with good common business sense a principle also is involved. It would be utter hypocrisy to extract money from the American taxpayer and give it to a "neutral" country like Sweden and they in turn loan it to the very people who are dedicated to killing our boys on the battlefields of Vietnam. How stupid can we get?

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WYLIE. With reference to the statement by the gentleman from Ohio

(Mr. ASHLEY) in the Export-Import Bank bill it says that the bank shall not guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase of any product, technical data, or other information by a national or agency of any nation which engages in armed conflict, declared or otherwise.

And then there is another section which applies the same prohibition to a country which deals directly or indirectly with a nation with which we are engaged in armed conflict.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, if for no other reason than principle alone, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) should be voted down.

One ironic coincident is that on the very day that Sweden's Foreign Minister Nilsson announced that that country was going to grant \$40 million in assistance to Hanoi, the U.S. Tennessee Valley Authority awarded a \$2 million order for electrical transformers to ASEA, a Swedish heavy electric equipment company.

It is also my understanding that a group of junketing Swedish parliamentarians are soon to visit this country. They are reported to want to visit with American Congressmen. I am sure that the purpose of that trip is to find additional ways for Sweden to "tap the till" of the American taxpayer.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I speak in favor of the amendment because I think it is good business for the United States, and I think it is good for our foreign policy. Right now we have a group that you have heard about during the debate called COCOM, which is a group of industrialized nations, that have agreed upon a list of materials that will not be sent to Communist nations because these materials directly aid their war potential. But the list that we have in our Export Control Act is far more comprehensive than the COCOM list, includes many items not related to the military potential of a country. The problem for an exporter is that he has to deal with three different governmental agencies to try and find out what he can export to an Iron Curtain country.

I am an exporter by trade, although I have only dealt with Mexico. It is tough enough just dealing with non-Iron Curtain countries when you have to go through all the bureaucracy that we have in the Federal Government to obtain the export license and the export financing that you need.

When one has to go through COCOM to get an OK by the State Department and the Defense Department and the Commerce Department, it means money lost and at times a lost export because of the delay.

So American exporters of American products do not get into many of the Iron Curtain countries, and I think it is good that our products get there because it makes for a dependence on American technology and on American supplies.

Let me give you one example.

Yugoslavia, considered a "hard" Iron Curtain country in our Export Control Act, is in between. But Yugoslavia just a few years ago was a "hard" Iron Curtain country. Yugoslavia a few years ago did most of their trade with the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc. But today Yugoslavia is dealing primarily with the Western bloc.

If you want to study their economy and ideology, you probably will find that Yugoslavia's economic system is closer to our own economic system than they are to the Soviet system.

Just last week it was announced that a consortium of Western banks from the United States and Western Europe, is now going into equity financing of investments in Yugoslavia.

So here is a country that was once a hard-line country. Now they were able to trade with the Western bloc and have developed a stable currency and become a member of the International Monetary Fund. We find Yugoslavia is independent—they are no longer a confirmed, iron-core Communist country. When we have a tragic event like the invasion of Czechoslovakia, we find that Yugoslavia has the guts and the independence to stand up and condemn this move.

Look at other Iron Curtain countries, for example, Rumania. Here is a country that is trying to develop an independent policy, independent from Soviet domination. I think we should be doing everything we can in our own foreign policy and in our own trade policy to try to encourage Rumania to have trade relations with the West and become less dependent on the Soviet bloc.

This amendment is a good amendment. It will build up our trade. As you know, our trade balance has been going into the red. We should be encouraging trade, not discouraging it.

An enlightened policy puts our products into a country where product dependence will be built up. Also, it means, eventually—looking at what has happened historically in the past—it will bring these countries closer to the United States and further away from the Soviet economic domination.

I am convinced that if we had had a more liberal policy with Czechoslovakia, the invasion might not have happened.

If we were able to grant Czechoslovakia the most-favored-nation treatment, and if we were able to develop a more liberal trade policy toward Czechoslovakia, perhaps the Soviet tanks would not have gone in there and smashed the Dubcek regime.

The amendment is good for the United States, and it is good for our business. It is good for our foreign policy. I would urge its adoption.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. WYLIE. Are we not now exporting to Yugoslavia under this law?

Mr. REES. Yes. Yugoslavia is an exception from the Export Control Act, an exception from this bill. But what you have going on is that Rumania might bring this country into the same situation as Yugoslavia. This amendment would hasten this trend.

Mr. WYLIE. The point I am making is that under the present law, the executive branch could authorize trade with Czechoslovakia if it felt it to be in our best interest just as it has authorized exports to Yugoslavia; could it not?

Mr. REES. No; there are several restrictions. One is the most-favored-nation treatment not granted to other countries of the Iron Curtain except Poland.

The Executive does not have the power automatically to grant most-favored-nation treatment.

Mr. WYLIE. Is Yugoslavia a most favored nation?

Mr. REES. Yes; Yugoslavia and Poland are two countries that have most-favored-nation treatment. I think Rumania should be considering their foreign and economic policy.

Mr. WYLIE. Within the purview of the present law, could we not grant the same treatment to Czechoslovakia if in the opinion of the executive department such action was proper?

Mr. REES. This act has to do strictly with export control. What we are trying to do here is to remove nonstrategic goods from the control of the triumvirate of the bureaucracy that now controls export licenses.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ASHLEY) there were—ayes 10, noes 23.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANDGREBE

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. LANDGREBE: On page 2, after line 4, insert the following:

"Sec. 4(c). No commodities, military or otherwise, shall be authorized for shipment to any foreign nation which sells or furnishes to North Vietnam or which permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from any equipment, materials or commodities or gives any form of assistance to North Vietnam."

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, the wording of the amendment is almost identical to the wording of Resolution No. 89, which I introduced earlier in this session, and which so far has received no consideration. The wording and intent of the amendment are crystal clear.

For many years—actually, no one knows how many years—we have been involved in a military struggle with the small nation of North Vietnam. We have honored boundaries, sanctuaries, agreements. We have played by the rules. We have honored Geneva treaties on warfare. Yet, this flyspeck on the globe continues to infiltrate South Vietnam and continues to kill and maim a significant number of our troops as well as our friends in South Vietnam, civilian and military. It would be absolutely impossible for this small country to continue

to hack away, hammer away at us without the support of many of the major nations of the world.

I know there are many industries, and so forth, in this country that are most anxious to continue to expand their markets, and I am all for them—after a cease-fire has taken place. There is only one way in which we are ever going to bring about a cease-fire. We have pleaded with the North Vietnamese. President Johnson and President Nixon have done so. We have made every conceivable offer. It has even been suggested on the floor of the House this week that we completely withdraw our troops in the hope that the people of this tiny nation would be kind enough to stop shooting our people and stop murdering the civilians of South Vietnam.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman's amendment is very similar to one which I offered to the foreign aid bill in 1967. The amendment was adopted by the House and, as is so often the case, it was lost in conference. I commend the gentleman for offering his amendment. It ought to be adopted.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDGREBE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, under the gentleman's amendment any country that has any trade whatsoever with North Vietnam would be affected.

Mr. LANDGREBE. It would be excluded.

Mr. REES. Yes. So it would mean under the gentleman's amendment, it would be prohibited for the United States to trade in any commodity with any country that traded with North Vietnam.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Exactly right.

Mr. GROSS. Right. But all those countries would have to do would be to cease trading with North Vietnam, and it would not disturb our relations at all with them.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I am really not interested in closing the factories of the United States, nor am I anxious to further cripple our farmers, but I am most terribly concerned about the number of American boys who are being shipped home from Vietnam in boxes, without any assistance or without any sympathy from those great nations such as West Germany and England and so on.

We are committed to fighting this battle and we fully believe our commitments there are good and proper, so how can we continue to trade and deal with countries who are aiding the enemy which is killing our boys and our friends?

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDGREBE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman for the nobility of his purpose in offering this amendment. I think it is the solution to our floundering struggle for peace. If we dis-

continue trade with the countries trading with North Vietnam, we will have bloodlessly crippled that country's capacity to wage war. I wholeheartedly support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

I could repeat what I said and speak until midnight on my convictions about the Vietnam war—I have heard many other Members expound at length on this subject in the last few days—but I will close with a sincere plea to my colleagues on both sides to support this amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. REES), a member of the committee.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. If this were passed, it would mean we would have no exports to our major trading partners, including Japan, Great Britain, Canada, Mexico, Scandinavia, West Germany, Italy, and most other major trading nations. This would ruin our balance-of-payments situation. If Members think we have inflation now, it would be 10 times worse if this passed. We would have complete economic chaos in this country.

We must realize the countries which are supplying North Vietnam are primarily the Soviet Union and Red China, and very few supplies come from Western Europe and Japan. There are some exports from those countries, but they are not necessary to North Vietnam in their continuation of the war.

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with those people who deplore the fact that our men are being killed in a questionable war, but the amendment will not help our Armed Forces; it will only ruin the United States economically and bring it into complete chaos by destroying our foreign trade.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Eighty-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 232]

Abbutt	Celler	Fisher
Albert	Clark	Flowers
Arends	Conte	Flynt
Aspinall	Conyers	Fountain
Baring	Cunningham	Fulton, Tenn.
Berry	Dawson	Garmatz
Biatnik	Dennis	Gibbons
Brasco	Devine	Griffin
Bray	Dingell	Haley
Brooks	Dorn	Hansen, Idaho
Brotzman	Dwyer	Hansen, Wash.
Brown, Calif.	Eckhardt	Harsha
Broyhill, Va.	Edmondson	Hastings
Burton, Calif.	Edwards, Calif.	Hays
Burton, Utah	Edwards, La.	Hébert
Byrnes, Wis.	Evans, Colo.	Horton
Caffery	Fallon	Hosmer
Cahill	Farbstein	Jarman
Camp	Fascell	Johnson, Calif.
Carey	Feighan	Jones, Ala.
Cederberg	Findley	Jones, N.C.

Kee	O'Konski	Smith, Calif.
Kirwan	Olsen	Steed
Kluczynski	Patman	Steiger, Wis.
Kyl	Pepper	Stokes
Landrum	Pollock	Stubblefield
Latta	Powell	Taylor
Leggett	Price, Ill.	Teague, Tex.
Lloyd	Pucinski	Tunney
Long, La.	Quie	Utt
Lujan	Reifel	Waldie
McClory	Reuss	Wampler
McCloskey	Rivers	Watts
McMillan	Roberts	Whalley
Martin	Rodino	Wilson,
Meeds	Rosenthal	Charles H.
Mills	Ruppe	Wold
Montgomery	St. Onge	Wright
Morton	Saylor	
Murphy, N.Y.	Sisk	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ABERNETHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 4293, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 314 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal. The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. REES), in his opposition to this amendment, said that he sympathizes with the Americans who are being killed in Vietnam. Perhaps this is understandable, because the gentleman from California (Mr. REES), also told us that he is an exporter.

There is not one thing that this amendment will do to injure any nation which is supplying the North Vietnamese Communists. All any nation needs to do to avoid being penalized is stop trading with the North Vietnamese.

I want to go further than sympathizing with dead men. I say to Members of the House it is time the Congress spoke out; it is time this Congress displayed enough morality to say to these countries that there will be no more trading with the United States if they are going to supply those whose principal interest these days is the killing of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, if the House rejects this amendment and again refuses to penalize those who are helping prolong the war in Vietnam, it will have made a mockery of the purpose of this legislation—export control—and I will have no alternative but to vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK).

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, we are considering an amendment which will prohibit trading with any country trading with North Vietnam.

Insofar as North Vietnam trade is concerned, there is only one trade that we should even consider—a trade of war prisoners.

There are no fewer than 40,000 reasons to support this amendment—40,000 Americans murdered by North Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, all are acutely aware that in many instances our fighting men are being maimed and killed by sophisticated weapons. These weapons are known to be supplied to the enemy by

the nations to whom we are building trade bridges and others to whom trade dollars and profit are worth more than American lives.

Since our military is restrained from interdicting the flow of enemy weapons—the least we can do is to make sure that no American profits from the sale of weapons to kill other Americans. Fratricide for profit strikes most Americans as immoral. If it is our national policy that our fighting men not be permitted to win militarily, then we can most assuredly win this war economically—simply by ceasing to aid the enemy.

I wholeheartedly support the amendment and urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARRETT yielded his time to Mr. ASHLEY.)

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment in all truth should be defeated. I say that sharing the frustration of many who would tend to support the amendment because of the conflict in Vietnam. But, Mr. Chairman, the thrust of this amendment would be to make our export policy considerably more restrictive than it is today.

Let there be no question about this: The administration in office today opposes this amendment. The administration wants a straight extension of the Export Control Act on the basis that there is ample flexibility within the Export Control Act to achieve the purposes and the policies of this administration.

This amendment may have some superficial appeal, but Mr. Chairman, it could work against the very purposes that the author and supporters of this amendment have in mind. I urge its defeat.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I support this important amendment to halt all exports to, and trade with, those countries trading with North Vietnam. I regret that we cannot get a record roll-call vote on this vital matter.

So long as hostilities in Vietnam continue, so long as Americans are fighting and dying in a foreign land, it is immoral, it is unconscionable, and it is un-American not to use every available means to stop vital supplies from reaching the enemy, and flowing through channels provided by countries receiving American tax dollars in aid and grants and/or trade or exports.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 53, noes 84.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. Brown of Michigan: On page 2, after line 4, insert the following:

Sec. 5. Section 1(c) of the Export Control Act of 1949 (as so redesignated by section 3 of this Act) is amended to read as follows:

(c) The unrestricted export of certain materials, information, and technology may adversely affect the national security of the United States."

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, although my interest in modification of the Export Control Act has been looked upon by some as reflecting a liberal approach, let me assure the Members that on this issue I am a hawk. I want an export control policy that works, not one that just penalizes our exporters.

The amendment which is before the committee at this time, one of two I shall offer, broadens the findings of section 1(b) of the Export Control Act of 1949 to conform to the 1965 amendment to the act, which gave the President authority to prohibit or curtail the exportation of "technical data and other information."

The amendment would further broaden the finding by removing the test of "potential military and economic significance" in regard to the exportation of materials which may adversely affect the national security. By removing those words "potential military and economic significance" the amendment reshapes the findings to accommodate the economic and technological changes of the past 20 years. The 1949 findings are limited to a condition that existed in 1949 and are unrealistic in light of the circumstances of today and of the 1970's.

Certain materials no longer fall within the category of military and economic significance, but still those materials might be detrimental to the security of the United States.

The amendment to section 1(b) would conform to the amendment of section 3(a), the intent of which is to give the President greater flexibility in determining what materials, information, and technology should be approved for export.

As I have said, this amendment basically broadens the discretion of the President as to what items may be controlled under the Export Control Act. He no longer will have to tie the denial of a license to a finding that this particular export has a military or economic significance. If it has any detrimental impact upon the national security of the United States he may deny the export license.

I believe the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his amendment. As I understand the purpose of his amendment, it is to introduce a fact of life with respect to the formation of the list of commodities to be excluded. It would require the Department of Commerce to consider availability as one of the criteria. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. The gentle-

man from Ohio is partially correct. The amendment which more specifically deals with the question of availability will be the second amendment I will offer. This deals with findings. The other deals with the alternative section of the statute. They complement one another.

Mr. ASHLEY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. Brown of Michigan: On page 2, after line 4, insert the following:

"Sec. 4. The third sentence of section 3(a) of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 2023(a)) is amended by changing 'shall determine that such export makes a significant contribution to the military for economic potential of such nation or nations which' to read 'determines, taking into consideration its availability from other nations with which the United States has defense treaty commitments, that such export'."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) alluded to, which, in simple terms, says that in determining whether or not an export license shall be granted or whether a commodity shall be denied the right of export, the President shall look to see what our friends and allies are doing. Then, if the export is readily available from our friends and allies with whom we have defense treaty commitments, that then a license can be granted.

This amendment adds new language to section 3(a). It requires matters to be considered in connection with controlling exports, such as the availability of such exports elsewhere. This amendment does not force the President to approve of an export that would be detrimental to the national security of the United States. It says, though, that in making such determination of the impact on our national security the availability of this export from nations with which we have defense treaty commitments—that the availability shall be taken into consideration and shall be a factor in determining whether an export license is granted or denied.

Now, why do we need this language? We need the language, I believe, because we need to have Congress tell the executive branch of the Government that we approve of this practice and approve of their looking to other friendly nations to see what they are exporting in determining what our policy shall be.

A further impact of this is in touchy areas where there are dual-use products and matters of that nature, where our administration, in negotiating with

friends and allies toward a multilateral policy of restrictions on trade, will be able to say, "If you are going to trade in these items, then we are going to trade in them, also." In many of these areas which are of questionable strategic value we can trade in them more advantageously and we can sell cheaper and, as a consequence, we would be getting the trade that other nations are presently getting. At that point in time our friends and allies will recognize that it would be as much to their advantage to put the item on the restrictive trade list as it would be to leave it off. In that way our export control policy would have a multilateral and multinational effect instead of an impact only on our exporters, as it presently has.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. Is the position of the administration that the gentleman's amendment would make export licensing easier or more difficult with regard to the arguments you have made?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. At the outset I cannot speak for the administration, because it requested an extension and I am seeking a modification.

Mr. HANNA. Getting an export license is not easy in almost any respect and we are discouraging a tremendous amount of trade simply because we botched up our export licensing applications so much that businessmen are getting a little bit sick of it. I hope you are not making it more difficult than it already is.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. The gentleman is correct. It would make it easier. He is correct on a further point, that a part of the problem is the delay in granting an export license. Granting an export license, even though it is eventually granted, oftentimes has an impact on denying to our exporters trade that they would otherwise have, which, of course, harms our balance of trade.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. Again, I think that the gentleman's amendment is a good amendment and should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLACKBURN

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. Blackburn: On page 2, after line 4, add the following language to the committee amendment:

"Sec. 3. Section 3 of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end:

"(d) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, any embargo imposed by the President against any nation shall

lapse sixty days after it is imposed or sixty days after the enactment of this subsection, whichever is later.

"(2) With the approval of Congress expressed by a concurrent resolution passed by both Houses within sixty days before or after the imposition of an embargo by the President against any nation or, in the case of an embargo in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection, passed within sixty days after that date, the embargo may be continued against that nation until such date as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may determine.

"(3) If an embargo against any nation has lapsed pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection or been terminated pursuant to paragraph (2), the President may not impose a new embargo against that nation within 12 months after the date of lapse or termination unless specifically authorized by legislation enacted after the date of enactment of this subsection.

"(4) As used in this subsection, the term 'embargo' refers to a total or substantially total embargo imposed under authority of this Act."

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. I wonder what effect the gentleman's amendment would have on the mandatory sanctions and international legal obligations of the United States?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I assume the gentleman is referring specifically to the Rhodesian embargo?

Mr. BARRETT. That is right.

Mr. BLACKBURN. My interpretation would be that this would not affect that situation, although I would be perfectly willing to approach that problem at the proper time with the proper legislation.

My understanding is that that is imposed by reason of the U.N. Participation Act, and it involves the authority of the President of the United States, acting under the U.N. Participation Act, under which this action was taken.

However, the Export Control Act is primarily aimed at restricting trade with Communist-oriented countries. I do not think there has been any charge that the Rhodesian Government is Communist dominated or Communist oriented. So I do not think this act is the one under which the President is acting.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Very frankly, I will say that the gentleman is one of the most capable members of our Committee on Banking and Currency and is well respected by the members of that committee on both sides. However, I am inclined to think that this type of amendment may distort our intentions with other countries throughout the world. It is my further opinion that if this were explored further by holding hearings, we could explore all its ramifications. However, at this time I am inclined to think I cannot support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his candor.

I would like to point out to the Members of this body, however, that it is going to be at least 2 years before we

bring this back up for consideration—at least the lethargy of the House being what it is—it will be 2 years before this act expires. I think there is involved a very important policy matter upon which we must act today. It is an important question that I present to the House today: To what extent do we in the Congress have the right to completely delegate the authority under the Constitution to regulate foreign commerce?

I recognize the Chief Executive is charged with the duty of handling our foreign affairs, and that he must give us direction in the handling of foreign commerce. But I think that this body, as the spokesman for the people of the United States, should have some voice in deciding whether or not the President, acting under the authority of this act, should have the total power to declare total economic warfare against any country.

One of the things that has been debated in recent weeks is the degree to which the Congress is subject to some criticism, perhaps, for permitting the Bay of Tonkin resolution to be treated as a blank check for total involvement in Vietnam.

If the Congress is going to continue to permit its power to be eroded by legislation which the Congress enacts, then it is subject to criticism.

I think it is our responsibility to the people of the United States, before we allow economic warfare being declared against any nation, that the Congress should reflect the desires of the people.

Under my proposal the President could declare such an embargo for a period of 60 days without congressional approval, but during that 60-day period the Congress could look into the matter, could hold hearings, and then the Congress could pass a resolution approving it if in the opinion of the Congress such embargo should be continued.

What I am saying is that the Congress has the responsibility, and I think the people of this country have the right to expect us to shoulder that responsibility and not give it away. That is the reason that I have introduced this amendment before this body today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment offered by a member of the committee was never offered for consideration in the debate during the period of consideration before the Subcommittee on International Trade, or before the full committee.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman from Ohio to be completely candid with the Members of this body.

I circulated a letter. As I recall, at the first meeting we had of the subcommittee, before we started preparing any amendments, and before we decided what we were going to do about the bill, that there was an agreement that each

of us would circulate a letter outlining what we thought we might want to do in the way of amendments. I circulated this amendment to the members of the subcommittee. I later circulated it to the members of the full committee. I explained that because of the request of the administration that this bill should be brought before the floor of this House without any substantial amendment I withheld my amendment. But I told everyone from the very beginning that my amendment would be introduced.

So I certainly would take some exception to any implication that I have brought this in at the last minute without previous notice to the members of the committee.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to infer any such activity, or motive on the part of the gentleman from Georgia.

However, I do not quite understand the differentiation in the offering of the amendment now and in failing to introduce the amendment in a timely fashion before the subcommittee, or before the full committee.

The gentleman says this was at the behest of the administration, yet the gentleman is not at all reluctant to offer it on the floor of the House today. I simply do not see what the difference is.

All it means is it was not possible for it to have the full consideration and a vote upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia during the period of time when the bill was being considered and marked up.

The administration is opposed to this measure. This administration, just as the last administration, does not want a less flexible trade policy than we now have. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida most certainly would render our trade policy considerably less flexible if that amendment is adopted.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to the Members of this body, and to the gentleman who is speaking, that other amendments have been offered here today by Members of the committee which we did not consider and vote upon in the committee, and there has been no objection made to this body considering those amendments. So I do not think the argument is a valid argument against my amendment any more than it would be against any other, and I really do not think it is a valid argument in any event.

Mr. ASHLEY. All I am suggesting is, of course, if the gentleman had offered his amendment in timely fashion, the administration witnesses who appeared before our committee would have been obliged to take a position on his amendment. His failure to offer his amendment and to discuss his amendment at the time of our hearings, of course, make it impossible for this body to be apprised of the position of the administration.

The reason I can say that with some assurance that the administration is opposed to the amendment is because they have indicated no later than this morn-

ing, because they made it abundantly clear—and I am talking about the Defense Department, the Commerce Department, and the State Department—they do not want a less flexible policy than we now have. They do not want a more liberal policy. They say they want the same policy that they feel they can administer satisfactorily.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I would just make the observation, of course, that the initial amendment I had proposed contained language which is not in the current amendment. After I had prepared my initial proposal in which I made my amendment apply to any act which is on the books, it became readily apparent—and, of course, we had the committee print out and we were working under great pressure at that point—and it became apparent that this would be subject to a serious question of parliamentary procedure. That being the case I have deleted the language which would have caused strong objection from the administration. But the fact that the administration neither approves nor disapproves or has not taken any action on this, should not act as a deterrent to this body in exercising its will.

Mr. ASHLEY. I am in perfect agreement with the gentleman on that. I acknowledge that the amendment, that is the other amendment, would certainly have had far greater implication than does the amendment now before us. My opposition to the amendment is simply on the basis that we have not yet had sufficient opportunity to go into all of the aspects that attend an amendment as broad even as this one is.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. The U.S. obligation to embargo Rhodesia under the U.N. Charter is implemented under the Export Control Act. Therefore, the administration is against the Blackburn amendment even as it is constituted right now.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise to speak in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to speak against this amendment, but also to bring the attention of this House to something I think has not been made very strongly here.

We have, I think, been addressing ourselves as the gentleman from New Jersey just now pointed out to you on some policy in the wrong direction. We have a Trading With the Enemy Act. Policies with reference to trade with an enemy country should fall in that area of the law. We have an Export Trade Act in which we can direct ourselves in terms of our trade in the international market.

What we are talking about now is extending legislation that we hope will encourage and expand genuine exports by our country. Mr. Chairman, we live in a marginal society just like everybody else in this world. Four percent of our gross

national product now is in international trade. If it falls below that, we are in trouble.

I will tell you. When you sell anything today—and when you buy your car, you buy your car and you buy your financing. If it is a choice between whether you are going to get a first-class Pontiac or a first-class Chevrolet, you are going to find out what your financing benefits are. If you can get a better financial package buying one way rather than the other, gentleman, that is what you do. Everybody in the whole world, when they are buying react exactly as you do. Our job in this Congress is to encourage trade under this Export Act and to help finance it under the Export-Import Bank legislation.

By comparison with competing free world countries our financial package is beginning to look pretty sorry. The ability of our business to get licenses to trade is beginning to look rather sorry and we are going to be hurt if we are going to fall below 4 percent of our GNP that is going into international trade.

You are not in this bill talking about trade between some country and our enemies. You are talking of trade between American businessmen and an international purchaser. This is the only trade that you are talking about in this bill.

I think you had better get your sights squared away on what you are doing here. I do not think you want to do what it appears to me you are doing. I suggest that this amendment just like some others have pointed out how seriously we can go awry when we let our emotional binges take over instead of our good solid judgment.

If you want to be against some of these things, address yourselves in the appropriate legislation that can effectively deal with that problem. But do not foist it upon an exporter who simply is trying to sell an American product with some kind of financial package; a competitive financial package with what the businessman in a competing country can offer to the same customer.

If we are not prepared to do that, gentlemen, we are prepared to help put this country down the road to a diminishing trade and worsening balance of payments and a real impact upon the economy that will mean loss of jobs, including a further impact on unemployment. This is the best way I know of to start a cycle of depression in this country.

We are able to protect ourselves against those cycles in the domestic economy, but we have no protection against the impact that will come from our international trade. If 4 percent of \$1 trillion does not mean anything to you, you had better sharpen up your arithmetic. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) desires to speak. I wonder if the time for debate on the amendment could be limited.

The CHAIRMAN. If the committee is so disposed.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BARRETT

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 5 p.m.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Did the Chair recognize the gentleman from New Jersey for 5 minutes? Would that be included in the limitation?

The CHAIRMAN. No, the Chair has not recognized the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania would amend his motion so as to have the time expire, say, 5 minutes after 5.

Mr. BARRETT. That would be satisfactory. I so amend my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is an outrageous operation to cut off debate on a matter of such substance, and I regret very much that the Chairman made the move he did.

I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. Its effect would seem to be to require a lifting of controls on strategic goods that the executive branch decides should not go to certain countries, unless the Congress takes certain action. And it would also seem quite possible under the terms of the amendment to require a lifting of an embargo such as that imposed against Rhodesia by Executive order. The fact that the sponsor of the amendment says he is doubtful whether it would have that effect, but that he hopes it will, is no consolation to me at all.

I would suggest that if we have our wits about us, we will vote down the amendment. This has been a disheartening debate. It has been seriously suggested that we ought to cut off trade relations with our major trading partners because we are unhappy about their trade with North Vietnam. Now because of an individual's feeling, we must consider an ambiguous and far-reaching amendment such as the one proposed, but with no opportunity to consider the specific language, its purpose or its effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. REES).

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be given to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I object.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Strangely enough, the gentleman from New Jersey objects. But I rise to support the position that he took.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I would like to point out to the gentleman from New Jersey that this amendment will not affect any partial banning of strategic goods, and it is not designed for that purpose. I think to the extent the gentleman has addressed himself to the fact that this would cut off any restriction on trade is not a valid observation, because the amendment itself defines the term "embargo" as being a total or substantially total embargo.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. No, I will not yield to the gentleman since he would not agree to my unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN).

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to some of the comments made by the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA). The gentleman's presentation, as I recall, was that my amendment is going to restrict the growth of international trade. I would like to point out we are the body who should be the spokesman for the very businessmen about whom the gentleman was expressing such concern.

When the President declares a total economic warfare against another nation and puts our businessmen out of the business of selling goods, and Congress lacks the power to approve or disapprove this act, I think the gentleman's argument is more in favor of my position than against it. We should be the ones to stand up and take the responsibility of saying to the businessmen no, you do not trade with those countries, or we should say that we think the President is wrong. It is time we exercise our responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I expressed the view this amendment would apply to the embargo under the United Nations Participation Act. The gentleman has explained it would not apply in his view, because that embargo is imposed under a statute of the United Nations Participation Act. But surely any embargo imposed by the President must be pursuant to a statute. He cannot impose an embargo on his own executive authority. Therefore, the first sentence of this must apply to any embargo the President applies pursuant to the statute, and that would apply to the Rhodesian situation. It would be contrary to our position under the U.N. charter, and it would be to the benefit of 200,000 whites who are ruling Rhodesia as a small minority in that country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT) to close the debate.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amend-

ment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLACKBURN) there were—ayes 28, noes 44.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, immediately after line 4, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Section 6 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 2026) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) In the administration of this Act, reporting requirements shall be so designed as to reduce the cost of reporting, record-keeping, and export documentation required under this Act to the extent feasible consistent with effective enforcement and compilation of useful trade statistics. Reporting, recordkeeping, and export documentation requirements shall be periodically reviewed and revised in the light of developments in the field of information technology. A detailed statement with respect to any action taken in compliance with this subsection shall be included in the first quarterly report made pursuant to section 8 after such action is taken."

#### AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PODELL

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. PODELL: On page 2 after line 4 insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to prohibit exports to any country which permits the refining, manufacturing, or trading in narcotic drugs (as defined in section 4731 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) or depressant or stimulant drugs (as defined in section 201 (v) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act)."

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me say I must apologize to the committee for not having submitted this amendment during committee deliberations on the bill. This amendment has coalesced since that activity concluded.

This is a permissive amendment. It does not require the President or the Congress to do anything, but merely declares it is the policy of the United States of America to prohibit exports to any country permitting refining, manufacture, or trading and dealing in narcotic drugs as defined by the Internal Revenue Code.

We do know that now, in Marseilles, France, there is a refining operation, permitted by that country, which is refining opium into morphine and heroin, and exporting all or almost all of these finished products into this country. Organized crime operates with impunity, and we here in America suffer.

If we walk the streets of our country,

no matter where, we will find youngsters on those streets and children in our schools becoming narcotics addicts. We have in New York City upwards of 100,000 narcotic addicts, stealing approximately \$100 a day in goods to feed their habit. This is what is turning our urban areas into jungles.

We are talking about 40 percent of the crime in our country today. Now we know what is causing this, and it is about time the Congress spoke up and did something about this. Words have flowed endlessly. Now we have a chance to put certain governments on notice that their tolerance of this traffic is at an end.

All we do with this amendment is to give official notice to the President that it should be the policy of this country to stop trading with those countries that permit refining, manufacture, or trading in opium and various narcotics as defined by the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PODELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman have a definition, as described in the amendment, of the provision in the statute?

Mr. PODELL. I do not have that section of the Internal Revenue Code here. It defines and outlines narcotics, barbiturates, and stimulants which do come under official regulation.

Mr. WHITE. Some of those are manufactured in the United States for legitimate purposes. If the definition said the "illegal manufacture" of course I would go along. If it merely defines the barbiturates and narcotics, perhaps we are doing an injustice to the legitimate trade and the legitimate manufacture in the country. Every country does manufacture or produce.

Mr. PODELL. The section we refer to here deals only with illegal traffic.

Mr. WHITE. Is that the definition?

Mr. PODELL. In the section, yes. First it deals only with illegal traffic. Second, it permits the President to make such policy. There is no congressional mandate. He will make policy only under circumstances where, of course, the activity is patently illegal.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Would not this section prohibit the trading with any country that is selling us drugs for medicinal purposes at the present time?

Mr. PODELL. If the President or administration in its wisdom felt that a particular country was permitting such drugs to be illegally exported to our country, the administration or the President would have a right to exercise this prerogative and prohibit further exports.

Mr. WIDNALL. The amendment does not say that.

Mr. PODELL. It certainly does. May I repeat it for the gentleman:

The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States—

That it is merely the policy—

to prohibit exports to any country which permits the refining—

Obviously, those countries which do refine drugs for medicinal purposes certainly would be permitted to continue to do so, and we may continue to deal with them.

Mr. WIDNALL. It says nothing about "illegal."

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. I wonder if the gentleman would entertain an amendment to his amendment to add "pornography." I believe, if the export policy is going to handle communism and our drug problems, we ought to have an export policy of this Nation taking care of pornography.

Mr. PODELL. If it is the gentleman's purpose and desire to be facetious, let me remind the gentleman to ask Art Linkletter, from his own State, whether he would feel we are being premature in dealing in such a manner with drug problems in our country. The gentleman might ask some of his neighbors down the street. On any street, for that manner. This flood of poison pours like cancer into our bloodstream, ruining lives, weakening our society's fabric and fattening up organized crime. We must serve notice on nations tolerating such traffic, and their authorities are fully informed on it, that we shall retaliate economically at any regime which allows further activities of this sort to continue within its borders.

I submit to the gentleman that this is the most pressing domestic problem in our country today. Our children, yours and mine, in the schools of this country are being infected with this horror. It is about time we took a forward step and took action in this area. Each of us knows of one case after another where drugs have crumbled the existence of young Americans. Remedies are available, and we have one here at hand.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am very sympathetic to the gentleman from New York and the amendment he has offered. I agree with him that there are few matters of more pressing domestic concern than the increased availability and the increased use of drugs among our young and among many Americans.

In all truth, though, Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is not a Christmas tree to be adorned with ornaments. The gentleman is quite right when he says that our committee did not have an opportunity to study the amendment that has been proposed. It does seem to me that a matter as pressing as the matter to which his amendment is addressed should certainly have the consideration of the legislative committee reporting the bill. This is the view that has been taken by the Department of Commerce. In a letter received quite recently, the Department of Commerce says as follows:

The Department fully supports enactment of comprehensive Federal legislation de-

signed to effectively meet the narcotic and dangerous drug problem at the international as well as domestic level. However, we oppose a premature and fragmented attempt to deal with the problem of illicit drug trade such as is contemplated in H.R. 13792.

This is a bill very similar to if not exactly the same as that incorporated in the gentleman's amendment. Continuing:

To regulate exports without concurrent controls over imports of dangerous drugs would not preclude the clandestine importation of those commodities produced abroad, nor the diversion of domestically produced drugs into illicit channels. The surveillance of exports of such drugs can be carried out through cooperation between the investigatory units of various Federal agencies including the Department of Commerce, without unnecessarily burdening lawful trade in these commodities, as would be the case if we imposed validated licensing requirements.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PODELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it not correct that this bill will not come up for passage again for 2 years?

Mr. ASHLEY. That is not necessarily true. The bill before us calls for a 2-year extension, but this obviously does not preclude my subcommittee or the full Committee on Banking and Currency from considering amendments to the Export Control Act that might be introduced during the intervening period.

Mr. PODELL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ASHLEY. Yes.

Mr. PODELL. Does the gentleman believe, as the administration does believe, according to their letter, that action on behalf of this problem is being premature? Does the gentleman believe we have any more time in dealing with this narcotic problem in our country? Does the gentleman really believe we can waste 1 more second or 1 more minute in stopping countries like France from refining these poppy narcotics and having them sold here in our country?

Mr. ASHLEY. I do not believe we can afford to waste one moment at all, but I think we are wasting time when we consider an amendment such as the one the gentleman offered very properly and in good faith but which has not had full consideration, full deliberation and testimony from those who are competent to give it. I think in answer to that that consideration of the amendment is not appropriate at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BINGHAM

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BINGHAM: On page 2, line 19, add the following new section at the end:

"Sec. 3. Section 8 of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended by striking all including the heading thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

#### "REPORTING AND INFORMATION

"Sec. 8 (a) The head of any Department or agency or official exercising any functions under this Act shall make a quarterly report, within 45 days after each quarter, to the President and to the Congress of his operations hereunder. In each such report, the Secretary of Commerce shall review all lists of articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data or other information, the exportation of which from the United States, its territories and possessions, is prohibited or curtailed with a view to making promptly such changes and revisions in such list as may be necessary or desirable in furtherance of the policy, purposes, and provisions of this Act. The Secretary of Commerce shall further include a detailed statement with respect to actions taken in compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 3 and the justifications thereof in the second quarterly report (and in any subsequent report with respect to actions taken during the preceding quarter) made by him to the Congress after the date of any extension of this Act.

"(b) The Secretary of Commerce shall use all practicable means available to him to keep the business sector of the nation fully apprised of changes in export control policy and procedures instituted in conformity with this Act. Pursuant thereto, and in order to enable United States exporters to coordinate their business activities with the export control policies of the United States Government, the agencies, Departments, and officials responsible for implementing the rules and regulations authorized under this Act shall, insofar as it is consistent with the national security, the foreign policy of the United States, and the effective administration of this Act—

"(1) inform each exporter of the considerations which may cause his export license request to be denied or to be the subject of lengthy examination;

"(2) inform each exporter of the circumstances arising during the Government's consideration of his export license application which are cause for denial or for further examination;

"(3) give each exporter the opportunity to present evidence and information which he believes will help the agencies, Departments, and officials concerned to resolve any problems or questions which are, or may be, connected with his request for a license, and

"(4) inform in writing each exporter of the specific reasons for a denial of an export license request."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I propose would make no change in the trade policies of this country, but is designed to improve administration and operation of the export control system for the benefit of American business. It is supported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Specifically my amendment would:

First. Require the Secretary of Commerce to review on a quarterly basis all items prohibited or curtailed for export, with a view to making promptly such changes and revisions as may be desirable consistent with the purposes of the act;

Second. Require that all officials responsible for implementing rules and regulations under the export control system fully inform exporters of consider-

ations which may cause license requests to be denied or subject to lengthy examination;

Third. Require that exporters be given full opportunity to present evidence and information on behalf of export license applications; and

Fourth. Require that prospective exporters be informed in writing of the specific reasons for denial of any export license request.

I would like to read from a telegram sent yesterday to me and other Members by Mr. Hilton Davis on behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce:

The National Chamber has long called for the thorough and continuous reexamination and reevaluation of the present system of export controls, with the view to eliminating those not necessary for the security of the U.S. and which result in discrimination harmful to its competitive position. The chamber also believes that authority given to administrative agencies should be policed by Congress and that these agencies should be required to keep the public fully informed as to their structure, functions and actions.

The Bingham amendment seems designed to carry out these objectives as they apply to export controls. We urge your vote for this amendment.

HILTON DAVIS,  
General Manager, Legislative Action.

I repeat: the amendment to the Export Control Act extension that I am proposing makes no change in the trade policies of this country. It is designed, instead to help eliminate the apparent trade disadvantage and difficulty encountered by many businessmen as a result of the complexity of the system of trade restriction and the clumsiness of its implementation. I refer specifically to the fact that a great many items continue to appear on the list of items restricted for export—particularly those items restricted unilaterally by the United States—which have no apparent national security or foreign policy significance. Looking through one recent version of the list, for example, I noted the following: “knots and tufts for broom or brush making,” “animated displays for window dressings,” “cow dip,” “belt clasps,” “typewriters”—multitype only)—“type fonts,” “lavatories and plumbing fixtures,” “used clothing,” “voice and music recorders,” and “terrestrial and celestial globes.” While there may be good reason to restrict these items, they certainly are not apparent, and Federal authorities should be required to review and report their reasoning in restricting these items.

As I understand it, for purposes of most destinations in Communist dominated areas, all items are assumed to be prohibited for export unless ruled otherwise. As a result, the list of items for which licenses must be granted is long. It is gradually being “shaken down” through what one Federal official has called a “gradual evolutionary process.” That is, certain items are removed from the list as applications to export them are filed and determination is made that there is no need to restrict their export. In addition, there have been occasional general reviews of these lists—the latest one as far as I can determine in 1965—which have resulted in the removal of literally hundreds of irrelevant items.

The Department of Commerce claims to make a continuing review of the commodity control list without waiting for specific applications for exports to be made. The specific results of these reviews for individual items, however, are not made generally available. It is, therefore, difficult for policymakers or businessmen to challenge these findings or conclusions should they wish to do so. As many businessmen have claimed in testimony, the justifications for retaining certain items on the restricted list and the kinds of considerations that are made is a very “foggy” and confusing area.

My amendment would assure that broad reviews of the commodity control list are undertaken on a continuing basis. Without such general reviews, removal of irrelevant items proceeds quite slowly, impeding and slowing down legitimate trade by necessitating added license applications. My amendment would require the Secretary of Commerce to undertake a continuing general review of all lists with an eye toward removing those that are irrelevant even before any export license application is filed; it will further require that justifications for retaining or removing items be reported to Congress quarterly.

Any export control system, regardless of the policy pronouncements on which it is based, is a difficult mechanism to administer and inevitably detains and restricts trade unless it is efficiently and smoothly administered. In the course of hearings on both the House and Senate sides, it has become evident that a great many businesses are losing trade opportunities not only because license applications are refused on certain items, but also because of the great delay that often occurs in reaching a decision on license applications and the lack of information available to businesses on the status of the applications and the relevant considerations being used to determine whether a given application will or will not be granted. This is particularly the case when the item under examination falls in the “gray” area—items which have both clear, peaceful, and potential military uses.

I note with satisfaction the efforts that are continuing to be made by the Department of Commerce and other agencies with authority under the Export Control Act to streamline the procedures for ruling on license applications. In May 1968, for example, the Department announced a new procedure that permits an exporter to receive an export license for samples of his product without any advance determination being required as to whether a commercial quantity might also be approved. It is the latter process which so often takes inordinate and critical time. But I am persuaded that much remains to be done to make the process of ruling on license applications more efficient and more responsive to the needs and requirements of the business community. My amendment, therefore, would require that potential exporters be fully informed at all stages of the licensing process of the status of their applications and the considerations which may

cause the application to be delayed or denied. It would also require that exporters be given an opportunity to present evidence and information which they believe will help their case and help the agencies concerned reach a rapid and favorable decision on license requests.

Finally, my amendment would require that exporters be notified in writing of the specific circumstances and considerations surrounding any denial of an export license request. It is my belief and hope that these requirements will expedite and improve the licensing process and enable businesses to salvage much potential trade which they are now losing merely as a result of the clumsy and closed operation of the licensing mechanism.

The requirement I mentioned earlier that the Secretary report his justifications for retaining or removing items from the commodity control list quarterly, will also enable businesses to operate with more knowledge and rationality in the export field, and permit them to challenge judgments of the Federal Government responsibly should they have evidence which they feel are contrary to official findings.

I hope my amendment will be approved.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York. It is a good amendment.

As I pointed out in my earlier remarks, both statistically and by example, the control lists embrace hundreds of categories accounting for thousands of products which are unrelated to the strength of the Eastern European countries within the context of the potential threat they pose to our national security.

The redtape that emerges from this vast network together with the admission by administration witnesses that little has been done to clean out the control lists, certainly indicates the good sense of an amendment with language requiring a systematic justification of the need to maintain the vast list of barriers to trade.

From testimony taken from several public witnesses, together with other written communications, it does appear that there is a need to establish closer coordination between business and government in the implementation of our export control policies.

The Subcommittee on International Trade took extensive and detailed testimony which pointed up the frustrations of exporters in attempting to work through this program. Not only are they faced with long delays which discourage further sales efforts on their part and cause them to lose sales to foreign competitors whose governments process applications much faster, they are also left uninformed about the status of their license applications and are not given reasons for denial which might enable them to reorient their marketing and production activities. The amendment, as I understand it, would diminish another of the barriers to the pursuit of export sales by enabling American businessmen to

keep abreast of the status of their applications without unduly hampering the functions of the Department of Commerce.

Hence, I support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is no objection on the part of the committee members on this side of the aisle to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this amendment has some very good ideas, but it would be the quickest way to build up a large bureaucracy in the handling of these matters. The sixth section of this bill provides for reporting requirements which I feel are ample, and which would expedite action, and I oppose the amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think the businessmen who have had experience under this act, as they testified before the Senate committee and the House committee, have indicated that they are floundering, that they are not given guides, and they do not know what the criteria are, and they have difficulties. This is an attempt to solve their problem by increasing certain reports.

I might add that this amendment has been adopted in practically the same fashion by the committee in the other body, and recommended to the other body for passage.

I hope that this amendment, which is a pro-American business amendment, will be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 23, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ABERNETHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4293) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, pursuant to House Resolution 575, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. WYLIE

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WYLIE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WYLIE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4293 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 273, nays 7, not voting 151, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

YEAS—273

- |                  |               |                 |
|------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abernethy        | Collins       | Green, Ore.     |
| Adair            | Colmer        | Green, Pa.      |
| Adams            | Conte         | Griffiths       |
| Alexander        | Corman        | Gubser          |
| Anderson, Calif. | Coughlin      | Gude            |
| Anderson, Ill.   | Cramer        | Hagan           |
| Anderson, Tenn.  | Culver        | Halpern         |
| Andrews, Ala.    | Daddario      | Hamilton        |
| Annunzio         | Daniel, Va.   | Hammer-         |
| Ashley           | Daniels, N.J. | schmidt         |
| Ayres            | Davis, Ga.    | Hanley          |
| Barrett          | Davis, Wis.   | Hanna           |
| Beall, Md.       | de la Garza   | Hansen, Wash.   |
| Belcher          | Delaney       | Harrington      |
| Bennett          | Denney        | Harvey          |
| Betts            | Dickinson     | Hathaway        |
| Bevill           | Diggs         | Hawkins         |
| Blaggi           | Donohue       | Hebert          |
| Blester          | Dowdy         | Hechler, W. Va. |
| Bingham          | Downing       | Heckler, Mass.  |
| Blackburn        | Dulski        | Helstoski       |
| Boggs            | Duncan        | Henderson       |
| Boland           | Edwards, Ala. | Hicks           |
| Bolling          | Ellberg       | Hogan           |
| Bow              | Esch          | Howard          |
| Brademas         | Evins, Tenn.  | Hull            |
| Brinkley         | Fish          | Hungate         |
| Brock            | Flood         | Hunt            |
| Broomfield       | Foley         | Hutchinson      |
| Brown, Mich.     | Ford          | Ichord          |
| Broyhill, N.C.   | William D.    | Jacobs          |
| Burke, Fla.      | Foreman       | Johnson, Pa.    |
| Burke, Mass.     | Fountain      | Jonas           |
| Burleson, Tex.   | Fraser        | Jones, Tenn.    |
| Burlison, Mo.    | Frelinghuysen | Karth           |
| Burton, Utah     | Frey          | Kastenmeyer     |
| Bush             | Friedel       | Kazen           |
| Button           | Fulton, Pa.   | Keith           |
| Byrne, Pa.       | Galliganakis  | King            |
| Cabell           | Gallagher     | Kleppe          |
| Casey            | Gaydos        | Koch            |
| Chamberlain      | Gettys        | Kuykendall      |
| Chappell         | Gialmo        | Kyros           |
| Cleveland        | Gilbert       | Langen          |
| Cohelan          | Goldwater     | Leggett         |
| Collier          | Gonzalez      | Lennon          |
|                  | Goodling      | Lipscorn        |
|                  | Gray          | Long, Md.       |

- Lowenstein
- McCarthy
- McClure
- McCulloch
- McDade
- McDonald, Mich.
- McFall
- McKneally
- Macdonald, Mass.
- MacGregor
- Madden
- Mahon
- Mailliard
- Mann
- Marsh
- Matsunaga
- May
- Mayne
- Melcher
- Meskill
- Michel
- Mikva
- Miller, Calif.
- Miller, Ohio
- Minish
- Mink
- Minshall
- Mizell
- Mollohan
- Monagan
- Moorhead
- Morgan
- Morton
- Mosher
- Moss
- Murphy, Ill.
- Murphy, N.Y.
- Myers
- Natcher
- Nedzi
- Nelsen
- Nichols
- Nix

- Obeys
- O'Hara
- O'Neal, Ga.
- O'Neill, Mass.
- Ottinger
- Passman
- Patten
- Pelly
- Perkins
- Philbin
- Pickle
- Pike
- Pirnie
- Poage
- Podell
- Poff
- Preyer, N.C.
- Price, Tex.
- Pryor, Ark.
- Purcell
- Quillen
- Railsback
- Randall
- Rees
- Reid, Ill.
- Reid, N.Y.
- Rhodes
- Robison
- Rogers, Colo.
- Rogers, Fla.
- Rooney, N.Y.
- Rooney, Pa.
- Rostenkowski
- Roth
- Roudebush
- Roybal
- Ruth
- Ryan
- Sandman
- Satterfield
- Schadeberg
- Scheuer
- Schneebeli
- Schwengel
- Scott

- Sebellus
- Shriver
- Sikes
- Skubitz
- Slack
- Smith, Calif.
- Springer
- Stafford
- Staggers
- Steiger, Ariz.
- Steiger, Wis.
- Stephens
- Stokes
- Stratton
- Stucky
- Sullivan
- Symington
- Talcoot
- Teague, Calif.
- Thompson, N.J.
- Thomson, Wis.
- Udall
- Van Deerlin
- Vanik
- Vigorito
- Waggonner
- Watkins
- Watson
- Weicker
- Whalen
- White
- Whitehurst
- Widnall
- Wiggins
- Williams
- Wilson, Bob
- Wolf
- Wylder
- Wyman
- Yates
- Yatron
- Young
- Zablocki
- Zion
- Zwach

NAYS—7

- Ashbrook
- Clancy
- Gross
- Landgrebe
- Rarick
- Scherle

Wylie

NOT VOTING—151

- |                  |                 |               |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Abbitt           | Edmondson       | Meeds         |
| Addabbo          | Edwards, Calif. | Mills         |
| Albert           | Edwards, La.    | Mize          |
| Andrews, N. Dak. | Erlenborn       | Montgomery    |
| Arends           | Eshleman        | Morse         |
| Aspinall         | Evans, Colo.    | O'Konski      |
| Baring           | Fallon          | Olsen         |
| Bell, Calif.     | Farbstein       | Patman        |
| Berry            | Fascell         | Pepper        |
| Blanton          | Feighan         | Pettis        |
| Blatnik          | Pindley         | Pollock       |
| Brasco           | Fisher          | Powell        |
| Bray             | Flowers         | Price, Ill.   |
| Brooks           | Flynt           | Pucinski      |
| Brotzman         | Ford, Gerald R. | Qule          |
| Brown, Calif.    | Fulton, Tenn.   | Relfel        |
| Brown, Ohio      | Fuqua           | Reuss         |
| Broyhill, Va.    | Garmatz         | Riegler       |
| Buchanan         | Gibbons         | Rivers        |
| Burton, Calif.   | Griffin         | Roberts       |
| Byrnes, Wis.     | Grover          | Rodino        |
| Caffery          | Haley           | Rosenthal     |
| Cahill           | Hall            | Ruppe         |
| Camp             | Hansen, Idaho   | St Germain    |
| Carey            | Harsha          | St. Onge      |
| Carter           | Hastings        | Saylor        |
| Cederberg        | Hays            | Shipley       |
| Celler           | Holtfield       | Sisk          |
| Chisholm         | Horton          | Smith, Iowa   |
| Clark            | Hosmer          | Smith, N.Y.   |
| Clausen, Don H.  | Jarman          | Snyder        |
| Clawson, Del     | Johnson, Calif. | Stanton       |
| Clay             | Jones, Ala.     | Steed         |
| Conable          | Jones, N.C.     | Stubblefield  |
| Conyers          | Kee             | Taft          |
| Corbett          | Kirwan          | Taylor        |
| Cowger           | Kluczynski      | Teague, Tex.  |
| Cunningham       | Kyl             | Thompson, Ga. |
| Dawson           | Landrum         | Tiernan       |
| Dellenback       | Latta           | Tunney        |
| Dennis           | Lloyd           | Ullman        |
| Dent             | Long, La.       | Utt           |
| Derwinski        | Lujan           | Vander Jagt   |
| Devine           | Lukens          | Waldie        |
| Dingell          | McClory         | Wampler       |
| Dorn             | McCloskey       | Watts         |
| Dwyer            | McEwen          | Whalley       |
| Eckhardt         | McMillan        | Whitten       |
|                  | Martin          | Wilson        |
|                  | Mathias         | Charles H.    |

Winn  
Wold

Wright  
Wyatt

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Dennis.  
Mr. Hays with Mr. Derwinski.  
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Corbett.  
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Findley.  
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Camp.  
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.  
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Cederberg.  
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Berry.  
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Grover.  
Mr. Carey with Mr. Cahill.  
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Kyl.  
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Del Clawson.  
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Lloyd.  
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Bell of California.  
Mr. Adabbo with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.  
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Hall.  
Mr. Albert with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.  
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.  
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Hastings.  
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Horton.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Conable.  
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Lujan.  
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Bray.  
Mr. Dent with Mrs. Dwyer.  
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Hosmer.  
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Brotzman.  
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Cunningham.  
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Erlenborn.  
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.  
Mr. Mills with Mr. Arends.  
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Snyder.  
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.  
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Don Clausen.  
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Dellenback.  
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Devine.  
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Harsha.  
Mr. Baring with Mr. Ullman.  
Mr. Kee with Mr. Clay.  
Mr. Evans with Mr. Meeds.  
Mr. Olsen with Mr. Eshleman.  
Mr. Watts with Mr. Latta.  
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Morse.  
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. McEwen.  
Mr. Steed with Mr. Martin.  
Mr. Haley with Mr. Lukens.  
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. McClory.  
Mr. Reuss with Mr. O'Konski.  
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Pettis.  
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. McCloskey.  
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Pollock.  
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Quile.  
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Mathias.  
Mr. Wright with Mr. Reifel.  
Mr. Patman with Mr. Mize.  
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Reigel.  
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Saylor.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Smith of New York.  
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Ruppe.  
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Stanton.  
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Taft.  
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Utt.  
Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Vander Jagt.  
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Wampler.  
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Whalley.  
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Winn.  
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Wold.  
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Wyatt.  
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Buchanan.  
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Brown of Ohio.  
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Carter.  
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Cowger.  
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Conyers.  
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Dawson.  
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Powell.  
Mr. Burton of California with Mrs. Chisholm.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**PERMISSION FOR CLERK TO CORRECT SECTION NUMBERS, CROSS REFERENCES, AND PUNCTUATION IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 4293**

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may correct section numbers, cross references, and punctuation in the enrollment of the bill just passed, H.R. 4293.

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

There was no objection.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

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

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

There was no objection.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained at a meeting at the executive offices when the vote was taken on the bill, H.R. 4293, the Export Control Act extension and was, therefore, unable to be here for the purpose of the voting.

Therefore, I want the RECORD to reflect my position as being in favor of the extension of the Export Control Act, and had I been present I would have voted aye.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show that I was on my way to the floor of the House at the time of the rollcall and would have voted "yea" on the bill just passed had I been able to reach the floor in time to do so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's remarks will appear in the RECORD.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement with reference to the vote on the student loan bill conference report. I was returning from my Pittsburgh office for today's session and my plane was several hours overdue at the Washington National Airport.

Had I been able to be present, I would have voted "yea" on final passage of the student loan bill conference report on rollcall No. 231 this afternoon.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON H.R. 13950**

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the bill H.R. 13950.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

**THE OIL INDUSTRY WINS—THE TAXPAYERS LOSE**

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, while the Nation is paying major attention to the moratorium and world's series, the oil industry is quietly carving out of the House-passed tax reform bill provisions eroding its accumulated tax privileges. Yesterday, the Senate Finance Committee began the quiet process of evisceration, dropping from the tax reform measure two sections which would have cost the oil industry \$65 million in added taxes. This is just a bare beginning. The first benefit handed back on a silver platter to the oil industry was the foreign tax credit, which the House had repealed. This is the credit American companies may take on their U.S. tax returns for taxes paid to a foreign government. So oil companies, under action taken yesterday, would still be able to deduct losses on new overseas operations against domestic income in 1 year, then apply the foreign tax on those same operations against income earned here in another year.

This confers a double benefit upon the oil industry, violating the rule that a foreign tax credit cannot be larger than the U.S. tax that would otherwise have been paid.

Mr. Speaker, the tax reform bill now before the Senate Finance Committee is the most delicate of compromises. In it, each vested interest affected has lost a small but significant portion of its accumulated tax privileges, all gained at the expense of the average lower- and middle-income taxpayer. This bill is broad enough, but certainly not deep enough. Nonetheless, it is acceptable for now as a beginning, although many Members of the House, myself among them, approved of its final form grudgingly, because it was too shallow in total cuts made in tax privileges.

Many vested interests in the Nation were prevailed upon to accept a cut in tax privileges on the ground that all other interests were sacrificing some of their tax benefits so the average taxpayer could receive some relief. The specter was often raised of one industry or interest using its influence to render itself immune to such a compromise. It was added that such an act would be foolhardy, because it would unravel the entire skein of compromise which was

the backbone holding the entire tax bill together. Few felt one industry would be foolish enough to do such a thing, but it has now happened.

Mr. Speaker, the oil industry is destroying the entire tax bill, depriving every American taxpayer of desperately needed financial relief and tax justice. Oil will undoubtedly succeed in eliminating almost every provision of the bill applying to its operations. This, in turn, will be the signal to every other concentration of strength to do the same. If the oil crowd is thumbing its nose at the public and getting away with it, why not the rest?

I shall never vote to accept any conference report which allows the oil industry to get away with such a blatant outrage. It is a deliberate insult to every person in this country who demands tax reform. Think of the prices we shall all have to pay this winter for fuel oil and gasoline. Twice what the going world rate is to any other consumer outside the United States. We are even going to have to pay indirectly for the many full page ads they are running in the papers defending their privileges, for these are all tax deductible.

There can be no tax reform without including the oil industry. They have shown their contempt for the actions of this House and needs and requests of the American people.

In 1967, major oil companies paid out 8.3 percent of their net income before taxes as Federal income tax. Last year, in 1968, that figure dropped to only 7.7 percent of their income in the form of Federal tax. Sinclair Oil earned a \$101 million profit before taxes and received a tax credit from the overburdened taxpayer of \$2.7 million. Together Atlantic and Sinclair netted \$341,537,000 while paying a total combined Federal income of \$200,000. Gulf cut its tax rate from 7.8 percent to less than 1 percent, while netting almost \$1 billion. The lowest percentage rates belong to large companies able to apply their royalties abroad against Federal tax liabilities, which is exactly the penalty removed yesterday by the Senate Finance Committee.

This is the cold, harsh truth. If the people want to know who is arrogantly cheating them while daring them to do something about it, there they are. I fervently hope this House will reject any tax bill benefiting the oil industry.

#### TAX REFORM, WILL WE GET IT?

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

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, there is every indication that both the Nixon administration and the Senate are determined to scuttle the tax reform bill passed by the House in August. First, there came the administration's ironic complaint that the House-passed reform bill would provide too much tax relief for lower- and middle-income taxpayers, while shifting too much of the burden onto corporations and the wealthy. Then, the Senate began showing signs of bend-

ing under the pressure mounted by special interest groups organized in opposition to tax reform.

One by one, long-sought reform measures are being placed on the Senate's chopping block. How is this all being justified? As one Member of the Senate remarked, "The general public's intense fervor for tax reform has greatly subsided since summer."

Apparently the Senator has been listening and talking with a strangely different "general public" than I have. The message I have been receiving lately from the district which I represent merely underscores the average citizen's demand that Congress deliver on last year's promise for tax reform and deliver now. If the enthusiasm for tax reform has cooled, it has cooled in the executive suites of America's corporations. Ever since the wealthy has discovered that for once they may have to pay something that resembles their "fair share" of the Federal income tax, there has been nothing but wailing from one end of Wall Street to the other.

Of course, the sad fact for the millions of average American taxpayers is that these cries against tax reform are being heard. I was pleased to note, however, that instead of trying to squeeze more "reform" out of the House tax reform bill, Senator YARBOROUGH suggested that the Senate add to this legislation by raising the personal exemption.

Along with other Members last April, I introduced H.R. 10592, which provided for an increase in the personal exemption of the Federal income tax from \$600 to \$1,000. Much to my disappointment, the Ways and Means Committee failed to include any increase in the personal exemption in the tax reform bill presented to the House. Although I believe the tax reform bill represents a great milestone in tax legislation, no tax reform can be complete without raising the personal exemption.

Since its adoption in 1948, the personal exemption has not been raised despite the fact that the cost of living in America has jumped nearly 53 percent. If Congress is to begin living up to its obligation to the average wage earner, who is paying the lion's share of America's tax bill, then it must start by increasing the personal exemption to at least \$1,000. I, therefore, hope the Senate will heed the advice of Senator YARBOROUGH and amend the House-passed tax reform bill to include a \$1,000 personal exemption.

#### DEMAND FOR RESIGNATION OF DR. YOLLES

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

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, all of you are aware of the liberal attitude taken by Dr. Stanley Yolles, head of the National Institute of Mental Health, relative to his position on the sale and use of marihuana.

But yesterday at our crime hearings this gentleman testified, and in response

to my specific question as to whether or not he favored dropping or removing minimum mandatory jail term for sellers of hard drugs, specifically heroin, to minors and teenagers, Dr. Yolles responded in the affirmative.

Dr. Yolles' response to my specific question about drug pushers and other questions, as well as the context of his testimony, convinced me that he is unfit to serve longer in this or any other administration. His views are indefensible, and they are completely contrary to the efforts of the Nixon administration to crack down on narcotics. Regardless of what may motivate his thinking, in my judgment his permissive approach to this critical national problem will come as welcome news to every dope peddler in the country.

Dr. Yolles' views are an affront to every decent, law-abiding citizen in America. At a time when we are on the verge of a narcotics crisis, a supposedly responsible Federal official comes along with the incredibly ridiculous idea of dropping mandatory jail sentences for those who push dope, even for those adults selling hard drugs to minors.

I do not believe that Dr. Yolles' views are shared by one-tenth of 1 percent of the American people. It is obvious to me that he has no grasp whatsoever of this problem. But time just does not allow us an opportunity for him to escape from his ivory tower and get in touch with reality. He can peddle these views as a private citizen if he likes, but I do not think the American taxpayer should have to foot the bill for such irresponsibility. I call upon Dr. Yolles to resign forthwith, and in the event he fails to do so, I do not think that this administration should any longer put up with the embarrassment he has caused it.

#### VIETNAM

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, our country has long been disturbed by the war in Vietnam. Now, when we delve into the reasons for our being in Vietnam, three basic ones are given: First, to permit self-determination by the people of the type of government the majority desires; second, to contain communism; and, third, the domino theory.

In 1964, it was evident that the 17,000 American troops and the South Vietnamese were facing defeat and that our forces were on the brink of being thrown out of Vietnam.

The Tonkin Gulf incident occurred at this time, purportedly two of our destroyers, the *Turner Joy* and the *Maddox*, were attacked while on the high seas. Immediately, the United States retaliated by bombing North Vietnamese bases. Next, Congress was given the above information and was asked to pass the Tonkin Gulf resolution, which it did with small dissent.

Today, it is accepted that the *Turner Joy* and *Maddox* were not under attack.

The commanding officers do not so state; actually, they were with South Vietnamese ships attacking North Vietnam. Suppose Miami were under attack by Argentina's vessels and two Mexican ships were in their midst, actually we would shoot at all the ships, would we not? Yet, it is not shown that our ships were fired upon.

By the authority of the Tonkin Gulf resolution, our troops were increased in number to 542,000, and the bloodiest conflict since World War II was begun.

It seems quite logical that the Gulf of Tonkin incident was a ploy to arouse public indignation, and support of intervention.

The ruse was transiently effective. With the country feeling our ships had been attacked, the increased troop deployment was approved.

On investigation and study of the reasons for increased involvement, the purpose for the creation of the Tonkin Gulf incident was perceived by many people throughout our country, thousands, even millions of our citizens became convinced that we were no longer basing our actions on the premise that right makes might—in other words, our country was departing from the paths of righteousness.

Conduct of the war was strictly controlled from the White House; advice of military leaders of recognized ability was disregarded. The enterprise, winning the war in Vietnam, lost the name of action. Vacillation and indecision were costly in lives and treasure. By 1967, it was clear that the war in Vietnam was being lost and that there was not the determination in the leadership to win.

With Congressmen STANTON, of Ohio, and DUNCAN, of Tennessee, at our own expense, we visited Vietnam in 1965. We were with the "Big Red One," the 1st Division at Bienhoa, and with the 1st Cavalry Division at An Khe. We saw the finest, best-trained, best-equipped young soldiers the world has ever seen.

We visited villages supposedly pacified, one in particular was called Happy Valley.

I also visited general hospitals in the Saigon area. Conditions were terrible. Two or more patients were often in one bed. Diseases rarely seen here were rampant there—malaria, tuberculosis, leprosy.

The Vietnamese are of small stature. The average weight is about 110 pounds and height 5 feet, 4 inches. But for all their illnesses and smallness in stature, they are highly intelligent.

In 1966, I was a member of the Speaker's Committee of Combat Veterans of World War II sent to evaluate the war effort. On this occasion, we visited I Corps commanded by Gen. Lou Walt. We were privileged to see our Marines in action. Again, they were the finest young men I have ever seen.

We visited the 1st Cavalry Division at An Khe. This time artillery was firing from the division perimeter, "Happy Valley," the pacified village, was neither happy nor pacified. We were no longer permitted to enter.

I visited the Mang Yang Pass where, in 1954, 5,000 of the flower of the French Army was attacked by the Vietnamese, where 3,900 lonely graves mark the spot where these young Frenchmen lost their lives.

We also visited the Montegnard villages and saw these people in their native habiliments. The men wore loin cloths. The women wore only short skirts. Their houses were built of bamboo with thatch roofs. Their educational level evidently was quite low. It was my feeling that they knew nothing about the war, communism, or any other ideology. They apparently wanted peace—and this desire was evident in all villages throughout South Vietnam.

What has this war cost us? The lives of 40,000 of the flower of American manhood, 250,000 maimed and mangled, and 120 billions of dollars.

Every 30 days as much blacktop is laid in Vietnam as there is in the New Jersey Turnpike. Every 60 days as much concrete is poured as is in Route 495, Washington's outer drive.

Also, this war has caused serious dissension among the youth of our country who may be called to serve. The questionable morality of the war and the serious inequities of the draft have caused thousands of youngsters to lose faith in our beloved country. Again, the war must be brought to a conclusion to cut short incipient revolt and rebellion.

The purposes of our being in Vietnam stated by the previous administration will be discussed in order.

First. That we are there to contain communism.

Does it make sense to contain communism 10,000 miles from home when Communist Cuba lies 90 miles off our shore, with its cancerous tentacles infiltrating and enmeshing the countries of South and Central America? Not only that, known Communists are permitted to work in our defense plants here.

Second. That we are in South Vietnam so that they may determine the type of government they want.

Numerous authorities, including Eisenhower, stated that 80 percent of the people would have gone with Ho Chi Minh if they had been permitted to hold fall elections in 1956, as had been provided by the Geneva Conference Convention, but our country went blindly in on the side of the 20 percent. Therefore, our argument for self-determination is spurious.

Third. That all countries of Southeast Asia would fall to communism.

The countries which would be affected do not fear this or they would have combat forces to the limit of their abilities in South Vietnam. Australia has fewer soldiers in Vietnam than it had at Tobruk. The Philippines have no combat forces. Malaysia and Indonesia have none. If they do not fear invasion, why should we sacrifice the lives of our young men to prevent it?

Our young people in America know the sordid reasons for this war. They feel that when they die in Vietnam, their lives are not given in defense of the United States. And their lives are all

they have. They feel that their visions, dreams, and hopes for the future are sacrificed to keep a few Vietnamese dictators in power.

I submit that this is the basic reason for unrest in our colleges and universities. The war must be ended expeditiously. I support the administration's policy for ending it.

Before entrance into any war, we must know beyond reasonable doubt that the future of our country is threatened, basing our actions on the words of Lincoln:

Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us dare to do our duty as we understand it.

We cannot fail.

#### ARTHUR GOLDBERG WRITES ABOUT THE GREEN BERETS

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I insert with these remarks an editorial from this week's issue of Life magazine by Arthur Goldberg, formerly an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, a man who has rendered distinguished service as our Ambassador to the United Nations and who performed most effectively as Secretary of Labor under the late President John F. Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, from the first unfolding of the recent Green Beret incident, I had a strong sense of personal disquiet. Somehow the development did not conform with American traditions nor with the traditions of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence which form the foundations upon which the legal system of this Nation is built.

Freedom has been recognized throughout history as fragile requiring protection of every facet of its many sides if the whole was to survive. I believe that in the recent Green Beret case something of great significance was taken from the American Government and the American people. Arthur Goldberg expresses quite eloquently and objectively the nature of that element of loss. After reading it I hope that many of my colleagues will share my feeling that something more must be done than to just brush this case under the rug.

Those the Government charged initially with a crime will, I think, throughout their lives be faced with the fact that no mechanism is provided to clear them, if in fact they are not guilty. On the other hand, if they were guilty no mechanism is provided to then impose punishment which our system demands must be given if law is to continue to be the basis for our society.

Mr. Goldberg's article follows:

#### ARTHUR GOLDBERG WRITES ABOUT THE GREEN BERETS

The dropping of murder charges in the now famous Green Beret case has almost everywhere evoked a widespread sense of relief.

I must confess that I find this reaction—and, even more, the powerful political clamor against prosecution which preceded the

dropping of charges—profoundly disturbing. In them I note an appalling, indeed frightening, deterioration in our national standards of morality and law.

Two comments are necessary by way of preface. First, what I say must not be construed as reflecting adversely upon the soldiers who were charged with murder, or as a judgment upon the facts of the case. Although the eight men will now not have their day in court, the old principle that persons accused of crime are presumed innocent until found guilty still lies at the heart of our legal system. The charges that were levied against the Berets were only charges. They were not evidence. Still less were they a finding of guilt.

Second, I do not have access to information which would enable me to judge whether the national security would indeed have been jeopardized by disclosures which might have resulted had the case been brought to trial. Nor, in fact, do I have any quarrel with the general proposition that considerations of national security may sometimes justify a decision by the authorities not to prosecute a particular set of charges.

What does alarm me is the way we have responded as a nation to the grave allegation that one or more of our uniformed soldiers executed without trial a foreign national whom they had in their complete control, because they suspected him to be a double agent.

Few of our people, and even fewer of our leaders, have manifested any sense of outrage that such an execution without trial might have occurred, or might have been ordered by American officers. Indeed, General Creighton Abrams, our commander in Vietnam and a brave and forthright soldier who knows the rules of war, has come under sharp public criticism for having insisted on their applicability in this case—to the point of ordering that murder charges be brought.

Of course war is hell. I suppose there has never been a war in which troops under the stress of battle have not committed acts of savagery which they would not think of performing under other circumstances. And I recognize that a counter-guerrilla war in the jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam is peculiarly prone to instances of misconduct of this kind.

But the Green Beret incident, as alleged, does not involve lapses of discipline under battlefield conditions. The charge was that a South Vietnamese agent in our employ and control was simply executed—rather than being detained, or tried, or turned over to the South Vietnamese for trial. No civilized nation can permit individual members of its armed forces to take this kind of action on their own initiative. Down that road lies anarchy.

Article 106 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice provides that alleged spies caught behind our lines and not in uniform may be punished by death—but not before trial and conviction by an appropriate tribunal. Articles 93 and 118 of the Code make it a crime for an American serviceman to murder or even to practice cruelty toward "any person subject to his orders." The Geneva Conventions to which we subscribe impose similar restrictions.

At the end of World War II we participated in war crimes trials at Nuremberg and elsewhere in which enemy military personnel who mistreated prisoners under their control were prosecuted, convicted and punished. We sentenced General Yamashita, the "Tiger of Malaya," to death not for his own acts but for his failure to control the conduct of troops under his jurisdiction. We treated as war criminals those German generals who had executed uniformed soldiers and agents

whom the Office of Strategic Services had sent into occupied Europe to train partisans, gather intelligence and commit sabotage—despite the generals' defense that Hitler had ordered them to do so. Under international law, as we applied it, an order such as Hitler's was an unlawful one, and therefore not entitled to obedience.

I take great pride in this nation's historic fidelity to the rules which govern civilized societies even when they are at war. Traditionally we have never allowed expedience to justify departures from these rules. In August of 1776, when our nation's very ability to survive was in doubt, the Continental Congress provided that alien spies were to be executed only according to the law and usage of nations, and on the sentence of a general court martial. The rule was followed from the bleak days at Valley Forge to the end of the war.

In 1942, when our struggle against the Axis powers was at its most desperate, the United States Supreme Court interrupted its summer recess for the first time in 22 years to reconvene and review the procedural protections being afforded eight Nazi saboteurs in civilian garb who had been landed in this country by submarine.

Has the time now come, after all these years, to adopt a lower standard of conduct?

The war in Vietnam is a tragic war, marked by events which no human being can applaud. Whether or not the national interests assertedly at stake there warrant our participation in it—at such sacrifice in lives, treasure and morality—the situation in Vietnam cannot justify us as a nation now, for the first time in our history, to tolerate—more, to legitimate—the cold-blooded murder of individuals wholly under the control of our troops. We may jail spies or prosecute them. But individual American soldiers may not take it upon themselves, away from the battlefield, to serve as prosecutor, judge and executioner. That is utterly unacceptable—now, as it was in 1776.

If the price of the war in Vietnam includes our coming to tolerate or applaud this sort of moral breakdown, it is one I am not willing to pay. Nor should any civilized nation. As a great patriot, Tom Paine, once said:

"He that would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression, for if he violates this duty he establishes a precedent that will reach to himself."

#### PRISONERS OF WAR: THE MEN IN LIMBO

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of American citizens, members of the armed services, being held prisoner in North Vietnam. We have been able to positively identify 401 men as captured. Approximately a thousand others, who are listed as missing in action, are thought to be help captive.

Today I am introducing a resolution which would express the sense of the Congress that our Nation and the people of the world do all in their power to obtain the humane treatment and prompt release of prisoners of war held by the North Vietnamese.

The Communist government calls the men "war criminals," and denies that as such they are entitled to the basic rights under the Geneva Conventions. In fact, they are the victims of the guerrilla

war engineered by the Government of North Vietnam.

I believe it is time that the antiwar protesters in this country begin looking at the Communist nation that is responsible for the countless deaths in South Vietnam and the atrocities being committed daily in the name of a "war of liberation."

It would be a great step forward if American boys received treatment half as humane as that received by Vietcong and North Vietnamese Army prisoners. The noisy demonstrators here at home would be well advised to work for this goal rather than the often meaningless slogans of the "new left."

People advocating the unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces do not seem to remember those of our troops over whom we have no control: the men held under subhuman conditions by the north.

I believe it is time to make every possible move to put pressure on Hanoi through diplomatic channels to free American men held by the Communists.

There are "free" nations which are on cordial terms with Hanoi. Sweden, for example, has most recently agreed to a \$40 million aid package for Hanoi. It is difficult to imagine that efforts by the Swedish Government in behalf of humane treatment for POW's would be unproductive.

I include the text of my resolution in the RECORD at this time:

#### H. CON. RES. 414

Whereas the United States Government and the Republic of Vietnam have continuously honored the requirements of the Geneva Convention relating to the treatment of prisoners of war;

Whereas the United States Government has repeatedly appealed to North Vietnam, and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to respect the requirements of the Geneva Convention, which North Vietnam has endorsed;

Whereas the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam have disregarded the provisions of the Geneva Convention and refused to release the names of prisoners of war who are members of the Armed Forces of the United States, to permit the regular flow of mail to or from those prisoners, and otherwise to accord humane treatment to those prisoners, and to permit inspection of the facilities in which those prisoners are held: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President, the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and all other concerned departments or agencies of the United States Government, the United Nations, and the peoples of the world to appeal to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention relating to the treatment of prisoners of war and to take such steps as may be appropriate to obtain the prompt release of all members of the Armed Forces of the United States so held as prisoners of war.

#### AID FOR BIAFRA

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

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, some of us who are interested in alleviating dire hunger, privation, and suffering in Biafra have been making urgent, persistent efforts to step up the aid being rendered by our Government, take satisfaction in knowing that our efforts are continuing, and that our intercessions and those of interested private, charitable, and religious groups are also helping a great deal to ease this horrible situation.

I am particularly pleased to bring to the attention of the House the recent action of President Nixon in making available two C-97 transport planes to joint church aid for their Biafran relief operations. Mr. William E. Timmons, Deputy Assistant to the President wrote me on October 10, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, October 10, 1969.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: As you recall, I wrote you on August 29 in response to your letter to the President on behalf of the Interfaith Effort for Biafran Relief. At that time, I stated I would be in further touch with you. I have been requested to inform you that the two C-97 transport planes have been transferred to Joint Church Aid for their relief operations.

The transfer of these aircraft is another indication of the President's deep and abiding concern to help relieve suffering in this tragic conflict. You can be sure we will continue our generous support of these humanitarian efforts.

With cordial regard,  
Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,  
Deputy Assistant to the President.

This is good news indeed, but it remains very clear that we must not rest on our oars in this matter. I recognize the operational problems of getting adequate relief to the sources, and they are serious, but some of the agencies concerned have found ways to circumvent them, and are managing to get urgently needed supplies into this distressed land to save the lives of young children and people who are suffering indescribably from lack of food and other necessities of life.

From the start, I have been making every possible effort to increase our aid to these woefully stricken people, and in thanking the President for his most recent action, I am again urging him to see to it that we keep up our country's strong financial support, in joining as we have been doing so generously, to send specific help to these stricken people.

Up to this time our Government has made available about \$63 million in aid which represents two-thirds of the global contributions, and which includes very substantial food donations under Public Law 480, to such commendable, human-spirited outside relief groups as the Catholic Welfare Service, Church World Service, Protestant, Jewish and other relief groups, UNICEF, and the world food program.

In addition, private U.S. organizations to date have made available about \$12 million in funds to assist the Biafran cause.

I am saddened to note, however, that some of the planes performing acts of mercy to bring food and other supplies to these poor people have been shot down, and otherwise restricted in their missions of mercy, making it very difficult in carrying out their dedicated, often hazardous, work to help these desperately needy people.

Nevertheless, this work must go on, and we must do everything we can, not only to provide funds, but where possible, to provide aircraft that other people are so bravely willing to fly in order to bring food and material relief to the sorrowfully afflicted children and people of Biafra.

I know that we who are so deeply interested in this great, humanitarian cause must and will continue to do everything we can to alleviate the truly deplorable hunger and privation which have caused widespread deaths, emaciation and untold distress.

Let me thank and hail the wonderful leaders and helpers enlisted in this cause. I am very proud of the church folks and others in my own great congressional district who are contributing such glorious efforts and very generous help to this great, human mission. The Good Lord will bless them and I am confident their work will continue until this great battle of mercy has been won.

I especially want the President to know of our deep gratitude for his effective and sustaining help.

#### MRS. NIKI ABINANTI

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, all too seldom in this day and age does anyone make a concerted effort to publicize the constructive activities of American youth, especially those who are attending America's universities and colleges; a fact in itself that is deplorable and inexcusable.

If one were to believe only what is reported concerning American youth, it would seem that the radical, irresponsible, and disruptive young people were in the majority. Quite frankly, such is not the case. In my judgment, the publicity seeking radicals constitute only a very small minority of our young people, while the majority are responsible and are constructively seeking ways to improve society.

Recently a young mother in my district in California set out to prove to the general public that the young people attending Humboldt State College were, indeed, acting constructively and responsibly, and her efforts have been more than successful.

Mrs. Niki Abinanti of Arcata became aroused by the reports in the media concerning the college riots and other disruptive activities of a minority of students and decided that it was time that someone publicized the responsible actions of the majority.

In order that my colleagues may know

of this dynamic lady's efforts, I am including an article written about her from the Humboldt Times-Standard. I hope that, in this way, others might be encouraged to step forth and become involved in a similar way.

#### LAUDING HSC WORKERS: SHE SPEAKS OUT FOR OUR QUIET STUDENTS

A petite one-woman steamroller has been quietly at work championing the activities of college students on the Humboldt State College campus.

Her concern is that "the radical, rowdy, publicity-seeking minority of students on California campuses and throughout the nation" have been getting the spotlight in the news.

In the meantime, the vast majority is not only unheard—but unheralded—a situation which, she says, broadens the so-called generation gap.

#### WRITING, PHONING

Mrs. Niki C. Abinanti, 1112 Chester Ave., Arcata, is either at her typewriter or on the telephone these days in a concerted effort to start a movement to publicize the constructive activities of students here. She has high hopes the movement will spread, with the help of other adults, throughout the state and nation.

To this end she has sent communications to CBS's Walter Cronkite, Harry Reasoner, Roger Mudd and Mike Silver; to Joey Bishop, who, she says has indicated some interest; California's Governor Ronald Reagan; Time Magazine's San Francisco headquarters.

She has also been in touch with a friend who could contact Danny Thomas; Kay Hart, a singer at Bimbo's Supper Club, local legislators and state legislators, including Assemblyman Jess Unruh.

So far she has a lot of communications she can exhibit for her efforts, some 80 registered air mail letters to CBS alone—but no takers.

A Time official said it was possible they could draw a "parallel" in the fall.

#### CELEBRITY VOICE

The housewife-mother believes that celebrities with their facility to reach millions of people could interest others, like herself, in projecting the good which is predominant in the youth of today. This could be done from community to community, in programs which would vary depending on environmental factors.

Mrs. Abinanti began searching the news, collecting accounts of the activities of college students on the HSC campus when campus troubles elsewhere were at their peak. She said "It was exceedingly gratifying to find that a vast majority of students were not only refraining from revolt, but were actually engaged in constructive activities, to the benefit of the entire community."

It was she who conceived the idea, and through the cooperation of Channel 3 and TV executive Paul Hoff, a student question and answer program was taped and presented in prime time locally. After the students' opinions were aired, the station received a barrage of mail and an extremely favorable public reaction.

She believes that such coverage nationwide would be highly relevant and would afford a pleasant change of pace besides giving the "forgotten majority" its chance to be heard.

#### ADVICE WELCOME

Reluctant to take the limelight, Mrs. Abinanti is quick to point out in her communications to others she has not had any experience in "this type of thing," and if she can do anything at all to get the ball rolling that is sufficient evidence that others can readily do it too.

Her approach to the problems relating to inadequate quarters and accommodations at Humboldt County's Juvenile Hall and Probation Building over the past years, however, was hardly reluctant.

It was her perseverance, along with that of interested community officials, which is largely responsible for the building of a new facility, now under construction.

If anyone can promote her present idea to fruition and wants to wager—best bets would be on this soft-spoken ball of fire.

#### AFTER THE MORATORIUM

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, as the tumult and shouting of the moratorium demonstrations fade into history, certain facts seem clear to me.

In the first place, a great many Americans earnestly desire peace in Vietnam.

No American desires this more than the President of the United States himself and he has embarked on a course which he hopes can bring honorable and lasting peace there.

The second fact which emerges is that the multiplicity of voices of critics of the Vietnam policy have, for all their noise and thunder, failed to come up with a clear and viable alternative to the President's present policy of step by step withdrawal and Vietnamization of the war.

This stands in vivid contrast to the tragic disregarding of any hope for freedom and self-determination for the people of Vietnam and the total waste of billions of dollars and 38,000 precious American lives which total and immediate withdrawal would entail.

The third thing that is clear to me is that many critics underestimate both the strength and virtue of the elected government in Saigon and underestimate the weakness and evil of its Communist challengers.

When I visited Vietnam in February of this year, I found a strong note of confidence in the increasing strength and popularity and the viability of that infant constitutional republic expressed by its military, government, and business leaders and by our military officials and those in our State Department.

There is every reason for such confidence.

The 1968 Tet offensive decimated the Vietcong forces, which were created and have already been sustained by Hanoi, and strengthened the hand of the Saigon regime. Its growing strength and responsiveness to the people have increased its popularity.

And as it grows month by month stronger and able to assume the burden of combat and as it grows more experienced in government, I am confident it can and will succeed in securing freedom and self-determination for the people in South Vietnam.

I urge every American to support the President's right and honorable course in Vietnam.

I feel the Governor of Alabama spoke for the overwhelming majority of the people of my State and for millions of

other Americans in the following statement which was published in the Birmingham News:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Oct. 15, 1969]

#### WHICH: THE EASY—OR HONORABLE WAY?

Another time of testing has come to America.

Many times in our history as a nation, we have had to decide between the easy way and the honorable way, both at home and abroad.

While our decisions to stand firm in behalf of freedom and justice have not always been universally popular, they have always been supported by the great majority of American people.

Today, we reach a time when we must decide again between the easy way and the honorable way.

Our flag flies in battle on foreign soil—while at home there are those who would have us believe that our people have lost the will to meet our commitments.

Let the word go forth from Alabama and America today that this vocal minority does not speak for the tens of millions of silent Americans whose deep desire for peace burns as brightly as the fires of our warriors' camps but who know that a peace without honor and justice is no peace at all.

Let every enemy, wherever he may be, know that we as Americans have again chosen the honorable way. (Albert Brewer, Governor of Alabama, Oct. 15, 1969.)

#### VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, while many of us have been critical of the conduct of the war in Vietnam—some of us desiring a more decisive military policy and others advocating total, immediate withdrawal—President Nixon has embarked, in a relatively short time, on a course in Vietnam which I believe may well prove sound.

It consists of a step-by-step withdrawal of American forces coupled with the Vietnamization of the war over a period of time so that the government in Saigon, created and elected by the people of that nation, shall not be undermined in the process and so that the Vietnamese military will have time to take over combat operations.

If this policy is allowed to proceed, I have every confidence that the South Vietnamese Government and military will become strong enough to guarantee self-determination for the people of the Republic of Vietnam and a free choice of their own government and governmental leaders.

Total and immediate withdrawal of American forces at this time would constitute nothing less than unconditional surrender and the unnecessary undermining of any hope of self-determination for the people of South Vietnam not to mention the wanton slaughter of thousands of individuals in that land. After the expenditure of 38,000 precious American lives and the investment of billions of dollars, such a withdrawal is, of course, unthinkable.

Self-determination for the people of Vietnam is the one basic principle which

the Nixon administration feels is not negotiable.

Under these circumstances, the war moratorium proposal is, in my judgment, destructive and remarkably unrealistic.

Had the President escalated the war or made new, unreasonable demands on the Communists, such demonstrations as those we have witnessed this week might be understandable, although I would disagree with those who participated.

Supporters of the moratorium say they are demonstrating to stress to the President their feelings and bring the situation to his attention.

Earlier this year, in a speech to the Nation, Mr. Nixon expressed his extreme concern about the Vietnamese situation saying nothing had taken so much of his time and energy as the search for a way to bring lasting peace to Vietnam.

He said, and I quote:

I want to end this war. The American people want to end this war. The people of South Viet-Nam want to end this war. But we want to end it permanently so that the younger brothers of our soldiers in Viet-Nam will not have to fight in the future in another Viet-Nam someplace else in the world.

There is no question of the President's concern.

Also, there are already indications that the growing vocalization of opposition to Mr. Nixon's policies are hampering our efforts in the Paris peace talks.

According to a wire service story last week, negotiators for the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong appealed directly to the American public to increase opposition to the President's policies to force him to accept their negotiation proposals in Paris.

The release goes on to say that Col. Ha Van Lau and Mme. Nguyen Thi Binh, and I quote, "whose governments apparently are setting great hopes on opposition to Nixon, warmly applauded the dissent in Washington."

The Communists could not ask for more in the way of support for their goals nor for their reluctance to negotiate a peace settlement.

Just what is our policy in Vietnam today, which is being so violently attacked?

One major negotiating position of the United States is the withdrawal in stages over a period of 12 months the major portions of all United States, allied, and other non-South Vietnamese forces immediately after an agreement is reached.

An international supervisory body, acceptable to both sides, would be created for the purpose of verifying withdrawals and for any other purposes agreed upon between the two sides.

This international body would begin operating in accordance with an agreed timetable and would participate in arranging supervised cease-fires.

As soon as possible after it began functioning, elections would be held under agreed procedures and under the supervision of this international body.

The United States does not insist that North Vietnam admit that it has forces in South Vietnam, for, as you know, no such admission has ever been made by the North Vietnamese delegation.

Arrangements would be made for the

earliest possible release of prisoners of war on both sides.

This country is seeking no bases or military ties in Vietnam and we are willing to agree to neutrality for the country if that is what the South Vietnamese people freely choose. Nor does this country have any intention of imposing any form of government upon the people of South Vietnam.

Our negotiators have said that we are prepared to accept any government that results from the free choice of the South Vietnamese people themselves.

The proposal to pull totally and immediately out of Vietnam or to tell the North Vietnamese that we will withdraw by a specific date could be disastrous not only for South Vietnam, but other nations in Southeast Asia which are trying desperately to determine their own futures without outside interference.

Vietnam represents a commitment by the United States to freedom in the world. It is a seedbed of individual rights which, if nurtured by American support, can spread these rights and keep them alive throughout Asia.

If the United States withdraws from Vietnam now, it will mean that this country has forsaken its obligations to the world and especially to Asia. It will open the floodgates of communism which would suppress their freedoms.

I do not want to bear the responsibility for this in Asia and I do not think the American people want to sit by and watch while one nation after another succumbs to Communist aggression.

Our policies in Vietnam during the last two administrations were unwise and led to the problems facing this Nation today. We should not, therefore, at a time when we are finally on the right track, turn around and resort to another egregious error in Vietnam policy—the immediate withdrawal of American troops.

Under previous administrations, we made the mistake of sending American combat troops to Vietnam. Once we sent them to that country, we should have had unrestricted military policies aimed at a real victory.

Massive campaigns by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong over the past year and a half, such as the Tet offensive in 1968, have ended in total failure and have, in fact, resulted in stronger support of the Republic of Vietnam's Government.

The Tet offensive was aimed at displaying the strength of opposition to President Thieu's government by taking over cities and attracting the wholesale support of the people.

Instead, the people of South Vietnam fled in terror and were further alienated from those who were supposedly liberating them by the Communist atrocities committed in the process.

These offensives have decimated the Vietcong so that current opposition in South Vietnam is composed of about 75 percent North Vietnamese forces.

It is generally agreed that following the failure of the Tet offensive in February of 1968, the Vietcong were placed on the defensive. North Vietnam was hard-pressed to supply enough men for

the battle in the South and Hanoi reflected noticeably the effects of U.S. bombing while South Vietnam, in the wake of national elections, showed new confidence and ability in governing and defending itself.

After the Vietcong's unsuccessful 1968 Tet offensive, if President Johnson and Secretary McNamara had listened to the urgent request of our military leaders, the enemy forces could have been brought to their knees and negotiations started on our terms.

This, however, was not the case.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to many critics of this administration's policy in Vietnam and some of them, in my judgment have assumed the National Liberation Front to have greater strength than it in fact has.

The NLF, which was created, sustained and has been directed by the North Vietnam Communist government, lost much of its infrastructure during the Tet offensive and has reached a position of relative impotence.

The Government of the Republic of South Vietnam, to contrast, has grown step by step stronger through the support of the people of that country which created the government in Saigon.

It is unjust and highly inaccurate to refer as some Members have done to both governments as two dictatorships without recognizing the basic distinctions between the government in Hanoi and the government in Saigon.

The Saigon government is moving toward freedom and individual rights and it is my desire to see it become stronger and purer and a better government.

Most importantly, this desire is strongly shared, to my personal knowledge, by many in the legislative and executive branches of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam.

To equate the infant representative republic in South Vietnam with the gangster government of Hanoi is, in my judgment, libelous.

It is as though these critics are saying that a child who has the measles is as sick as one who has cancer, so it is good to give the first child cancer because there is no hope for him anyway. Or it is to equate a sometimes-errant teenager with a hardened psychopathic criminal.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand this position.

On the positive side, within the past 2 years there has been created a constitutional republic in South Vietnam with the constitution drafted by a representative assembly and approved by a free vote of the people. It created a tripartite system of government including an executive branch and legislative branch elected directly by the people plus an independent judiciary.

The present Government of South Vietnam under President Thieu is not perfect, no government ever is. But it is the elected government, chosen by the people of South Vietnam in a free election despite acts of terrorism by the Vietcong.

President Thieu and others in the

South Vietnamese Government want peace and have made a number of concessions to the North Vietnamese to attain this goal.

Their country has been war-torn for years. It is unrealistic at this time, when an acceptable solution is in sight, to abruptly halt our efforts.

The Government of South Vietnam is becoming stronger, so is its military. Many critics of the war are addicted to disparaging remarks about the South Vietnamese people, about their alleged corruption, their laziness, their unwillingness to fight. As one who has visited Vietnam on several occasions, talked with her leaders and to many others who have been in Vietnam, I must set the record straight.

The South Vietnamese are a resourceful people who, although engaged in a war of survival for nearly 20 years, have held free elections, kept fighting in the face of often impossible odds and displayed incredible energy and ingenuity in so doing.

I am confident of their ability to sustain a viable, stable government and to take over the operations of the war in their country if given the time to do so.

In keeping with his drive for peace in Vietnam, President Thieu, in a speech following his Midway Island conference with President Nixon last summer, offered to talk privately with the National Liberation Front without preconditions toward the solution of the internal political problems of South Vietnam.

He called for the participation of all political parties and groups, including the NLF, in elections if they renounce violence and pledge themselves to accept the results of the elections. Thieu has said his regime would abide by such results.

This, in my judgment, is not too much to ask. It is a reasonable step.

At the same time, President Thieu warned that the other side should not misconstrue his desires for peace as a sign of weakness. He said, and I quote:

It should not be induced by our repeated acts of goodwill into believing that it has only to remain adamantly negative for us to accept eventual surrender.

The United States has provided a foundation on which the Republic of Vietnam can build itself militarily and politically. To remove that foundation without permitting South Vietnam to shore up its own strength would be to topple that nation.

It would seem to me, therefore, that under the circumstances, the movement toward step-by-step withdrawal which the President has initiated, is in order. While the limitations of our policy in the past have prevented a clear-cut victory, I think it would be a mistake to believe that nothing has been accomplished in Vietnam or that we will make no further progress.

What can still be accomplished is freedom and self-determination for the people of the Republic of Vietnam, a better hope for peace and stability in all of Asia, and the continued confidence of other nations in the strength and the will of our own great republic.

### THE NAVY NEEDS TO SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON THE TRUE SHAPE OF THE SOVIET SUBMARINE THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day the Nation's press featured stories attributed merely to "Navy sources" which poof-pooed the Soviet submarine threat and spoke in glowingly optimistic terms of the Navy's ability to handle this threat.

These stories represented a very grave distortion of the actual facts. Having had the privilege for the past 3 years of serving as chairman of the Antisubmarine Warfare Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, and as such having acquired some knowledge of where the Russians stand in the submarine field as well as where we stand in our ability to counter them, I simply cannot in good conscience allow these damaging anonymous stories to remain unchallenged.

These reports appeared widely on October 8 and 9, and proclaimed that the United States has a very comfortable 10-year lead over the Soviets in both the submarine and antisubmarine field. Here are a few of the more sensational assertions made in these stories, contrasted with what are the actual facts:

First. The "U.S. is about 10 years ahead of the Russians in antisubmarine capability." The fact is that our lead is in only one single aspect of antisubmarine warfare. In many others the Russians are plainly ahead of us, for example, in the sheer size of their submarine fleet, in their vastly greater capacity to build new and different submarines, and in the two new antisubmarine helicopter carriers of the *Moska* class, now operating in the Mediterranean, which have been termed the most advanced new ships in any navy today by Jane's Fighting Ships.

Second. The newest Soviet submarines are "noisier than expected and thus less able to conceal their location." This just is not so. Vice Admiral Rickover testified to our committee in 1968 in the published record that in terms of quieting, the Soviets had reached a point in 1968 that our intelligence experts had not expected them to reach until 1975. In other words, the Russians are 7 years ahead of our expectations, not 10 years behind.

Third. "The Soviets have never deployed missile-firing submarines within range of this country." This, too, is false. Soviet missile-firing submarines patrol regularly in range of Hawaii, and in December 1967, at the time of the wedding of President Johnson's daughter Linda Bird, one came so close to Washington that the whole Atlantic command was placed on alert and urgent efforts were made to chase the missile-firing submarine out of range.

This notion that the seriousness of the Soviet submarine threat is just a fantasy of some alarmist Congressman, which one local newspaper had charged on the basis of these stories, is utter hogwash. Admiral Rickover told Congress in 1968

that if he had to choose between commanding the present Soviet submarine fleet or the present American one, he would choose the Soviets without any hesitation. But Admiral Rickover, these anonymous Navy sources are also quoted as saying, "lacks the antisubmarine warfare expertise of other top officers."

The fact is that Vice Adm. Turner Caldwell, who is the Navy's own antisubmarine warfare czar and possesses probably more expertise in this field than any other Navy officer, testified before our committee this year on recent Soviet progress in the submarine field as follows:

Last year I was concerned. This year I am frightened.

Of course, the net effect of all these stories, if they are allowed to remain officially unchallenged by the top leadership of the Navy and the Pentagon, will be to undermine everything that Congress has tried to do in recent years to improve one important area of our Nation's defenses which, because of a certain lack of glamor, has all too often been the Navy's own stepchild.

So if the Navy really wishes to keep its ASW forces intact, and continue to do a better job of intercepting intruders than the Air Force did in Florida the other day, I would suggest that they take off the gloves, come out fighting, and set the record straight publicly and unequivocally for quotation.

Various news stories follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 9, 1969]

#### UNITED STATES YEARS AHEAD OF RUSSIA IN SUBS, NAVY SOURCES SAY (By Orr Kelly)

The Soviet Union is lagging at least 10 years behind the United States in submarine development, according to well-informed Navy sources.

Although new Soviet subs have come close to the speed of the most modern American subs—a fact which caused a flurry of apprehension when it was first discovered in January 1968—the Soviet subs are far noisier than their American counterparts.

This means that American sailors can hear Soviet subs twice as far away as they can be heard. In undersea warfare, this would almost certainly be a critical difference.

This margin of silence is also one major reason U.S. Navy officers are confident their subs would more than hold their own against the Soviet sub fleet even though they would be outnumbered more than 3 to 1 in the event of war.

#### REDS HAVE 350 SUBS

The Soviet Union now has some 350 submarines and is engaged in a vigorous construction program. In less than two years, four new classes of Russian subs have been seen—two of which are of special interest to the U.S. Navy.

One is the Yankee class, which is similar to the American Polaris and carries 16 medium-range missiles. It has not yet been determined whether the missiles carry multiple warheads. One model of the Polaris missile now carries a cluster of three warheads and the Poseidon, which can carry 10 or more small, independently targetable warheads, is under development.

Of the half dozen Yankee class boats so far produced, two have recently deployed for what appeared to be training cruises in the North Atlantic, but neither came within missile range of the United States.

#### NEVER WITHIN RANGE

In fact, Navy sources said, the Soviets have never deployed missile-carrying submarines within range of this country.

On the other hand, Polaris boats have long been stationed within range of Russian targets, prepared to fire if the United States were attacked.

For several years, the Soviets have had diesel-powered Golf and Hotel class submarines on station in the Atlantic.

They carry three relatively short-range missiles in their sail, or conning tower. The missiles could not reach this country unless the subs moved in much closer.

Navy officers had speculated that the Golf and Hotel subs might have been sent out to prepare the way for the nuclear-powered Yankee class subs with their longer-range missiles. So far, however, the new subs haven't moved into the positions occupied by the older boats.

Because they have produced relatively few of the Yankee class subs and have not yet deployed them in a meaningful pattern, Navy experts don't yet know how they will be used or what threat they may pose to this country.

The other submarine being watched with special care is the Charlie class. On its bow, it has four tubes, angled upward at an angle of about 30 degrees. So far, the Navy hasn't seen the tubes used and doesn't know what they are for.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 9, 1969]  
NEW SOVIET SUBS RELATIVELY NOISY, EASY TO DETECT

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON, October 8.—Recent intelligence reports on Soviet nuclear-powered submarines have convinced military analysts that in the rivalry for supremacy under the seas the United States is likely to stay ahead for some years to come. The reports find the newest Soviet submarines noisier than expected and thus less able to conceal their locations.

The information became available during recent Soviet maneuvers in the North Atlantic with the newest submarine, the "Y" class. The nuclear-powered submarine has 16 long-range missiles similar to those of Polaris system.

Some analysts say that because of the noise American nuclear attack submarines should be able to determine the location of Soviet submarines at about twice the distance that the Russians need to become aware of an American submarine.

#### OBSERVED IN THE ATLANTIC

But the rate and variety of Soviet submarine development and construction is of some concern, the analysts say. Over the last year or so, American intelligence has learned of four new types of Soviet submarines, three nuclear-powered and one propelled by a diesel-electric engine.

Within the last several weeks, according to these sources, the Russians have ventured into the Norwegian Sea and the North Atlantic with some of their first six deployed "Y" class submarines. Three or four others are being made ready for deployment and an undetermined number are under construction in covered construction yards. The Soviet Union is believed capable of building 7 to 12 nuclear submarines a year.

While the Russians have placed older missile submarines, whose missiles have a 700-mile range, on patrol within 1,000 miles of the coasts of the United States, the new "Y" class, with a missile range of 1,000 miles, has not yet been stationed near the United States.

Because Soviet submarines are so noisy, some military analysts are inclined to be less concerned than Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird and Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover over the potential vulnerability of the

41 Polaris submarines during the next decade.

#### DETECTION GEAR AT ISSUE

Their concern seems to be based on the belief that the Soviet Union could achieve a technological breakthrough in the field of underwater detection that might be hard to counter.

The analysts contend that the American antisubmarine warfare program is 10 years ahead of the Soviet program.

So far the "Y" class submarines have been assigned to the Northern Fleet, operative in the Barents Sea. None are believed to have operated in the Pacific, the Mediterranean or the Indian Ocean. As their number increases, they are expected to be assigned to all Soviet fleets.

According to the intelligence reports, the other new Soviet types of submarines are:

The "C" class, a nuclear-powered attack submarine with a bulbous bow that is believed to contain a new type of weapon. The analysts do not know whether this is an antisubmarine rocket, an antishipping missile or a coastal bombardment missile.

The "V" class, a more conventional nuclear-powered design, believed to carry homing torpedoes for use against shipping.

The "B" class, a diesel-powered submarine, smaller than the others, believed designed for close-in defense near the Soviet coasts.

The Soviet Union has about 350 to 375 submarines, roughly 65 of which are nuclear-powered. The United States has 156 submarines, of which about 85 are nuclear-powered.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Oct. 9, 1969]

#### NAVY GIVES REPS 10-YEAR SUB GAP (By Mike Miller)

The U.S. has a 10-year lead on Russia in the quality of attack submarines and anti-submarine warfare (ASW) capability. Navy sources said today.

This surprisingly optimistic assessment of the U.S. submarine program conflicts, however, with many public statements by Defense Secretary Melvin Laird.

During the recent congressional debate over the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system, Mr. Laird voiced fears that the missile-firing U.S. Polaris' strategic subs might become vulnerable to attack by Russian submarines in the next five years.

But the Navy sources predicted it will be perhaps as long as 20 years before the Russians can score a technological breakthrough that would enable them successfully to track Polaris subs at sea.

The sources also gave this comparison of the relative capabilities of the U.S. and Soviet nuclear-powered attack submarines—vessels designed to find and attack other submarines and ships rather than fire missiles like the Polaris.

The latest Russian attack subs are comparable to the Thresher class of U.S. subs deployed 10 years ago. To catch up, the Russians will have to go thru a similar 10-year period of technological development.

While the Russians have demonstrated dramatic speed increases with their latest models, pulling about even with the speed of U.S. subs, they have done so at the expense of noise. Meanwhile, the U.S. has concentrated on building quieter submarines to avoid detection by enemy ASW forces.

Russia's latest nuclear subs are about twice as noisy as the advanced U.S. models. Thus, the U.S. subs can hear the Russian ones long before being detected. Speed then becomes a secondary factor because there is plenty of time to move away and avoid detection by an approaching Russian sub.

Meanwhile, the U.S. is developing a new, high-speed nuclear attack sub, which promises to be faster than anything the Russians

have fielded, and an experimental super-quiet model.

Sources said U.S. sonar equipment is far superior to that of the Russians, enabling the Navy to do a reasonably successful job of tracking the position of Russian subs in vital areas of the high seas.

They acknowledged, however, that the world's oceans are too vast and the problems of ASW too complex for the Navy to pinpoint the specific location of all the Russian subs as sea at a given time. The problem is particularly acute in the Mediterranean, where a high noise level from ocean currents makes detection difficult. The Russians have substantially increased their Mediterranean fleet, including submarines, since the middle east war of 1967.

The Navy sources added that:

Despite years of trying, the Russians have never succeeded in tracking a U.S. nuclear sub, attack model or Polaris, at sea. U.S. subs use various secret methods to evade Russian subs which loiter outside U.S. nuclear submarine ports and try to follow them.

Russia now has six Polaris-class strategic submarines equipped to fire 16 missiles each. Two of these have made shakedown cruises in the Atlantic but their paths caused no alarm in the U.S. intelligence community over the possibility of an attack. None of the Russian Polaris-class boats has yet remained at sea long enough for the U.S. fully to assess its capabilities.

Some congressional committees have expressed concern in recent years over Soviet nuclear submarine advances and the fact the Russians have 350 submarines to 145 for the U.S. These reports are fueled by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, the "father" of U.S. nuclear subs who is impressed with the Russian program and wants the U.S. to build faster models.

While hailing Adm. Rickover as the foremost builder of nuclear subs, the sources said he lacks the ASW expertise of other top officers.

The sources also sought to put down persistent reports the nuclear submarine Scorpion, lost in the Atlantic last year, may have been destroyed by a Russian sub. There were no Russian submarines in the area at the time, the sources said.

#### RUN SILENT, RUN DEEP

After all the reports about Russia developing new terror weapons, it is comforting to hear that the United States has a 10-year lead on the Soviets in quality of nuclear-attack submarines and anti-submarine warfare capability.

This assessment, reported in The Washington Daily News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers, comes from highly reliable Navy sources.

It is both surprising and encouraging because for years we have been hearing mostly scare stories that Russia is rapidly overtaking the United States in submarine technology, posing a grave military threat. It turns out that we have not been getting the whole story.

According to the Navy sources:

Russia's latest subs are fast—about as swift as our models. But they are noisy—twice as loud as ours. This means the United States subs can detect Russian subs long before being heard themselves. To overcome this gap will cost the Russians heavily in time and rubles.

The Navy's sonar detection equipment also is years ahead of Russia's. This enables the Navy to do a reasonably successful job of tracking Russian subs in vital areas of the high seas. The Soviets are said never to have successfully tracked a U.S. nuclear-powered sub at sea.

Congressmen and others who often sound the alarm about Russian subs want the United States to continue building rather than stopping with 41 Polaris missile-firing

strategic nuclear subs and 69 nuclear-powered attack subs—the program established by former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. They may have a good point.

But the Navy sources, by getting out the word on relative capabilities of current U.S. and Soviet subs, have performed a public service. And Russia is learning the hard way that modern nuclear subs should run silent as well as deep.

#### ON VIETNAM

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

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, when the people of this country made the decision in the fall of 1968 to change the complexion of their Government by electing a Republican President, there was evidence enough of the need for change and redesign. The overcreative approach of the past two administrations had far outstripped the basic requirement of Government to manage efficiently the affairs of the Nation and to solve the problems current to our society. This resulted in a climate of promise and in a catalog of false hopes.

In order to respond to the demands of the people of America who brought into being the Nixon administration, the new President has addressed himself to the hard task of solution. The time now is for picking up the pieces—the time now is for management, for discipline, for constructive action. The time now is to face four-squarely the reform of those things which consume the public resource but do not contribute to the public welfare. In short, the time is for reorganization and for hard decision.

The overriding problem, and the one most churning in the national conscience, is the war in Vietnam. It represents a position not well enough understood by the American people. It grew out of a tradition of assistance to emerging nations; it developed from a belief in the principle that peoples have an inherent right to establish government of sovereignty vested in themselves.

The failures to recognize sooner the effects of massive involvement of American manpower were a matter of history before Mr. Nixon took office in January 1969. Nevertheless, these failures, along with the fatigue and sacrifices, we have experienced as a nation because of years of involvement without the kind of success which has been traditionally ours, weighed heavily not only on us, but also on the nations who were historically our friends.

Out of this the President has developed a new direction, a new leadership toward peace. It must be a peace that will work amid the massive political forces inherent to Southeast Asia. It must not be a false peace which will content Americans who may be living in a dream world of neo-isolationism. If it is a peace that results in the massacre of dissenters who believe in their own right to elect their own government, it will not be a peace at all but an outright surrender. It will be a turning of the tide in this world toward the subordination of man's spirit to a totalitarian concept of communism which we have rejected time

and time again as being inadequate to serve the best interests of mankind.

No President in history has inherited a more complex, a more difficult, or a more frustrating situation than is represented by our involvement, for more than a decade, in the wars of Vietnam.

The opportunity for solution, the opportunity for broadening the basic principle of self-determination, will be greatly enhanced by the singleness of purpose and sense of unity on the part of the American people.

Wars are terminated by hard decision, and skilled leadership. Effective leadership nearly always is a reflection of national purpose. The purpose here is to bring about a lasting conclusion and a meaningful peace. No one in this administration, from the President on down, deviates from that purpose. Is it asking too much that, as the world's most powerful nation, we Americans join hands and hearts in a spirit of national pride and overriding dedication to our own institutions of government, to our own President? It has been this great spiritual dimension of America that has brought us to a point of magnificent opportunity to perfect our civilization with new technologies. It has been this spirit which has kept alive the desire for freedom in the hearts of men wherever they exist on this planet. It has been this spirit which has been the source of our great strength and our contributions to mankind.

Today in history when the American spirit is needed so badly, why do we consider the proposition of abandoning it?

#### THE VIETNAM MORATORIUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GRAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed ironic that the hard-won freedoms for which millions of Americans have fought and died since the beginning of the history of our Republic should now serve the purposes of those who would destroy it and those same freedoms on which they must depend to sustain their cause. But this was not unpredictable; our forefathers foresaw the possibility, and indeed, the right to dissent openly and freely has held an important place in checking what some may call "government by consensus."

And so, today, the Vietnam moratorium proceeds unobstructed, and as characteristic of the inherent nature of dissent, it has the unfortunate tendency of being construed as the mouthpiece of public opinion, because it is organized and because dissent generates its own sensationalism which readily finds its way into print for mass consumption. How true it is that dissent will always motivate overt action, while the lack thereof is merely tacitly relished, leaving the mind at rest and giving little cause to rant and rave as to one's own peacefulness that all is well.

Thus, the moratorium has become the symbol of dissent of an unpopular war abroad, but in my view, is also the manifestation of the present-day objective of

protest for whatever alleged grievance—to force upon the majority the dissenters' views, if not by persuasion, by threat of or actual violence. This is the alternative, in the view of an impressionable minority, to seeking change through the established institutions of representative government. The President is claimed to be "insensitive" to the demonstration; he is chastised for "failing" to be responsive to the realities of public concern. It is difficult for me to conceive of the naivete of those who believe that today's demonstration should be the cause for the President to radically alter his policy, for the only alternative presented to him is total and unconditional withdrawal of our forces within a specified period of time. I go on record as stating my unequivocal support of the President's policy of seeking an honorable and durable peace in Vietnam, as it would be presumptuous of me, or anyone else, to think that we as individuals have the wisdom or, more importantly, the means to implement and effect the intricacies of negotiations in the absence of a policy of total and unilateral withdrawal, a completely repugnant option to me and, I believe, to the majority of concerned Americans.

Consider the President's own words:

First, there is a clear distinction between public opinion and public demonstrations. To listen to public opinion is one thing; to be swayed by public demonstrations is another. A demonstration—in whatever cause—is an organized expression of one particular set of opinions, which may or may not be shared by the majority of the people. If a President—any President—allowed his course to be set by those who demonstrate, he would betray the trust of all the rest. Whatever the issue, to allow government policy to be made in the streets would destroy the democratic process. It would give the decision, not to the majority, and not to those with the strongest arguments, but to those with the loudest voices . . .

The planned demonstrations will tell us that a great many Americans are deeply concerned about the war; that some of these consider U.S. participation immoral; that many want U.S. troops withdrawn immediately and unconditionally. But all of us in the Administration are already well aware of this sentiment . . .

There is nothing new we can learn from the demonstrations. The question is whether in the absence of any new evidence or any new arguments, we should be turned aside from a carefully considered course. The policies we are now following reflect our own best judgment, based on exhaustive study of all available evidence, of how to achieve that goal. To abandon that policy merely because of a public demonstration would therefore be an act of gross irresponsibility on my part . . .

One of the first acts of my Administration was to review, exhaustively and comprehensively, every aspect of the nation's policies in Vietnam. We have drastically altered the policies we inherited . . . For nine months, we have worked every day for a just end to a conflict which has been building for more than eight years.

Indeed, if for no other reason, the motives of the so-called moratorium are suspect for proclaiming that the President has done "nothing" to end the war—one that has gone on for 8 years—during the period of only 9 months in office. The only conclusion to be reached, again, is that the dissenters will consider

nothing less than total and unconditional withdrawal of American forces, regardless of the consequence of this Nation's vital interest in the security of that part of the world; the credibility of its commitments throughout the world; the tenacity of its adherence to the principles of individual freedom and self-determination for all peoples and nations; and the sure fate of a bloody and barbaric Communist suppression of the South Vietnamese people. I do not believe that the spirit of this Nation could withstand the consequences of such a move at the cost, already, of some 40,000 American lives in South Vietnam.

To be sure, the President's course of action, even in the face of the implacable North Vietnamese and Vietcong negotiators, has been radically altered from the past realities of escalation and the virtually complete domination of the war by American forces. Succinctly stated, a recent article in the *National Review* summarized:

The outlines of President Nixon's Vietnam policy have now become clear. During the next eighteen months a substantial number of American troops will be withdrawn—around half the number now there. Drastic tactical changes and increasing use of Vietnamese troops and regional forces will 1) greatly reduce American casualties, and 2) eliminate the possibility of a Communist takeover. Those American troops remaining in Vietnam will be volunteers, largely professionals, rather than draftees.

This strategy is entirely plausible—so plausible, in fact, that the hard Left is moving at full speed to counter it. The principal instrument thus far has been designed by the "Vietnam Moratorium Committee" and consists of a McLuhanized variation on the old General Strike . . . There will be teach-ins, demonstrations and all the rest of it. The Moratorium Committee also proposes that the strikes expand by one day each month as long as the war continues. The Left has thus threatened to disrupt higher education, and whatever else it can get its hands on, in the interest of bringing about a humiliating American defeat in Vietnam . . .

It is unprecedented, not to say unspeakable, that American forces in the field should be undercut at home by an effort of this sort, and it is even more contemptible in light of the President's now evident strategy. What the October 15 movement tells us is that de-escalation is not enough; that a reduction in casualties is not enough; that fighting a de-Americanized war with volunteers is not enough. Nothing but an American defeat, with a consequent Communist takeover in the South . . . will do.

Even more damaging than the moratorium itself, in terms of jeopardizing the lives of American forces remaining in Vietnam and solidifying the gap between the Paris negotiators, is the weight given to the cause of defeat and Communist victory by the overt support of a number, however few, of persons who, by virtue of their positions in government, education, or elsewhere, give backbone to an otherwise ill-advised, ill-informed, and generally impulsive minority who would, and do, protest anything—from saying a prayer on the moon to fighting a war, any war. In a word, columnist Richard Wilson, basing his observation on an in-depth survey by the respected Institute of Social Research at the University of Michigan, says:

Members of Congress, college presidents and government administrators who, because of expediency or intimidation, have aligned themselves with the war protest and have joined an anemic, if rowdy, company with no political clout. [Emphasis added.]

It is for certain that such individuals have, in recent days, been vigorously competing for television time to express their views on Vietnam. Richard Wilson's column, appearing in the October 13, 1969, issue of the Washington Evening Star, follows:

**VIET PROTESTERS DELUDE POLITICIANS, SURVEY SHOWS**

President Nixon says that he will not be affected by anti-war demonstrations and he has very sound ground for ignoring them. They do not represent significant political opinion even among the young.

It is possible to say this with more than impressionistic assurance on the basis of in-depth surveys of the 1968 presidential election by staff members of the highly respected Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan.

Members of Congress, college presidents and government administrators who, because of expediency or intimidation, have aligned themselves with the war protest have joined an anemic, if rowdy, company with no political clout. The protesters are a small fraction of the young. Most of the young who oppose the Vietnam war disapprove their tactics. Others oppose not only their tactics but everything they stand for.

Such conclusions flow naturally from the findings of the Michigan researchers on the phenomena of the 1968 election which have upset a great many preconceived ideas of the mass media, especially television, on what happened in that dark and confused year, viz: Gene McCarthy's support came as much from hawks who hated Johnson for bungling the war as from the peaceniks who wanted him to end it.

Other astonishing conclusions bear on the present resurgence of war protest which has unhinged so many members of Congress, probably to their future regret.

One such astonisher is that George Wallace got more than his share of the support of the young. "One of the major ironies of the election," the Michigan researchers wrote, "was that Wallace made his appeal to the old but mainly received the vote of the young."

The Michigan academicians saw it this way: "Although privileged young college students angry at Vietnam and the shabby treatment of the Negro saw themselves as rallying forth to do battle against a corrupt and cynical older generation, a more head-on confrontation at the polls, if a less apparent one, was with their own age mates who had gone from high school off to the factory instead of to college, and who were appalled by the collapse of patriotism and respect for law that they saw about them."

The vanguard of youthful revolution, the researchers found, is numerically swamped even within its own generation. The wave of the future for 1970 and 1972 promises several times more votes to politicians by leaning toward George Wallace than by leaning toward Gene McCarthy, the researchers found.

If the Michigan researchers are right (they support their conclusions with the most advanced sociological techniques) the Vietnam Moratorium is more likely to create an unfavorable reaction than to advance the cause of Peace. But even if the researchers have been so scientific as to mislead themselves, common observation supports their intimation that great masses, young and old, do not like this kind of thing.

President Nixon's problem is to marshal this mass reaction on his side, which he has

not been too successful in doing. If he is to pursue his course of measured disengagement without sacrificing his ultimate goals then he probably will have to speak and act in more blunt terms.

He will have to ask and answer what the consequences will be if he withdraws abruptly from Vietnam, as the peace elements demand.

Will such an abject surrender create strong undercurrents of resentment which will fester in American life for generations? It will not be enough to say that he will not be the first American president to preside over a military defeat, nor that he will not be influenced by the anti-war demonstrations. He will have to spell out why in the most direct and simple terms, not sparing the members of his own party whose political courage in these circumstances is not equal to his.

The reason the President will have to speak this way is so that he can command the respect and support of the middle America he supposes he represents. Nixon will have to demonstrate that the noisy manifestations of dissent are those of a minority who will be satisfied with nothing less than abject and apologetic defeat as a lesson against such involvements in the future and irrespective of the fate of the Vietnamese people, the prestige of America and the future of Asia.

If the President does not wish to do this, if he wishes to continue to be ambivalent so as to appease those who are trying to destroy him, he will sooner or later discover that they cannot be appeased short of total American humiliation in Vietnam. That does not go for the great numbers who are sick of the war but want an honorable settlement. It does go for radical activists, their academic and intellectual sympathizers, and frightened politicians.

There are those who have said they are tired of hearing the same "old" argument that antiwar protests in the United States have the effect of aiding and abetting the enemy. But, in fact, it is no secret that the Communist North Vietnamese and Vietcong have long savored the unrest caused by the anti-Vietnam protesters which has certainly been given consistent and broad coverage in the news media. I dare say that from the arguments and demands set forth by the antiwar demonstrators and the Communist negotiators, it is difficult to determine who is feeding whom the line. The occasion of this moratorium is the first, I believe, where the Communists have so blatantly and outspokenly endorsed the antiwar movement and denounced the President in connection with it. Said Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh, the foreign minister of the Communist provisional revolutionary government—a government in fiction only:

The Vietnamese people warmly acclaim this movement of the American people who demand that the Nixon administration put an end to the war of aggression in Vietnam and rapidly and totally withdraw American troops.

The gist of this propaganda—to end the war according to the Communist design—was again broadcast by Radio Hanoi last night and monitored throughout the country. No better a propaganda forum has been available to the Communists than the Paris negotiations, and no more damaging propaganda has been supplied them than that by their "sympathizers" here in the United States. While paying lip service to "peace," they denounce and make a

mockery of the only means by which an endurable peace can be achieved—through the office of the President of the United States. As columnist David Broder has said, writing in the Washington Post:

Given the impatience in this country to get out of that miserable war, there is no great trick in using the Vietnam issue to break another President. But when you have broken the President, you have broken the one man who can negotiate the peace.

This column, appearing in the October 7 issue of the Washington Post, follows:

**A RISKY NEW AMERICAN SPORT: "THE BREAKING OF THE PRESIDENT"**

(By David Broder)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—If there are any smart literary agents around these days, one of them will copyright the title "The Breaking of the President" for the next big series of nonfiction best-sellers. It is becoming more obvious with every passing day that the men and the movement that broke Lyndon B. Johnson's authority in 1968 are out to break Richard M. Nixon in 1969.

The likelihood is great that they will succeed again, for breaking a President is, like most feats, easier to accomplish the second time around. Once learned, the techniques can readily be applied as often as desired—even when the circumstances seem less than propitious. No matter that this President is pulling troops out of Vietnam, while the last one was sending them in; no matter that in 1969 the casualties and violence are declining, while in 1968 they were on the rise. Men have learned to break a President, and, like any discovery that imparts power to its possessors, the mere availability of this knowledge guarantees that it will be used.

The essentials of the technique are now so well understood that they can be applied with little waste motion.

First, the breakers arrogate to themselves a position of moral superiority. For that reason, a war that is unpopular, expensive and very probably unwise is labeled as immoral, indecent and intolerable. Critics of the President who are indelicate enough to betray partisan motives are denounced. (That for you, Fred Harris.) Members of the President's own party who, for reasons perhaps unrelated to their own flagging political careers, catapult themselves into the front ranks of the opposition are greeted as heroes. (Hooray for Charley Goodell.)

The students who would fight in the war are readily mobilized against it. Their teachers, as is their custom, hasten to adopt the students' views. (News item: The Harvard department of biochemistry and molecular biology last week called for immediate withdrawal from Vietnam.)

Next, a New England election (the New Hampshire primary is best but the Massachusetts Sixth Congressional District election will do as well) surprisingly shows that peace is popular at the polls. The President's party sees defeat staring it in the face unless it repudiates him, and the Harris poll promptly comes along to confirm his waning grip on public trust. The Chief Executive, clearly panicky, resorts to false bravado and says he will never be moved by these protests and demonstrations, thus confirming the belief that he is too stubborn to repent and must be broken.

And then, dear friends, Sen. Fulbright and the Foreign Relations Committee move in to finish off the job.

All this is no fiction; it worked before and it is working again. Vietnam is proving to be what Henry Kissinger once said he suspected it might be—one of those tragic, cursed messes that destroys any President who touches it.

That being the case, any President interested in saving his own skin would be well-advised to resign his responsibility for Vietnam and publicly transfer the assignment of ending the war to Congress or the Vietnam Moratorium Committee or anyone else who would like to volunteer for the job.

But he cannot. And that is the point the protesters seem to overlook. Assume that they and the President are both right when they assert the time has come to end this war. Assume that the protesters know better than the President how to do so—despite the conspicuous absence of specific alternatives to the President's policies in their current manifestos.

There is still a vital distinction, granting all this, to be made between the constitutionally protected expression of dissent, aimed at changing national policy, and mass movements aimed at breaking the President by destroying his capacity to lead the nation or to represent it at the bargaining table.

The point is quite simple. Given the impatience in this country to be out of that miserable war, there is no great trick in using the Vietnam issue to break another President. But when you have broken the President you have broken the one man who can negotiate the peace.

Hanoi will not sit down for secret talks with the Foreign Relations Committee. Nor can the Vietnam Moratorium's sponsors order home a single GI or talk turkey to Gen. Thieu about reshaping his government. Only the President can do that.

There is also the matter of time. It is one thing to break a President at the end of his term, as was done last year. It is quite another thing to break him at the beginning, as is being attempted now.

The orators who remind us that Mr. Nixon has been in office for nine months should remind themselves that he will remain there for 39 more months—unless, of course, they are willing to put their convictions to the test by moving to impeach him.

Is that not, really, the proper course? Rather than destroying his capacity to lead while leaving him in office, rather than leaving the nation with a broken President at its head for three years, would not their cause and the country be better served by resort to the constitutional method for removing a President?

And what a wonderful chapter it would make for Volume 2 of "The Breaking of the President" series.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we may rightly ask what purpose the Vietnam moratorium serves. Will it alter the President's course of action? As he has stated, no. Does it express the desire of the majority of the American people to unilaterally, totally, and unconditionally withdraw within a fixed time? I do not believe so. Is this alternative, as sought to be imposed on the President, designed to be constructively critical? The fact that it is a fixed alternative answers that question in the negative. In my estimation, the only purpose to be served at all, if any, is to limit the options to two: First, unilateral, total, and unconditional withdrawal in a specified time, or, second, support of the President's policy to negotiate a lasting peace, with the cooperation of the Government of South Vietnam, and without a fixed time limit for withdrawal or a wholesale, unilateral withdrawal in the absence of mutual withdrawal—and to polarize American opinion accordingly. I am firmly of the belief that given these two choices now at issue, the overwhelming majority of Americans will come to the support of

the President. The spirit of the American people to end this war honorably and the interest of international peace depend on it.

#### THE WRONG CURE FOR INFLATION

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

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, we in this country are consumed with our desire to terminate the war in Vietnam, and to do so in such a way that the peoples of South Vietnam will continue to have the right of self-determination, and to protect the lives of our own troops in withdrawal, and to prevent the butchering of hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese by the North.

However monumental this effort may be, we simply cannot let slide or gloss over the state of the domestic economy. We are in most serious trouble. The \$25 billion deficit which we suffered in fiscal 1968, on top of substantial previous deficits, together with what I consider to be the irresponsible action of the Federal Reserve Board in ballooning the supply of money during the last half of fiscal 1969, shifted our country into high-gear inflation. I have great concern over the efforts which have been made thus far in an effort to deal with this tremendous problem. The efforts have been courageous and well intentioned, but I for one feel that they are not hitting the mark, and are not strenuous enough.

My concern as a Congressman from the Northwest in regard to the measures which have been taken are perhaps more exaggerated than that of the average Member. As in the past, the traditional cures for inflationary trends have an immediate depressant effect on the homebuilding industry and on construction generally. We in the Northwest feel this effect exactly the same as all other areas in the United States. However, there is another and a secondary effect, much more devastating, that we feel which is not felt in other parts of the country. Oregon's economy is timber and lumber oriented. The woods fiber industry is the backbone of our entire economy. When home building and construction drops, the core of our economy is hurt. Thus we suffer with all other areas, and we suffer acutely the additional problem of hardship in the woods fiber industry.

At the present time, there are in excess of 10,000 unemployed in this industry in the Northwest. It appears obvious that the situation is going to become much worse before it starts to recover for the Northwest.

With the start of President Nixon's administration, the Federal Reserve Board wisely reduced the rate of increase of the money supply, a policy of gradualism, until May of this year, when the supply's increase was completely cut off, a situation which I am advised still continues. Our economy has started to slow, reacting to the policy of gradualism in money supply and to other brakes placed on the economy. I am advised further that it will probably be nearly the

first of the year before the "no increase" policy of money supply will be felt. I would expect that there will be grave and extended reaction at that time, which, of course, will make the economy of the country and of the Northwest in particular suffer much more intensely than at the present. This policy must be changed.

Perhaps this is a price that we could and would pay if we were certain that our inflationary problems would be cured in the process. However, I see no real signs of any relief, and very little promise of meaningful relief. I believe that it is evident that wage demands will be even higher than in the past, and that prices subsequently will follow the resultant upward path in the continuing cycle.

Although there is some argument about it, I am convinced that we are in the cost-push type of inflation, as distinguished from the traditional high demand-low supply type. The use of fiscal and momentary controls has and can be effective against traditional inflation, but I do not think it is the proper medicine for cost-push inflation. If wage demands continue high, prices will continue to rise, and the cycle goes on, catching in the squeeze the millions of people in this country who cannot protect themselves.

I would respectfully suggest that the administration should immediately re-study our posture in the war against inflation, lest we be caught in the dreadful position of the worst of both worlds, simultaneous recession with continued high inflation.

Specifically, I would suggest the most serious consideration of the following measures:

First, an immediate return to the policy of gradualism by the Federal Reserve Board in increasing the money supply;

Second, the imposition of selective credit controls on many installment consumer purchases;

Third, continuation of the Kennedy investment tax credit at its present level, thus permitting productivity to increase, and permitting the United States to maintain a better position of competition in the world markets;

Fourth, an immediate halt to statements by officials of this administration that wage and price controls are not being considered. This situation is akin to a spectator watching a fire blazing out of control, and announcing repeatedly that the nearby water hydrant will not be used.

Fifth, a request by the administration for standby wage and price control legislation, with a clear and loud public announcement that it will be implemented by the President retroactively if wages and prices continue to accelerate;

Sixth, muscular jaw-boning by the President himself in an effort to persuade industry and labor that they each have a very high interest in containing inflation. The past administration attempted the jaw-boning technique so often, with no parallel governmental effort to reduce its own spending, that the process was cheapened to the point of uselessness. President Nixon has made

an excellent start in fulfilling his campaign pledges of reducing Government spending, and has made substantial cuts, even in the previously sacrosanct defense budget. He has thus established his own credibility and I believe would be effective in efforts in the private sector; and

Seventh, concerted effort should be made in addition to the foregoing suggestions to spread the sacrifice around, and not concentrate it in the home building and construction industries. The recent Federal construction cutback will have little immediate effect, other than to cause hardship to many contractors, and in the end will result in even higher construction costs. Any one huge industry cannot be mobilized and demobilized, and once again mobilized without the consumer ultimately paying a substantial penalty. High interest rates and tight money are the principal causes of the drastic reduction in our commitment to the housing goals of this Nation. Placing contractors in a worsened position will not solve either of these basic problems, and will have no real effect on home building starts.

Focusing specifically on the home-building problem, in addition to the other suggestions, I believe immediate attention should be given to the following possibilities for relief:

First, appropriation, on a loan basis of a substantial amount of money for the home loan bank system to enlarge their credit supplying capacities to sav-ings and loan associations;

Second, exempt the first \$750 of interest earned on savings in institutions which invest a substantial percentage of their deposits in single-family home mortgages;

Third, legislation limiting the Federal tax exemption enjoyed by pension and retirement funds to those that invest a substantial percentage of their funds in single dwelling family home mortgages; and

Fourth, legislation permitting the Veterans' Administration national service life fund to be available for direct loans for single family homes for veterans.

There are several other programs suggested by the National Association of Home Builders which merit very careful and immediate serious consideration.

I know that the President and other high ranking officers in the administration are determined to break the inflationary cycle. I know that great effort has been made to correct this situation. I am, however, fearful that too much emphasis has been placed on textbook remedies, and not enough consideration has been given to the practical proposals which I believe would spread the burden of the fight more evenly, and would bear much more promise of success than what has been undertaken to date.

We are in a domestic emergency of frightening proportions, and I am only asking that a reevaluation of our remedies be made, and that it be made on an objective, practical basis. I hope that our administration never makes the mistake of automatically attempting to justify past policy, with the inevitable result of a hardheaded continuation on a course which, without a genuine review, might turn out to be wrong.

#### EXCHANGE OF FOOD STAMPS FOR PREPARED MEALS FOR THE ELDERLY

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

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, today, along with 78 other Members of Congress, I am introducing legislation which would amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to authorize elderly persons to exchange food stamps under certain circumstances for meals prepared and served by nonprofit organizations.

The bill is identical to language contained in the recently passed Senate food stamp bill and was originally sponsored by Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania. It would extend the benefits of the food stamp program to elderly persons now denied eligibility because they are physically unable to cook for themselves. Under this legislation, nonprofit, charitable organizations would be authorized to accept food stamps in exchange for cooked meals prepared either for home delivery or for consumption in community dining halls.

Under the present law, persons who otherwise meet age, residency and income requirements are not eligible for food stamps if they do not have cooking facilities in their households. If individuals are physically incapacitated or have a chronic illness which makes it impossible to shop or prepare food, and if they have no one to do these things for them, these persons are in effect denied the use of food stamps. We see no reason why these citizens, who are often among the most isolated and needy in the community, should be denied the benefits which the Food Stamp Act was enacted to provide.

This legislation would amend the Food Stamp Act to meet this problem. It would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, under regulations carefully prescribed and administered by him, to designate specific church and other nonprofit organizations of a bona fide charitable nature, to accept food stamps in exchange for prepared meals. Although the redemption of these stamps would assist eligible groups in the purchase of food, the stamps themselves would be issued only to individuals who would be the direct beneficiaries of this amendment. By engaging the cooperation of nonprofit, charitable organizations, this proposal would be in keeping with the current trend of relying more heavily on private initiative for solutions to pressing national problems.

In these times of unprecedented economic achievements, the basic goal of "having enough to eat" still remains, for too many Americans, a promise rather than a reality.

#### GIMMICKRY BY THE BIG FOUR AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a brutal automobile accident occurred in Syracuse, N.Y., in my congressional district. This tragic event compels

me to speak out on a matter which has been on my mind for some time.

During the last few years, an ominous trend in automotive manufacturing has taken place, foreboding an increasingly dangerous situation on our Nation's highways. With the advent of the so-called supercar, the death rate and the incidence of partial and permanent maiming resulting from highway accidents have skyrocketed. Only a short time ago, the Nation's foremost insurance companies announced that they were increasing the premiums on supercars by over 50 percent. I am not addressing myself to the merits or lack of merits of the insurance companies' decision to increase their premiums. I am citing their decision rather as a concrete example of the concern which has been raised over this situation. Nor am I questioning the freedom of an individual to purchase the automobile of his choice. That freedom, of course, is an essential ingredient in the democratic process. What I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, and what every parent and responsible American should be concerned about is the gimmickry which the automobile manufacturers, the big four of the industry, engage in in attempting to induce our young people to purchase these highway missiles.

We have witnessed a great deal of debate and discussion recently on the issue of automobile safety. We have witnessed massive recalls of defective automobiles, defective from both a mechanical and a safety standpoint. These alone should make one stand up and take notice. But, coupled with a monumental sales campaign put on by the automobile manufacturers to convince the public that happiness is a warm, supercharged automotive animal, capable of leaping tall buildings at 100 miles an hour, the whole situation demands an element of self-imposed restraint on the part of the manufacturers.

Day in and day out, in the newspapers and on the radio and television, the manufacturers offer an engaging invitation, particularly to our young people, to get away from it all in overpowered, superperformance, death-defying cars that purportedly are the envy of an Indianapolis contestant. Yet, whether intentionally or not I cannot say, they offer us these earthbound spaceships in the sublime surroundings of a traffic-free highway, a lonely seashore or a Nevada desert. Now, I do not know about the rest of my colleagues in the Chamber today, but I for one have not traveled on a traffic-free highway in some time, and I guarantee that only a tiny percentage of our population spends much time cavorting around the Nevada deserts. The point here is that high-powered, supercharged automobiles are presented to the public in surroundings that exist only in the mind of some Madison Avenue huckster. The fact is that these cars are going to be driven on city streets and country roads which are designed for conventional highway travel. They should be advertised and sold to the public on that basis. If a youngster is brainwashed into believing that a supercar is supposed to be driven at 80 miles an hour, the chances are that he might be tempted to do just that.

I do not believe that Congress, or any other legislature, has or should have the right to tell automotive manufacturers how to advertise their products. But I do believe we have a moral responsibility to plead with them to consider the consequences of their decisions. One can multiply the tragedy in Syracuse a thousandfold across the country.

No one is suggesting that supercars be banned from manufacture; no one is suggesting that the public be denied the right of choice in its purchase of an automobile. I am suggesting, however, that automobile manufacturers redirect their advertising campaigns to avoid the implication that supercars are harmless toys that offer a measure of security, a sense of social acceptance, and a high rating on the popularity chart simply by depressing the accelerator as far as it will go.

#### FRESHMAN ECONOMICS NO. 8—UP, UP AND AWAY GO PRICES

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, it is quite possible that this administration will succeed in being the first American Government to maximize unemployment, cost of credit, and interest rates while inflation hits an alltime high. Truly a breathtaking accomplishment, given all the factors involved. If it were not so sad, the soothing gurgles passing for public statements of the ruling economic whiz-bangs would be amusing. As it is, they are merely ludicrous. Let us therefore proceed to further explorations into the world of freshman economics.

The aluminum industry rates a gold star this time, because it has shown the greatest corporate irresponsibility in recent price increases. Kaiser upped aluminum ingots \$20 per ton on primary metal forms, plus it increased prices for insulated wire and cable by 4 percent. Alcoa followed in a spirit of true American competition. And was it not surprising that the rest of the industry followed the same day with the same hikes?

Louis Allies Co., a subsidiary of Litton, raised induction motor prices 7 percent. Gould, Inc., increased prices on rechargeable batteries. Not wishing to be considered nonconformist, Goodyear upped prices on its passenger, truck, and farm tires and tubes by 2½ percent. This rise is the second for Goodyear in 4 months. The rest of the newsprint industry raised their rates. More good news followed as RCA, United States Steel, and Armco Steel played follow the leader in a variety of hikes. TV sets, stereo receivers, stainless steel, foundry coke, grinding and lapping machines, and insulated wire and cable product prices shot upwards, as industry again demonstrated its public spirit and desire to ease inflation.

Retail meat prices are a national scandal, as meat producers continue to enjoy the privilege of grazing their animals on millions of acres of public domain at bargain prices. In the past 5 months, retail meat costs to consumers have risen

at the rate of 12.6 percent. Yet we are told by the administration's consumer advocate that they are actually going down.

Then Control Data Corp. raised charges for computer products and maintenance services. Monsanto, Container Corp. of America, and Mead Corp. further brightened our lives by upping prices on chemicals, folding cartons, and white paper. Note that all these products are basic to everyday life, being either sold directly to consumers or used in a wide variety of essential products.

Meanwhile, public holders of almost a quarter of Government securities maturing October 1 and December 15 decided they would rather be paid in cash than take new Treasury notes yielding as much as 8 percent, the highest return on Government issues in 110 years. Confidence in our Government is mounting, as we can see. Reflecting pressures exerted by American policies, British and Belgian banks upped their prime rates.

Construction costs have risen more rapidly in recent months than at any time since World War II. The Nation's railroads have agreed to seek an across-the-board freight rate increase of 6 percent. Unless the ICC intervenes, these will take effect October 18. Net new orders for machine tools, the production machinery that goes into the Nation's assembly lines, continued their precipitous decline.

This was all capped by a momentous announcement by the Labor Department, which announced the greatest jump in unemployment in 9 years. At least half a million more Americans are pounding the pavements looking for jobs as a result of the economic policies of the administration. The Secretary of the Treasury announces that such a 4-percent unemployment level is "acceptable." Enlightening and eloquent, to say the least. Compassion and sympathy are his middle names.

Meanwhile, the Federal Government grows richer through the progressive growth of its sources of taxation. Simultaneously, the tax sources of our cities shrink in proportion to their rising costs of operation. And the administration gaily slices away at essential programs, such as model cities and medical research, to name only a pair, for the entire list is as long as it is sad and depressing. Plenty of money for wars and military boondoggles, such as ABM. Nothing for the cities.

This type of national policy is as silly as raising homing pigeons and then moving. At this rate, by the time we will have caught up with the Joneses, they will have refinanced or gone to the poorhouse, if one remains. Our Government has a combination of the financial cold wobbles and economic cholera morbus. The average major corporation leader sports an income as fat as a young sequoia as unemployment lines lengthen. The facts are plain, yet the Government ignores them, tightens the screws, and pretends that all is well. Was it not a little boy who was supposed to whistle as he passed the cemetery? Such folly is 110 proof.

#### MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, during the last several years, I have maintained a keen interest in the activities conducted under the Manpower Development and Training Act and have been most impressed by the institutional programs conducted under this act. Some 540,400 trainees have been reached through over 10,000 projects since the inception of the act.

The Division of Manpower Development and Training in the Office of Education has been constantly attuned to the needs of the unemployed it serves particularly the so-called hard core trainee and has provided outstanding leadership in the development of programs specifically structured to their needs.

The institutional programs—under MDT—offer trainees the only opportunity for hard-core individuals to obtain a base of occupational knowledge that will permit them not only to become employed but to advance in the occupation. Entirely new opportunities for upward mobility have been opened up in the health field, the clerical field as well as in other occupations. This training has made possible for nurses aides to utilize their base of training to progress as licensed practical nurses.

The clerical training program has made available to the disadvantaged in such new areas of endeavor as stock brokerage clerk.

I have recently become aware of a new development that can be supportive to any of the programs that relate to the disadvantaged, that is the Area Manpower Institutes for Development of Staff—AMIDS. These are in five separate locations and are conducted through contracts with the Office of Education. They were developed to provide needed training in relating to the needs of the trainees served by manpower programs. They have served not only instructors, counselors, and administrators of these programs, but also employment service counselors and coordinators, national contractors, and personnel from industry.

It is with interest that I follow this program and I commend the Division of Manpower Development and Training, Office of Education, for the contribution it is making in breaking the cycle of poverty for the disadvantaged that are really being reached in the institutional programs under MDTA.

#### A CONVINCING CALL FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, there has just been brought to my attention the recent statement of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions

Development, entitled "Leadership and the Educational Needs of the Nation." This powerful appeal to action was sent by a distinguished panel of educators and lay citizens to the President, to the Senate, and to our own House of Representatives earlier this month. It strikes out in poignant language about the national mood of "cutting back":

Everywhere the mood appears to be one of cutting back—withdrawing—seeing how little we can get along with; in short, a steady retreat from the bold plans the nation launched several years ago.

The statement goes on to demand that the political leadership of America—in the executive branch and in the Congress "demonstrate to the young that the Nation can envision a future of hope and that we can translate that vision to tangible policies and sensible priorities. We could do no better in this than to start with the field of education itself." It continues:

If the Executive Branch feels that Congress has not moved in a fashion appropriate to the time, let it take leadership. If the Congress feels that the Executive Branch has not sensed the urgent need for a bold educational policy for the nation, let it provide the leadership. But let us have leadership.

Because this cogent and carefully reasoned statement deserves widespread discussion, I include the text of the entire statement of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development in the RECORD at this point:

#### LEADERSHIP AND THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE NATION

The National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development is charged with reviewing and evaluating programs of the Federal government which support the training and development of educational personnel. We come to Washington several times each year to review with those responsible for the administration of these programs the progress they are making in their efforts to provide the best teachers for our schools and colleges. We have just concluded one such meeting. We are deeply disturbed about what we find.

Everywhere the mood appears to be one of cutting back—withdrawing—seeing how little we can get along with; in short, a steady retreat from the bold plans the nation launched several years ago.

Specifics are not hard to come by. Only last week the U.S. Commissioner of Education pronounced the "right to read" for every youngster in the nation. At that very time, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was directing the Office of Education to cut \$8 million of a \$13 million program, a substantial portion of which was designed to improve the preparation of teachers of reading.

Just two months ago, the House of Representatives cut appropriations supporting the chief program of the Federal government for the preparation of college teachers. The 1969 appropriation of \$70 million was reduced by \$14 million.

In neither case has there been offered any compelling evidence to warrant such reductions.

But it is not only a matter of reduction in funds. There is also an absence of any bold planning to meet the problems of tomorrow. We have reviewed a recently-completed report recommending programs related to the training of educational personnel that should be undertaken by the Federal government. This report, a plan for the next five years, was prepared by one of several sub-groups

of a Task Force on Education appointed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There are many worthy programs in this plan. We commend the Department for taking this kind of initiative in looking ahead. But we find the conception and scale of the plans no match for the needs. In fact, the so-called plans are timid and token. It would appear that instead of taking as a point of departure a searching inquiry into the needs of education and concluding with a determination of the resources required to meet these needs, this group was faced with an assumption of severe financial constraints and the necessity to fit its planning into this assumption.

In dramatic fashion, these decisions and actions add up to default on the proclaimed responsibility of the Federal government to act as a partner with the other levels of government in supporting the nation's educational enterprise. The Council believes strongly in this notion of partnership. We reject any suggestion of domination of the Federal government. But each partner must do its *share*. And when we find that the States have, in the last two years, increased their expenditures for higher education by 38% for elementary and secondary education by 28%, and when we find that at the same time the Federal government is cutting back, we can conclude only that there is, in fact, a default of responsibility on the part of the Federal government.

Recently the House of Representatives voted a substantial increase in appropriations for education. We commend the leadership of both parties in this effort. But apart from this action—which has yet to be voted by the Senate and signed by the President—retrenchment is the only signal coming out of the Federal government at the present time. This signal creates a mood—a mood that is affecting the thinking and actions of those in the Federal agencies responsible for administering educational programs and of those in the field who are trying to provide new prospects for the young.

While we sit for two days as members of a Federal Advisory Council and read this signal and sense this mood, we bring with us a sense of another reality "out there"—as the principal of an elementary school in a ghetto, as a school board member in Oregon, as president of a university in Appalachia, as a graduate dean in a private university in New England, as a superintendent of schools in the fourth largest city in the nation, as a professor of physics in a Midwest university, as a guidance counselor in Arizona—as people from a variety of educational settings and various parts of the country. Here we read a different set of signals, sense a different mood.

Above all, we sense a worsening climate in American schools and colleges. While increased controls by school and university authorities may be necessary to check the activities of certain small destructive groups, we assert that present national conditions are deleteriously affecting the studies, the hopes, and the convictions of a wide and responsible segment of the educational community. A new and ugly cynicism and anti-intellectualism is infecting American education. Repressive measures will not arrest this trend, and may even accelerate it; positive and affirmative leadership promptly to end the war and to address forthrightly our domestic problems *can* do so. While these attitudes stem from the war and the disparity between the ideals of the nation and present realities, it is the judgment of this Council that, as Representative Brock and his colleagues so sensitively discerned, the source of much of the disquiet can be traced to fundamental inadequacies of education itself. The needed improvements and reforms will come about only if appropriate leadership is offered, leadership in the educational community and leadership in government, particularly—as

we have noted earlier—from the national government.

Too many of our young are concerned by what they are *against*—the war, racism, poverty, corruption. They need, as have all youth in all times, to be *for* things, to have a star, a dream. While we recognize that such affirmative leadership is subtle, and will require politically difficult actions, we feel that the growing dismay and cynicism of our youth could develop into a calamity of devastating proportions. The future college and school teachers—the *people of greatest concern to this Council*—are a centrally important group among our youth, and their disaffection can have serious effects in future years.

It would be unfortunate if our political leadership were to take the position that a response to the dissatisfactions of the past—or the yearnings for a different kind of future—must await the ending of the war, or some other development. It is now we must plan. It is now we must act. It is now that we must demonstrate, *mainly to ourselves*, that a nation which can take such just pride in its extraordinary achievements in the material realm is no less resourceful, no less vigorous, no less sacrificing in dealing with matters of the spirit.

Competent observers have noted a growing sense of purposelessness on the part of an influential segment of our student population—a feeling of these young people that it is not possible for our social institutions to cope with an increasing complexity.

If politics is the art of the possible, then our political leaders have a special opportunity to demonstrate to the young that the nation can envision a future of hope and that we can translate that vision to tangible policies and sensible priorities. We could do no better in this than to start with the field of education itself. More policemen in the schools is not a policy; it is an admission of failure.

If the Executive Branch feels that Congress has not moved in a fashion appropriate to the time, let it take leadership. If the Congress feels that the Executive Branch has not sensed the urgent need for a bold educational policy for the nation, let it provide the leadership. But let us have leadership.

#### NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Adron Doran, President, Morehead State University, Morehead, Kentucky.

Annette Engel, Director of Special Education, Roosevelt School District, Phoenix, Arizona.

Rupert N. Evans, Professor of Vocational and Technical Education, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

Susan W. Gray, Director, Demonstration and Research Center for Early Education, George Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee.

Laurence D. Haskew (Chairman), Professor of Educational Administration, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

E. Leonard Jossem, Chairman, Department of Physics, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Marjorie S. Lerner, Principal, George T. Donoghue Elementary School, Chicago, Illinois.

Kathryn W. Lumley, Director, Reading Clinic, Public Schools of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

Carl L. Marburger, Commissioner of Education, State Department of Education, Trenton, New Jersey.

Edward V. Moreno, Executive Secretary of the Mexican-American Commission, Los Angeles City Schools Districts, Los Angeles, California.

Lloyd N. Morrisett, President, Markle Foundation, New York, New York.

Mary Rieke, Member, Board of Education, Portland, Oregon.

Theodore R. Sizer, Dean, Graduate School

of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Bernard C. Watson (Vice Chairman), Deputy Superintendent for Planning, Philadelphia School System, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Joseph Young, Executive Director.

### VIETNAM

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER), objected to a unanimous-consent request for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 582, jointly sponsored in a bipartisan effort by both the majority and minority leaders. It was acknowledged that the resolution was in response to the open letter to the American people from the Premier of North Vietnam in support of the Vietnam moratorium, or, as the Premier called it, "their fall offensive" whose purpose he construes to be forcing the United States "to withdraw completely and unconditionally" from Vietnam. The specific purpose of the resolution was twofold:

First, to endorse the right of all Americans to responsible and peaceful dissent, but to abhor the Premier's attempt to associate those Americans who demonstrate for peace with the cause of our enemy; and

Second, to repudiate the Premier's letter and call upon all Americans to disassociate themselves from North Vietnam's declaration.

As I understand the gentleman's reasons for his action, under leave to extend his remarks, they are that—

First, the subject matter is too important not to be given due consideration; Second, there is some hidden implication in the words of the resolution;

Third, it was wrong for "certain prominent" Americans to call attention to the Premier's letter in the first place; and

Fourth, it would be more appropriate to condemn those of our own citizens who sought to give attention to the letter with the inference that it was done to discredit the moratorium.

Mr. Speaker, the words of the resolution are in plain and clear English and it was certainly not intended to support or reject the administration's policy. Regardless of the gentleman's reasons, his action is certainly another feather in North Vietnam's propaganda cap and that is all that will be reported in the Communist press. I include the text of the resolution for all to judge accordingly:

#### H. RES. 582

Resolution relating to demonstrations for peace

Whereas responsible dissent and freedom of speech are among the most sacred traditions of the American people; and

Whereas many Americans are demonstrating their concern for peace pursuant to rights enjoyed under the Constitution of the United States, from which springs our Nation's deep commitment to peaceful debate, the essence of our free political system; and

Whereas the Premier of North Vietnam has publicly described the Vietnam Moratorium

in an open letter to the American people as "their fall offensive" aimed at forcing the United States "to withdraw completely and unconditionally" from Vietnam; and

Whereas the said Premier greatly misjudges Americans, and deceives himself if he believes that those who demonstrate are doing so with a desire to assist Hanoi; and

Whereas the said Premier's letter to the American people is a blatant and insolent intrusion into the affairs of the American people by an enemy; Therefore be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives,* That we support the inherent right of all Americans to responsible and peaceful dissent, but we abhor the attempt of Premier Pham Van Dong to associate those Americans who demonstrate for peace with the cause of our enemy; and be it further

*Resolved,* That we repudiate the Premier's letter and call upon all Americans to disassociate themselves from North Vietnam's insolent and intolerable declaration.

### AN ARTIST PASSES

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have lost a friend. The world has lost an artist who took great delight in extracurricular activities in every phase of civic endeavor including chairmanship of the Redding-Georgetown Democratic Town Committee.

I was personally proud in June 1966 when Hugh Donnell made the principal nominating speech in my favor at the district congressional nominating convention. It was a sad day for me on September 26, 1969, when I received word of Hugh Donnell's death following a short illness.

The Redding Pilot of October 2 published the report of Hugh Donnell's death and included with it a biographical report replete with identity of the many commendable areas of interest to Hugh Donnell, and in which he performed with a genuine feeling for the public interest. I include the report from the Redding Pilot herewith:

#### HUGH DONNELL DIES AT AGE 66

Hugh Donnell, chairman of the Redding-Georgetown Democratic Town Committee from 1951 to 1966, died at Age 66 last Friday at Danbury Hospital following a short illness.

A familiar figure on the Redding scene, Mr. Donnell was active in almost every field of civic endeavor. He was particularly visible at town meetings, where over the years he crusaded for diverse personal and political causes ranging from the Saugatuck Reservoir battle of the late 1930's to the workmanship of a neighboring developer as late as this summer.

A skilled and humorous public speaker, Mr. Donnell was called upon to nominate U.S. Rep. John S. Monagan at the June 1966 Fifth Congressional District convention. He himself ran on the Democratic ticket for State Representative from Redding in 1960.

Although his was a distinctly minority party in a heavily Republican region, Mr. Donnell used to recall that when he and Mrs. Donnell moved here from New York in 1928, the first selectman and most other major town officials were Democrats. And he used to predict that the tables would someday turn again.

His involvement in community affairs sometimes went beyond the community. He even served as chairman of the Danbury

Chamber of Commerce. In Redding, he served on the Police Advisory Board until his death, and he was at one time a commissioner of the West Redding Fire Department.

His skills as a professional artist were put to use in creating a distinctive image for the Annual Town Reports, the Bicentennial program in 1967, and numerous pamphlets and publications for the town's two libraries, the Boys' Club, and the Boy Scouts.

Mr. Donnell was born in New York City in 1902, the son of the late Samuel J. and Dorothy Lang Donnell. He attended the Art Students League in New York and in 1928 married Lola Michele, his only survivor.

The Donnells came to Redding immediately following their marriage and made their permanent home on Diamond Hill Road.

A commercial artist by profession, Mr. Donnell also developed a highly personal style for this "serious" painting, reworking vacation sketches into warm, multi-faceted land and seascapes; one of his pet causes, unrealized, was to obtain a gallery of some kind in which Redding's many resident artists could display their work.

Early this year, Mr. Donnell dropped his account with Volkswagen of America, for which he was art director of "The Weather Vane." But he continued his long association with Hal Foster of Lee Lane, creator of the "Prince Valiant" comic strip, as colorist, working in his crowded studio at the rear of his home.

His work has been represented in one-man or group shows at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Modern Art, the Silvermine Gallery, and New York's ACA Gallery. He served for several years on the Connecticut Commission for the Arts.

The Rev. James B. Yee, pastor of the First Church of Christ Congregational, officiated at a burial service at Umpawaug Cemetery on Monday, Sept. 29.

### LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS

(Mr. POFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in concert with Senator HRUSKA, of Nebraska, I have introduced a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act enacted last year.

This legislation would make two principal changes. First, it would authorize \$650 million for fiscal year 1971. Second, it would promote greater flexibility in the administration of the 15 percent discretionary funds authorized under section 306 of the act.

For the current fiscal year, moneys available to fund the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration do not yet exceed \$300 million. Plans submitted by States if fully funded would require more than \$1.1 billion for fiscal 1971. While most of these plans appear meritorious and while some might even be called urgent, it is felt that \$650 million is a more realistic estimate of the total commitment that can be made at this time. While our legislation does not make any provision for fiscal years 1972 and 1973, it is anticipated that when the program becomes fully operational, it will require an appropriation in the neighborhood of \$900 million.

I do not look upon these expenditures as an extravagance. On the contrary, they represent an essential investment. I have made it my concern to survey the work of the Law Enforcement Assistance

Administration, and I must say that I am much pleased with the progress it has made. Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act was designed to activate a working partnership between Federal, State, and local governments insofar as such a partnership can properly function without violence to jurisdictional concepts in the Constitution. In its truest sense, the process of monetary grants by the Federal Government to the States and localities is a splendid example of the new concept of revenue sharing. It can become a showcase for utilization of the concept on a broader scale.

When title I was passed, it was assumed that section 306 was broad enough to permit LEAA the discretion necessary to administer the discretionary fund in a genuinely discretionary manner. Under that section, 85 percent of the funds is allocated to State planning agencies. The other 15 percent can be used by LEAA as it thinks best in promotion of the criminal justice system. In practice, the language has been found to be too restrictive. The amendment proposed in the legislation Senator Hruska and I have introduced would make it possible to make discretionary grants to units of general local public agencies, Federal or State law enforcement offices or agencies, institutions of higher education, or combinations of the same.

I hope the Committee on the Judiciary can give early attention to this legislation.

#### MORATORIUM

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is by intention and not by oversight or omission that I have withheld comment about the moratorium until the day of observance has passed.

I have waited not only to find out whether it was peaceful or violent, but because I did not want to associate myself in any possible way with the efforts of the National Moratorium Committee who have called for the immediate and total withdrawal of all our troops from South Vietnam without at the same time making any demands whatsoever of the North Vietnamese.

Not a single one of us wants to continue this war any longer than is necessary to secure an honorable conclusion. One thing we must never forget, however, is the consequence of an immediate and unilateral withdrawal. We must think of the effect this will have, not for the moment, but for the future. Throughout all of Asia, whether in the Philippines, Taiwan, Japan, Pakistan, Indonesia, Malaysia, Australia, and New Zealand there exists gnawing fear of the consequences of a hasty United States withdrawal from Vietnam. Put in a few words, there would come into being the widespread feeling that no one in the future could rely on the United States as they have in the past.

If we disengage without some type of honorable conclusion but simply walk out and turn South Vietnam over to the

Communists then we have charted our course not simply for Vietnam, but for all of Asia.

The head of the independent State of Singapore has said that as much as he hates communism, if the United States makes no firm stand but acquiesces to all of the demands of North Vietnam and the Vietcong, then he will have no future course but to embrace their principles and accept their dictation as a matter of self-survival.

If leaders of the National Moratorium Committee could only realize that their demand to disengage immediately and unilaterally means to charge off all of Asia, not just Vietnam, and leave our friends to the mercy of their foes, then they might make a more responsible request for a moratorium in the hope that the war would end as a result of mutual deescalation. If they had any intention to be more responsible they would limit their demands to a temporary cease-fire to see if the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong would respond. If on the other hand the present policy advocated by the moratorium committee were followed the consequences would amount not to peace but to a policy of surrender.

The worst thing about the moratorium movement is that it may give the North Vietnamese and Vietcong in Paris the impression that the mood of our country is one of surrender. If this impression is gained by our enemy then the advocates of "peace" may actually be serving the complete opposite purpose of prolonging the war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was present in the House last Tuesday night. I participated in my own way by listening to those who had asked for special orders as well as those who challenged their remarks. My participation did not take the form of speaking or engaging in debate. Instead, my contribution was to be present to vote to protect the rights of those whose persuasions were in opposition to my own views. I voted against both motions to adjourn. I was present and answered to my name on the quorum calls.

Who can say whether those who spoke in favor of immediate withdrawal from Vietnam, last Tuesday night, changed the minds of any one single House Member? Even if that did not happen, I left the floor late Tuesday evening greatly impressed with the dignified manner in which the proceedings were conducted. Although I must state frankly I was not swayed from the course I feel we must follow in Southeast Asia, I was proud of the respect shown on the House floor for conflict of opinion.

I bow to no one who may think he has a greater desire to see an end to the hostilities in Vietnam than myself. I think we all want peace returned to the world. Yet, it is wrong to conclude that the large outpouring of thousands of demonstrators yesterday and last night and the eloquence of the speakers on the House floor Tuesday night accurately reflects the sentiments that the majority of our people want to let Hanoi take the war by default and for our country to suffer the loss of prestige and honor that would result if we were to turn tail and run leaving thousands of South Vietnamese helpless before the onslaught of

a heartless and murderous Hanoi takeover of all of Vietnam.

Every one of us is as weary of the war as those speakers who expounded on an immediate and unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam. Clearly, the most significant thing about the moratorium is the fact that those who spoke and those who marched were able to do so in this land of the free. They could march, carry their candles, show their placards, and openly express their views. The most impressive thing of all about the moratorium is that a protest of this kind could take place in an orderly manner without many incidents of violence. Even though I found their arguments defective, I am happy and proud that my colleagues were given the opportunity last Tuesday evening to express their views by speaking on the House floor. There are far too many countries in the world where such freedom of expression would not be tolerated.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for October 17, on account of official business as U.S. observer to NATO parliamentary Conference.

Mr. PETTIS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. MOSS), for today through Monday, October 20, 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. BUCHANAN, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. MORTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNT, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 60 minutes, on October 21.

Mr. WYATT, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GOLDWATER, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BIESTER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STRATTON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN immediately following the remarks of Mr. ERLÉNORN on the conference report on H.R. 13194 today.

Mr. GROSS to revise and extend his remarks on the conference report on H.R. 13194, today.

Mr. MORGAN during the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 11039.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota immediately following Mr. MIZE during general debate in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. SEBELIUS to follow the remarks of Mr. MIZE during general debate today.

Mr. FOREMAN prior to the vote on the Landgrebe amendment during consideration of H.R. 4293.

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

Mr. RARICK during debate on H.R. 4293 and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. SCHADEBERG.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. HARSHA.

Mr. HORTON in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.

Mrs. DWYER in three instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mrs. REID of Illinois.

Mr. BOW.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. RALLSBACK.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. HALPERN.

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in five instances.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. FARSTEIN in four instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in six instances.

Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. REUSS in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington in two instances.

Mr. FUQUA.

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. SYMINGTON in two instances.

Mr. CLAY in five instances.

Mr. GIBBONS in three instances.

Mr. NEDZI.

Mr. SISK.

Mr. KASTENMEIER in two instances.

Mr. MANN in three instances.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. NIX in two instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. MCCARTHY in three instances.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. ADDABBO in five instances.

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. BRASCO.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in three instances.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA.

Mrs. MINK.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. HAGAN in five instances.

Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows: S. 2910. An act to amend Public Law 89-260 to authorize additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 12781. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13194. An act to authorize special allowances for lenders with respect to insured student loans under title IV-B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 when necessary in the light of economic conditions in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education, and to increase the authorizations for certain other student assistance programs.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 20, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1263. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe rules, regulations and performance and other standards as he finds necessary for all areas of railroad safety and to conduct railroad safety research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1264. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 501 and 504 of title 18, United States Code, so as to strengthen the law relating to the counterfeiting of postage meter stamps or other improper uses of the metered mail system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7618. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the Federal Government to the Board of Public Instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla.; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8664. A bill to authorize an increase in the number of flag officers who may serve on certain selection boards in the Navy and in the number of officers of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve who are eligible to serve on selection boards considering Reserves for promotion (Rept. No. 91-572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9564. A bill to remove the restrictions on the grades of the director and assistant directors of the Marine Corps Band (Rept. No. 91-573). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8662. A bill to authorize command of the U.S.S. Constitution (IX-21) by retired officers of the U.S. Navy (Rept. No. 91-574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 10317. A bill to adjust the date of rank of commissioned officers of the Marine Corps; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11548. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit naval flight officers to be eligible to command certain naval activities and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 14001. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to authorize modifications of the system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces under this act (Rept. No. 91-577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 584. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 13950, a bill to provide for the protection of the health and safety of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-578). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 14376. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for treatment and rehabilitation centers for drug addicts and drug abusers, and to carry out drug abuse education curriculum programs, and to strengthen the coordination of drug abuse control programs by establishing the National Council on Drug Abuse Control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 14377. A bill to amend the Social Security Act concerning psychiatric benefits available under titles XVIII and XIX; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL:  
H.R. 14378. A bill to provide for additional penalties for commission of a crime in the District of Columbia when armed; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:  
H.R. 14379. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for sex education in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GAYDOS:  
H.R. 14380. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD:  
H.R. 14381. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (for himself and Mr. CHAPPEL):

H.R. 14382. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RYAN:  
H.R. 14383. A bill to prohibit the procurement of California table grapes by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:  
H.R. 14384. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:  
H.R. 14385. A bill to provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Md.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZWACH:  
H.R. 14386. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to develop training in family medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIESTER (for himself, Mr. BROCK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DELLENBACK, and Mr. DERWINSKI):

H.R. 14387. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to authorize elderly persons to exchange food stamps under certain circumstances for meals prepared and served by private nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDADE (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. MINISH):

H.R. 14388. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to authorize elderly persons to exchange food stamps under certain circumstances for meals prepared and served by private nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. ST GER-

MAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. VIGORITO):

H.R. 14389. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to authorize elderly persons to exchange food stamps under certain circumstances for meals prepared and served by private nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. WHALEN, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 14390. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to authorize elderly persons to exchange food stamps under certain circumstances for meals prepared and served by private nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOWDY (for himself and Mr. CABELL):

H.R. 14391. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Big Thicket National Monument in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:  
H.R. 14392. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits, with subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits and a minimum primary benefit of \$80; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUDE:  
H.R. 14393. A bill to provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Md.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:  
H.R. 14394. A bill to provide for the protection of the health and safety of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:  
H.R. 14395. A bill to protect interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting the movement in such commerce of horses which are "sored," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETTIS (for himself, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. CORMAN):

H.R. 14396. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:  
H.R. 14397. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to modify the provisions relating to discretionary grants to the States, to limit the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to one block grant per State per year from 85 percent funds, and to provide authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1971; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:  
H.R. 14398. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Peace Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. REUSS, Mr. KEE, and Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota):

H.J. Res. 957. Joint resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payments to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other educational agencies and organiza-

tions, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 13111 which passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FASCELL:  
H.J. Res. 958. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of January of each year as "National Blood Donor Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL (for himself and Mr. WRIGHT):  
H.J. Res. 959. Joint resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payments to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other educational agencies and organizations, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 13111, which passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:  
H.J. Res. 960. Joint resolution to designate Route 70 of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways as the Eisenhower Memorial Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WIDNALL:  
H.J. Res. 961. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:  
H. Con. Res. 412. Concurrent resolution urging the adoption of policies to offset the adverse effects of inadequate long-term financing upon the housing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:  
H. Con. Res. 413. A Concurrent resolution condemning the treatment of American prisoners of war by the Government of North Vietnam and urging the President to initiate appropriate action for the purpose of insuring that American prisoners are accorded humane treatment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:  
H. Con. Res. 414. A Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with regard to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam and their compliance with the Geneva Conventions on Prisoners of War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MESKILL introduced a bill (H.R. 14399) for the relief of Nelly J. Ainslie, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

295. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the New York State Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, relative to placing the flag in public school classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

296. Also, petition of Louis Cohen, Brooklyn, N.Y., relative to ending the war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.