

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M., MONDAY, JUNE 18, 1973

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. 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 the hour of 11 a.m., Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 1:42 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 18, 1973, at 11 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15, 1973:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Terence E. McClary, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Arthur I. Mendolia, of Delaware, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Malcolm R. Currie, of California, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

Jack L. Bowers, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

William A. Morrill, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Lewis M. Helm, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

George M. Moore, of Maryland, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1979.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

James S. Dwight, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service.

(The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES

The following-named persons to be Members of the Board of Regents of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences for the terms indicated:

For a term of 4 years:

Charles E. Odegaard, of Washington.
Joseph D. Matarazzo, of Oregon.

For a term of 6 years:

Alfred A. Marquez, of California.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated, under the provisions of chapters 35, 831, and 837, title 10, United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Edward R. Fry, ~~xxx-xx-xxxx~~ PG, Air National Guard.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Samuel Jaskilka Robert H. Barrow
Edward S. Fris Herbert L. Beckington
Thomas H. Miller, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Richard Mulberry, J. Louis Conti

The following named officers of the Marine Corps of permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

William L. McCulloch William H. Lanagan, Jr.
Robert W. Taylor Francis W. Vaught
Adolph G. Schwenk Robert L. Nichols

IN THE AIR FORCE AND NAVY

Air Force nominations beginning Richard L. Frymire, Jr., to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Terry L. Young, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 1973.

Air Force nominations beginning George B. Aaron, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending William E. Wilson, Jr., to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 8, 1973.

Navy nominations beginning Steven A. Klein, to be ensign, and ending William E. Short, Jr., to be ensign, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 1973.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, June 15, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.—Matthew 6: 33.

O Lord, we pray for guidance and wisdom as we meet in this troubled hour of our national life. Let not differences of opinion make a difference in our relationships, let not the divisions of party divide us in principle, let not the difficulties of daily life make us difficult to live with. Now and always may we seek first Thy kingdom of peace, truth, and love in our Nation and in our world. This is not easy to do, but with Thy spirit we will work to make it a reality in our day. So help us, God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing, as a House docu-

ment, of the eulogies and encomiums of the late President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; and

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the compilation of the social security laws.

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

H. R. 7645. An act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document of a revised edition of "The Capitol."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 7645) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. PELL, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CASE, and Mr. JAVITS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 271. An act to improve judicial machinery by amending the requirement for a three-judge court in certain cases and for other purposes;

S. 797. An act to direct the Secretary of Transportation to make a comprehensive study of a high-speed ground transportation

system between Washington, D.C., and Annapolis, Md., and a high-speed marine vessel transportation system between the Baltimore-Annapolis area in Maryland and the Yorktown-Williamsburg-Norfolk area in Virginia, and to authorize the construction of such system if such study demonstrates their feasibility;

S. 1585. An act to prevent the unauthorized manufacture and use of the character "Woody Owl," and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on illegal, improper, or unethical activities during the Presidential election of 1972.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF LOSS OF VOLUNTARY PRAYERS IN OUR SCHOOLS

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my good friend and capable colleague, Congressman WYLIE, who will bring to the attention of the House that it was 10 years ago Sunday that American youth attending public schools lost their right to voluntary freedom of prayer. This loss happened, when the Supreme Court ruled that prayer would no longer be permitted in the public schools of the United States. I disagreed with this decision when it was issued and I disagree with it just as strongly today. I have been happy to join with Congressman WYLIE in past Congresses to enact a proposed constitutional amendment allowing public prayer on a

voluntary basis. I will continue to look to him for leadership in this area and hope we will see a renewed effort during the 93d Congress.

SCHOOL PRAYER

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the reference by my good friend Mr. MONTGOMERY, of Mississippi, and thank him for able and conscientious support. This Sunday marks the 10th anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in Murray against Curlett—a case which held that Bible reading without comment in a tax-supported school setting is unconstitutional. The case was brought by Madalyn Murray O'Hair who has also objected to the recitation of prayer by the astronauts in space and who more recently brought suit to prohibit Bible services in the White House.

There are those who believe that many of our problems of juvenile delinquency, crime, and problems directly related to a moral consciousness such as drug- and sex-related crimes started following the Engle case, the Murray case, and the school prayer decisions based thereon.

The Reverend Father Robert G. Howes, the National Coordinator of Operation Prayer, is asking for a national day of rededication to the proposition that voluntary prayer be unmistakably restored to public schools. It is time that we rededicate ourselves to the proposition that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, that there is standard of right and wrong above men, and that recognition of a Supreme Deity by anyone, anytime in America—even by students in public schools—is essential to the continuation of our way of life.

I will include a paper entitled "National Rededication Day '73" by Father Howes at a later point in the RECORD.

SCHOOL PRAYER AMENDMENT

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE), who has worked so hard to restore voluntary prayer to our schools.

Last year I was pleased to join Congressman WYLIE in supporting the discharge of the school prayer amendment. While we were not successful last year, it is my hope that we will have the opportunity to vote on this amendment during the 93d Congress, and that this time we will succeed.

THE SCHOOL PRAYER AMENDMENT

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am today most pleased to associate myself once more with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr.

WYLIE) in seeking an amendment to the Constitution that will make it legal to have prayer in our schools and other public buildings.

New Jersey itself is unique in that the courts there have ruled prior to this that even the prayer that is spoken in this Chamber of the House of Representatives may not be used in public schools by our students prior to any classes. This is a travesty in itself. It infringes upon the rights of all Americans. I am hopeful that this year we may get enough support in this House to put the amendment through without any equivocation so that people will be permitted, if they so desire, to repeat the Lord's Prayer, which I fail to see as a governmental promoted function.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

DR. JACK A. BERGSTROM OF MIDLAND, MICH., ELECTED PRESIDENT OF MICHIGAN OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate a constituent, Dr. Jack A. Bergstrom of Midland, Mich., upon his election as the 1973-74 president of the Michigan Optometric Association. It is a distinct honor to be selected by his fellow optometrists and I am sure that under his direction the association will continue to progress in implementing quality vision care in the State of Michigan.

Dr. Bergstrom's contributions to optometry in the State have been numerous. He has served in zone 4 of the Michigan Optometric Association as secretary, vice president, and president. He has been trustee and president-elect for the entire MOA. Since 1963 he has been a fellow of the American Academy of Optometry.

In addition to this dedication to his profession, he has served the community—through the Lions Club, through the Citizens Education Committee for Midland Public Schools and trustee of his church, Trinity Lutheran.

It is a pleasure for me to be able to mention this record of service; Dr. Bergstrom exemplifies concern for his

community and his profession. I offer my best wishes to the new president and the entire Michigan Optometric Association.

THE SCHOOL PRAYER AMENDMENT

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, Congressman WYLIE, for calling to the attention of the House that 10 years ago the U.S. Supreme Court launched an attack on the freedom of religion in this country which still persists, despite the efforts of many of us in this Chamber to halt its advance.

In its 1963 decision in the case of Murray against Curlett, the Court ruled that prayer had no place in public schools.

Justice Tom Clark, who wrote the majority opinion, said then that—

The breech of neutrality that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent.

Justice Clark was writing for the majority, and against prayer in schools, but his eloquence better serves the cause of those of us who believe the Supreme Court erred in its judgment of this case.

For today freedom of religion is under attack on all fronts, and leading the attack is the same person who brought that first suit 10 years ago.

From the "trickling stream" of preventing prayer in public schools, those who oppose prayer in schools has loosed a "raging torrent" in the past decade that threatens now to engulf all public buildings, including this one and including the White House, in this sea of Godlessness. So great is her ambition that she seeks even to prohibit the worship of God in outer space, which itself proclaims in its infinite silence and in its majesty the greatness and power of its Creator.

I firmly believe that this was not the intent of the authors of the Constitution, and that the courts have abrogated a right of the people which our Founding Fathers held dear.

Many Members of this body, including myself, have introduced a constitutional amendment to restore that right. We have come close to passage once before, and we will keep trying until that right is assured and public prayer is restored.

THE SCHOOL PRAYER AMENDMENT

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE) for bringing the amendment to the attention of this House that Sunday is the 10th anniversary of the Murray decision. A case that I think is reprehensible. We have had almost 200 years of prayers in this Chamber since the founding of our country. Prayer is legal here. The Supreme Court starts every day with a prayer.

The Senate starts every day with a prayer and, Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a finer way to start a day than with prayer.

I compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, and I shall support him again.

VOLUNTARY PRAYER IN SCHOOLS

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, in bringing this issue of voluntary prayer to our attention. The Supreme Court decision 10 years ago in my opinion was wrong. I feel that something should be done about it. Now more than ever I think we need to expose our children to the fundamentals of education, fundamentals such as right from wrong, good from bad. This includes the teachings of God.

An effort by this body to reverse the decision by the Supreme Court is indeed a worthy one. I therefore am glad to join my colleague in his efforts.

REQUEST FOR CONFERENCE ON S. 795, NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 795) to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I make this reservation to indicate to the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and to my colleagues that I do not believe it appropriate for us to request this conference with the Senate in this matter. We will limit the ability of the House to deal effectively with this matter. Therefore, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF MEDGAR EVERS

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues, while we are pointing out the 10th anniversary of things, that June 12 was the 10th anniversary or the memorial of the death of Medgar Evers, who died violently while trying to secure civil rights for all Americans and particularly his brethren in Mississippi. He will be remembered in history as a noble being in pursuit of a great cause for humanity.

On June 12, 1963, Medgar Evers' life

was snuffed out by an admitted assassin who has not yet been brought to the bar of justice. In life as well as in death Medgar Evers should be remembered for his pursuit of the American dream that every American is endowed with certain inalienable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In addition, we should constantly keep in mind that the goals and objectives that he diligently sought to achieve are far from being obtained. His death stands as a living memorial to that fact.

Today, Medgar Evers is remembered as a leader and a great man. He was a black American who shared his dreams, his hopes, and aspirations with all who expressed a desire to further the rights of mankind. He was an individual who had no place in his heart for malice or violence. Instead, he occupied his time with a deeply felt conviction that the American dream could be achieved in his lifetime.

I commend to the Members the statement inserted by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) at page 19731 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 1973, on this matter.

PRAYER IN SCHOOLS

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, from the Columbus area, Mr. WYLIE, in pointing out the fact that this is the 10th anniversary of the decision which eliminated prayers in public schools. I join the gentleman in his effort to seek a restoration in this regard.

This was brought home to me yesterday on the occasion of the weekly prayer breakfast here in the Capitol Building. Our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MARTIN), pointed out that it is tough for those of us in public service today to speak about God, flag, or motherhood, because they have all become controversial. The Supreme Court has made prayer in public school controversial, and the flag has become controversial because some of the more militant activist nuts are burning and degrading it, and, of course, motherhood has become controversial because of the Supreme Court decision on abortion.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio for again bringing the prayer issue before the Congress.

ANNIVERSARY OF SUPREME COURT DECISION ON PRAYER IN SCHOOLS

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

Mr. BEARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio on his statement.

It is very appropriate that this subject be raised as we approach the anniversary of the Court's decision on prayer

in schools. Many of the citizens of my district consider it tragic that voluntary prayer in school has been eliminated.

I would hope the Congress will again address this question in the near future and thank the gentleman for his remarks.

AGRICULTURE, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mr. WHITTEN. 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. 8619) making appropriations for agriculture, environmental, and consumer protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 226]

Abzug	Fisher	Mosher
Adams	Flynt	Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson	Fraser	Owens
Calif.	Fuqua	Pepper
Anderson, Ill.	Giaimo	Powell, Ohio
Arends	Gray	Pritchard
Ashbrook	Gubser	Railsback
Ashley	Gunter	Reid
Badillo	Harsha	Rhodes
Bafalis	Hastings	Rogers
Bell	Hays	Roncalio, Wyo.
Blester	Hebert	Rooney, N.Y.
Bingham	Heckler, Mass.	Rosenthal
Blackburn	Henderson	Rousselot
Blatnik	Huber	Royal
Breckinridge	Ichord	Ruppe
Buchanan	Johnson, Calif.	Sandman
Burke, Calif.	Johnson, Pa.	Schneebeli
Carey, N.Y.	Karth	Seiberling
Chisholm	Kluczynski	Sikes
Clark	Landrum	Sisk
Clawson, Del.	Leggett	Stark
Collier	Littton	Steelman
Conable	McDade	Symington
Conte	McKinney	Symms
Crane	McSpadden	Teague, Tex.
Daniels,	Macdonald	Waggoner
Dominick V.	Maillard	Walde
Danielson	Maraziti	Whalen
Davis, Wis.	Mathias, Calif.	White
Dent	Mathis, Ga.	Wiggins
Derwinski	Metcalfe	Winn
Dickinson	Michel	Wydler
Diggs	Mills, Ark.	Wyman
Dingell	Moorhead,	
Edwards, Calif.	Calif.	
Erlenborn	Moorhead, Pa.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 328 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

AGRICULTURAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

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. 8619, with Mr. WRIGHT 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 unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) will be recognized for one and a half hours, and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) will be recognized for one and a half hours.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, for many years I have had the privilege of bringing to the floor of the House an appropriation bill which affects all Americans and, indeed, many people throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, since I first started handling this bill on the floor there have been many changes in the world, but one thing has not changed; it continues to be true that food, clothing, and shelter are the very basis for human life, and that is what is provided by this bill.

It also continues to be true that the amount of time people take to provide the basic necessities of food, clothing, and shelter largely determines the standard of living they enjoy, because the less time it takes to secure the basic things the more time that is available for other things. Our country has the highest standard of living in history because we spend less time providing these basic necessities than any other country in history.

SUMMARY BY TITLE

Mr. Chairman, with those brief opening remarks, I would like to summarize the bill. The bill is divided into four major titles—a division which is designed to demonstrate the general impact of the appropriation. Such a division is by no means precise and is subject to individual interpretation because of the multiple benefits derived from the programs funded in this bill.

The bill provides \$813 million for the regular activities of the Department of Agriculture, \$3.3 billion to restore capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and \$386 million for rural development activities; \$1 billion is included for environmental activities, of which \$514 million is for the Environmental Protection Agency and \$322 million is for the Soil Conservation Service. The \$3 billion for consumer programs includes \$166 million for the Food and Drug Administration, \$30 million for the Federal Trade Commission, and \$31 million for the new Consumer Product Safety Commission. The consumer programs also include \$2.2 billion for food stamps. In all the bill totals \$9.4 billion, which is \$120 million below the budget

estimates and \$3.3 billion below the 1973 appropriation.

There are many changes between the fiscal year 1973 and 1974 bills because of legislative actions of Congress such as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92-500) which have changed the financing sources of many of the programs in the bill from a direct to an indirect basis. The principal changes and their effect on the budget totals are discussed in the following summary and in the detailed statements which follow in the report.

TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

Title I includes \$813 million for the regular programs of the Department of Agriculture including administration, research, extension, marketing, and other programs. \$454 million is included for the "Food for Peace" program, \$175 million for meat and poultry inspection, and \$3.3 billion is included for the reimbursement for net realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation which, as is explained elsewhere in the report, is of vital importance to the consumer.

TITLE II—RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Title II provides \$758 million for insured loans for Rural Electric and Telephone Systems, but these funds are no longer a direct charge against the budget because the Rural Electrification Act (P.L. 93-32) removes these loans from direct government financing. The title also includes \$150 million, of which \$120 million is prior year funds, for water and sewer grants which are essential if the rural to urban migration, with all its attendant social problems, is to be reduced. The bill includes \$314 million in direct appropriations for FHA programs, including administration, and \$2.8 billion in direct and insured loans. There are more changes in title II in comparison to last year than in any other part of the bill. These changes reflect the passage of the Rural Development Act (P.L. 92-419) and the Rural Electrification Act (P.L. 93-32), which take many programs out of the budget. Thus, title II includes a total of \$386 million in direct appropriations, and \$3.6 billion in the direct and insured loan programs.

TITLE III—ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

Title III includes \$516 million for the programs of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Council on Environmental Quality. In addition, \$600 million, which is not included in the totals, is provided for the liquidation of contract authority in the EPA construction programs. The programs of the Soil Conservation Service and the Agricultural Conservation Program (REAP)—which both date back to the 1930's before concern for the environment became fashionable—total \$492 million. The total for title III exceeds \$1 billion. This is a convincing demonstration of the Committee's concern for the environment.

TITLE IV—CONSUMER PROGRAMS

Title IV includes \$166 million for the Food and Drug Administration, \$30 million for the Federal Trade Commission, and \$31 million for the new Consumer Product Safety Commission. The consumer programs also include \$2.2 billion for food stamps. In all the bill totals \$9.4 billion, which is \$120 million below the budget

are not included in the totals, is provided for child nutrition programs, and \$2.2 billion for the food stamp program. The total for title IV, the second largest title in the bill, is in excess of \$3 billion.

AGRICULTURE BASIC TO US ALL

The Committee, in dealing with the appropriation for agriculture for the fiscal year 1974, has taken into consideration the fact that those engaged in agriculture, while only approximately five percent of the American people, continue to constitute labor's and industry's biggest market and provide for the consumer his greatest bargain.

In view of various developments during the past year, we must now be especially mindful of our agricultural policies which for years have made this nation the "Bread Basket" of the world. In any new legislation we must carefully evaluate recent events which might tend to influence some to abandon the tried and true principles which have blessed this Nation with an abundance of pure, wholesome food throughout our history.

THE DANGERS OF A DEPRESSION

Many of us are inclined to forget that the seeds of the great depression of the 1930's were sown in the agricultural depression of the 1920's which followed the First World War. The failure to maintain farm exports or to support farm prices and income during this period, and thus to maintain farmers' purchasing power, weakened banking and business throughout the country. It was graphically illustrated in 1921, in 1929, and again in 1937 that, if the farmers' prices and purchasing power collapsed, the whole economy suffers both in the cities and in the rural areas. An analysis of these past crises indicates that the drop in purchasing power of those engaged in agriculture not only wrecked farming, but dragged down the economy of the whole Nation.

Agricultural activity continues to be the base of our overall economy, and is essential if we are to have continuing prosperity. Each depression we have had has originated with a break in farm purchasing power and the farm programs themselves have resulted from efforts to restore that purchasing power after the depression of the late 20's and early 30's. From that time on they have been continued for the purpose of sustaining farm purchasing power that we might maintain our overall economy, and insure an adequate food supply.

Today three out of every ten jobs in our country are related directly or indirectly to agriculture. So we can easily see labor's and industry's direct interest in a healthy farm economy. Without adequate purchasing power, farmers will not be able to purchase the products of labor and industry.

FARMERS, THE WORLD'S GREATEST GAMBLERS

Farmers' investment in total assets totals over \$341 billion, equal to roughly one-half of the market value of all corporate stocks on the New York Stock Exchange; or to about three-fifths of the value of the capital assets of all corporations in the United States. Everytime the farmer plants a crop, he risks all these assets accumulated through many years.

His return on his equity was only about 3.6 percent in 1971.

PRODUCTION FOR PLENTY

In addition to maintaining farm purchasing power, we must also produce a sufficient supply of food to meet domestic needs and provide for export markets. We must have reserves for domestic and world use, and must be careful that in our efforts to maintain price we do not unnecessarily limit supply. To meet that requirement we must follow a policy of producing over and beyond the bare essentials. Buyers, foreign and domestic, want a consistent supplier in lean as well as good years. The Committee recognizes that to follow such a course must result in supplies surplus to domestic needs. These surpluses can and should be used to meet domestic needs of the aged and of the many groups which under present law receive Food Stamps and other assistance. Without adequate supplies, Food Stamps create an extra demand for a short supply. It doesn't do much good to have Food Stamps or even dollars if the shelves are bare. Evidence of this is to be found in some existing high prices of farm products which come about primarily because the supply is short. To chastise the farmer is not the way to increase the food supply. Most of the quoted high prices come after the commodity is out the farmer's hands.

PROMOTION OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

We all need to remember also that agricultural export sales will reach \$11 billion in fiscal year 1973. This is one of the few bright spots in our overall problem of a negative balance of trade. An abundant supply of food can also be a material influence for international good will and improved relationships with other nations. It constitutes a major force in foreign affairs and a great asset toward good international relationships. For these reasons, the committee believes a return to a situation of abundant food supply to be absolutely required.

THE DANGER OF UNWISE REVISION OF THE FARM PROGRAM

The farm program must be based on long-range projections. Agricultural production is influenced by many factors. During the past several years there have been some surpluses which have caused some concern. But on the whole these surpluses are our own fault. We have caused them by surrendering many foreign markets to our former customers, who are now our competitors. For various reasons the situation has changed dramatically during the past year to the extent that our surpluses are at an all time low. This situation coupled with the increase in food prices has given rise to recommendations for drastic revision of the farm program in general. This could be a great mistake. Take for example the export situation which existed in 1972. Our high exports were due to a large extent to adverse weather which prevailed in other parts of the world. This situation could change materially within the next few years.

If, in the light of the current demand for food, we expect the farmer to increase his investment and expand his operations so that he will be able to supply this demand, we cannot expect him to carry

all the risk. Past experience has proved that supply and demand for agricultural production is not consistent year in and year out.

This country has the capacity to produce and it is essential that we do. When we have that production we must enter the competitive markets of the world to assure its distribution. Otherwise, we may again be plagued with excessive surpluses or we may be faced with a severe shortage in our food supply if the farmer is not sufficiently certain of a reasonable return on his investment and drastically reduces production.

THE WAY TO INCREASE FARM INCOME

A majority of the committee believes that we must return to protecting farmers' income by loan or by purchase. Since farm income is the total of volume times price less cost, we must see that the sum total constitutes such a percentage of parity as will keep a sufficient number of our people engaged in agriculture both to maintain purchasing power and to enable them to keep producing for the consumer.

With a constantly increasing cost, we have followed the policy of trying to get price at the marketplace by reducing volume. This has not worked, as shown by the fact that during the period of 1965-72 an average of about 409,000 people have left the farm each year.

It may be that the present 2.9 million farms left in this country will remain in operation, even so, we are already in trouble, and if our policies force this exodus to resume, we will indeed be faced with a very serious problem.

A major cause of this migration is that the return which the farmer has received from the net value of his farm investment has declined to approximately 3.6 percent. Lack of modern conveniences in rural areas has also been perhaps something of a factor. The committee has tried to correct this by restoring action programs to develop rural areas, with water and sewers, rural electrification and other programs which will make life in the country more nearly equal to life in the city.

The committee recognizes that a farm program providing for more than adequate production in order to meet domestic and foreign needs must be so geared as to have the Government share the risks of surpluses. The Government should stand ready, so far as perishable commodities are concerned, to buy up the surplus so as to strengthen the market. Storables, or nonperishables, such as grain and cotton should be taken off the market, or sold overseas, so as not to depress domestic prices. Policies of this type would encourage production while protecting the farmer from bankruptcy.

It is the belief of a majority of the committee that the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation in its charter and under the law should be fully utilized to this end if necessary. Not only that, but the records clearly show that it is essential that the Commodity Credit Corporation—with its sales manager, a position created by this committee—should be utilized fully, if necessary, in protecting the U.S. share of world markets since under present internation-

al trade conditions we are up against government-to-government trading. The last several years have demonstrated clearly that private industry alone, in many cases with international connections, has been unable and occasionally unwilling to maintain the fair U.S. share of world markets.

SUBSIDIES TO THE CONSUMER

The committee would point out that the so-called "farm subsidies" now existing are really "consumer subsidies." They are necessary because other laws protect labor and industry, and agriculture must have similar protection in the name of equity. Labor is protected by a minimum wage, and the bargaining power of the unions results in contracts which assure an increasing share of the national income dollar to labor. Industry, in turn, receives tax credits and is able to mark up its cost by a percentage for its own profit and thereby protect its share of the total. With the national income dollar limited, it leaves those engaged in agriculture dependent upon what's left. According to the Economic Report of the President for 1973, the farm or agricultural share of the gross national product has dropped from 7 percent in 1950 to 3 percent in 1972.

This situation has led the government to adopt a system of payments to make up the difference, leaving those engaged in agriculture dependent upon an annual appropriation by the Congress for all their profit and part of their cost. This program is subjected to unjust criticism. As the above discussion has tried to indicate, the "subsidy" program is in reality to offset the disproportionate share of the Federal income dollar that goes to industry and labor. While it is identified with those engaged in agriculture, it is really a subsidy to industry and labor who thus get cheaper raw materials at the expense of the farmer or perhaps the treasury. If this savings were passed on, then the farm payments would ultimately be a "consumer subsidy."

The committee would also point out that the consumers of our urban nation are constantly threatened by the movement of people from agriculture. We are becoming more and more dependent upon imports, particularly in vegetables and perishables. For example, information provided the committee indicates that Mexico now supplies 61 percent of U.S. winter tomatoes versus 30 percent in 1964. If this trend continues, then we will be in danger of having the price of our food supply determined by others.

FOOD IS STILL OUR BIGGEST BARGAIN

As a result of recent increases in the price of food at the market, concerted attention has been given to agriculture. There are many not entirely familiar with all the facts involved who are demanding stringent price controls on food, the elimination of all farm payments, and who feel that the farmer is getting the major portion of the food dollar.

Some pertinent facts to be considered in this connection are:

Less than 16 percent of total U.S. disposable income goes for food. This is

lower than any other country in the world and the lowest in the history of the world.

One day's wages in 1952 would buy 14.4 pounds of "choice" beef—in February 1973 it would buy 23.2 pounds.

Out of every 10 dollars the consumer spends in retail stores for U.S. farm-grown food, 6 dollars pays for the marketing—which includes everything done with food between the farm and store.

Those who attribute the recent increase in food prices to the farmer fail to give adequate consideration to other influences which have had a direct effect on our food costs in the last year. Probably the most important is the factor of inflation or the declining value of the dollar. Notwithstanding, the price of food during the past 10 years has not increased as rapidly as other prices.

Another important factor is our increasing export of commodities. Total farm exports in fiscal year 1973 are estimated to be in excess of \$11 billion, an all-time record. Foreign housewives are now competing with American housewives for the world's limited supply of food, and under the laws of supply and demand this results in higher prices.

The adverse weather conditions which prevailed over major sections of the country during the fall of 1972 and the early months of 1973 have also been a factor. Harvest was delayed or prevented in many instances. Severe winter conditions resulted in heavy losses of cattle, thus further reducing the supply in the face of increasing demand.

When all these factors are considered, two things become apparent. First, even at current prices, food is our biggest bargain. Second, many of the factors which have caused increased food costs may be temporary and we shouldn't make basic changes in the farm program on the basis of these one-time occurrences.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM (REAP)

The committee has always endorsed a vigorous and effective soil conservation activity as part of the farm program. Actual experience has substantiated the prudence of this philosophy. Under the Agricultural Conservation Program (REAP), more than 1 million farmers contributed about 70 percent of the cost (including labor) of various conservation practices. Some of the accomplishments of this program are as follows:

Practice	Unit	Total accomplishments 1936-71
Water impoundment reservoirs constructed to reduce erosion, distribute grazing, conserve vegetative cover and wildlife, or provide fire protection and other agricultural uses.	Structures	2, 201, 000
Terraces constructed to reduce erosion, conserve water, or prevent or abate pollution.	Acres	32, 301, 000
Stripcropping systems established to reduce wind or water erosion or to prevent or abate pollution.	Acres	114, 051, 000
Permanent sod waterways established to reduce erosion, safely dispose of excess runoff, or prevent or abate pollution.	Acres	1, 152, 000
Competitive shrubs controlled on range or pasture to permit growth of adequate cover for erosion control and to conserve water.	Acres	62, 697, 000
Trees and shrubs planted for forestry purposes, erosion control, or environmental enhancement.	Acres	5, 258, 000
Forest tree stands improved for forestry purposes or environmental enhancement.	Acres	4, 358, 000
Wildlife conservation.	Acres served	12, 685, 000
Animal waste and solid waste pollution-abatement structures (lagoons, storage, diversions, and other).	Number	5, 578, 000
Sediment pollution-abatement structures or runoff control measures.	Acres served	1388, 000
Other pollution-abatement practices.	Acres served	137, 000

¹ 1962-71, inclusive, with certain data estimated.

² 1970 and 1971 only.

A review of the foregoing examples clearly demonstrates that these practices are long-range conservation measures which are beneficial to the general public.

ACTION PROGRAMS ARE THE MOST EFFECTIVE
RURAL DEVELOPMENT

It is vitally urgent that the development of rural areas proceed at the maximum possible rate. Migration from the farm has been at a very high rate. During the period 1965-1972 the average decline in farm population has been 409,000 persons a year. The number of farms has decreased from 3,257,000 in 1966 to 2,870,000 in 1972. Not only does this migration drastically reduce the supply of labor needed in rural areas, but in the majority of instances these individuals move to the cities and greatly increase the urban problems we are experiencing. The provision of funds for necessary facilities in rural areas, such as electric

power, water and sewer facilities and housing, is a much better investment than to have to use the funds later to combat social problems in urban areas.

The Rural Development Act (P.L. 92-419) was enacted August 30, 1972. Several members of this committee sponsored and strongly supported that legislation being aware of the vital unfulfilled needs in this area and believing that the provisions of that legislation would enhance programs currently in effect.

However, while the Committee supports the general purposes of the Rural Development Act, it does not approve of the elimination or restriction of many existing rural development programs for the substitution of a fine title, without concrete plans and which the Department of Agriculture has reduced to the concept that the greatest need is an educational program. What the record shows

is that the need is for water and sewer facilities and modern homes and home conveniences.

The committee fully subscribes to the concept of the Rural Development Act as passed by the Congress, but insists on and has provided for the continuance of existing action programs which provide for modern housing, for water and sewer grants and loans, and for electrification loans. The work of the Soil Conservation Service, and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, in running the Agricultural Conservation Program (called REAP until eliminated on December 26, 1972 by executive order), has also been continued since these programs help enhance the quality of rural life and thus keep farmers on the farm.

The committee will be favorably inclined to further fund the activities provided by the Rural Development Act when a workable plan is presented for specific and definite program actions to meet the objectives of the Act.

REGULATORY AGENCIES NEED FACTS

This bill funds some of the principal regulatory agencies, including the Federal meat and poultry inspection program, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Food and Drug Administration, the Federal Trade Commission, and the new Consumer Product Safety Commission. Each of these agencies has tremendous individual power over every aspect of American life. The combined effect of these agencies is even greater, especially if one considers in addition other agencies such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration which are funded in other bills.

If all of these agencies were to use all of their power, the economy could become immobilized. This can only be avoided if these agencies use their power responsibly acting only on the basis of scientific fact and with due consideration to the economic and social impact of their decisions. They must always proceed with a sense of priorities, placing that which is dangerous to health ahead of that which is merely undesirable or unesthetic.

There must also be a consideration of the competitive effects of regulatory decisions. Many small businesses are having difficulty complying with the complex regulations being promulgated. They should receive all permissible help or else the result may be the achieving of one set of social objectives at the expense of another. The maintenance of competition—a goal of the Federal Trade Commission—may be endangered by edicts of the EPA or FDA or the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

The goal of increasing exports may also be hampered by excessive regulation. The committee has heard allegations that some foreign countries are trying to entice American industry overseas by establishing less stringent regulatory policies. The new Consumer Product Safety Act tacitly recognizes this problem by permitting different export standards. The Federal Trade Commission is also becoming concerned about this problem.

CONCERN FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Chairman, when environmental concerns reached national prominence

a few years ago it was common practice to speak of "spaceship Earth" and to think of the environment as a "closed cycle." People began to realize, many for the first time, that a relationship exists between the air, the water, and the land. People also began to realize that whatever pollutants we remove from one must go into one or both of the others. How, then, should we approach the problem?

Logically, we should attempt to reduce pollution to its most unobjectionable form. Furthermore, we should set our priorities for doing this. We should attempt to first take care of that which represents a hazard to human health and then set about to take care of that which is merely undesirable. Again, being logical and using our common sense, we would look at the undesirable in terms of how we could spend our money to get the greatest amount of environmental improvement per dollar invested.

Congress recognized the need to do something about our environment and passed the National Environmental Policy Act. The stated purposes of the act are:

To declare a national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation. * * *

TOTAL IMPACT MUST BE CONSIDERED

Then followed a period when the Congress passed many additional laws. These laws reflected the feelings of the Nation and the Congress and express their earnest desire to improve and restore the environment. However, these new laws for the most part did not address the total environment, instead they addressed an individual environmental problem. We have passed air laws, we have passed water laws, we have passed solid waste laws, we have passed noise laws, we have probably passed too many laws. By passing these laws we have tended to some degree to look at the environment with tunnel vision.

Because we have approached the problem of improving and restoring the environment on a piecemeal basis, we in many cases have forced or encouraged the Environmental Protection Agency to look at the action and ignore the reaction, thereby totally disregarding the premise on which the environmental movement was based—that we must deal with the total environment. An example of this dilemma can be found in the opinion written by Judge Winner, U.S. District Court, Denver, Colo., in the case of *Anaconda* against *Ruckelshaus*.

Compliance with the Administrator's proposed emission limitation would create additional pollution problems including problems of water pollution, solid waste disposal problems and air pollution problems having to do with the quarrying, transportation and the hauling of limestone and other similar materials. These problems are directly related to the resultant production of a staggering quantity of unsalable sulfuric acid which would threaten water pollu-

tion. None of these problems has been studied or considered by the Administrator or by any member of his staff.

Increasingly, we are seeing more and more examples of our failure to consider our "total environment." Likewise, many actions have been taken where there is reason to believe that the costs may outweigh the benefits.

\$287 BILLION TO CLEAN UP THE ENVIRONMENT

Testimony before the committee this year indicated that in order to meet the pollution problems and the standards associated with air pollution, water pollution and solid waste disposal over the next decade the country will have to spend about \$287 billion. By setting standards that are perhaps too high, we have forced massive expenditures that may result in only modest improvements. Not only is there a problem of cost, but the Congress has passed laws based on technology that does not exist, acting much like the person who contacted the Patent Office and asked for a list of things that had not been invented.

The hearing record this year shows strong evidence that actions by the Environmental Protection Agency in carrying out these laws have contributed to the energy crisis, have increased the damage from floods because of the delay of flood and soil conservation projects, have increased the cost of production of food thereby contributing to higher consumer prices, and have greatly increased the danger to human health by banning DDT, which according to testimony has never injured a human being. In addition, actions by the Agency have placed American industry and American agriculture at a competitive disadvantage both at home and abroad.

ENERGY CRISIS

The committee is convinced that the Environmental Protection Agency has played a major role in the current energy crisis. The approval by the Agency of overly restrictive State plans, which call for the meeting of primary and secondary ambient air standards at the same time, has resulted in the need for industry to convert from coal to low sulfur fuels. This increased requirement for oil and gas has been a major contributor to our current fuel problems.

In addition, the automobile emission control standards imposed by the Agency have greatly increased the requirements for gasoline, which is also in short supply and will probably require rationing.

The energy crisis has major implications with regard to our country's national security, foreign policy and balance of trade. These implications were not considered by the Agency in setting the standards and approving the plans that led to the problem. The potential impact on the economic and social well-being of this Nation of actions by the Agency is so great that it is absolutely essential that the Agency be required to consider the impact of their actions.

AUTOMOBILE PERFORMANCE

Emission control standards issued by the Agency, at the direction of the Congress have created serious problems for the American consumer. By setting deadlines that called for the development of

new technology, the automobile companies, according to testimony before the committee, were forced to proceed with the development of the costly catalytic exhaust converters.

Had sufficient time been allotted to meet the standards, then the automobile companies could have devoted their research funds to alternative types of clean burning engines. Instead, deadlines were set that did not provide sufficient time for development of alternative types of engines and the American consumer has ended up with an automobile that costs significantly more to buy, significantly more to maintain, will provide poor fuel economy, with a reduction in performance.

The committee recommends an increase of \$2,000,000 for research on alternative types of clean burning engines so that the Agency can accelerate this important program.

OVERLY RESTRICTIVE STANDARDS

The committee is extremely concerned that the Agency, in some of its regulatory or standard-setting activities, may be placing too little emphasis on the environmental and economic impact of such actions. Increasingly, questions are being raised that certain actions by the Agency have been addressed to the elimination of one specific source of pollution without giving sufficient consideration of the overall impact on the environment. Many times these actions have actually proven detrimental. Reportedly, some abatement actions have resulted in a reduction of air pollution while at the same time significantly increasing water pollution or solid waste. Some standards or regulations have resulted in modest reductions in pollution while at the same time causing enormous increases in energy requirements, thereby increasing pollution and raw material usage.

The Agency also has to approve many of the State standards or regulations to see that they equal or exceed Federal standards or regulations. The committee is concerned that the Agency does not consider the economic and environmental impact of these State standards. Reportedly, the Agency will disapprove State standards if they are too loose but will approve State plans that are too restrictive. For example, testimony before the committee indicates that in the case of the Clean Air Act, most States designed their plans to attain or surpass the secondary ambient air quality standards by 1975, which is more than the Clean Air Act requires. Reports prepared for the committee indicate that these overly restrictive standards have played a major role in the current energy shortage of the Nation.

The committee has also been advised that the Tennessee Valley Authority has had to include \$43 million in their budget for cooling towers for a nuclear power plant under construction in Alabama. These cooling towers are required because the State of Alabama has currently set water temperature standards that require discharge temperatures lower than the natural temperature of the river.

NEED FOR A SENSE OF BALANCE

By not using a commonsense approach and by not thinking in terms of

the total environment, by looking at the trees rather than the forest, we may well end up creating an environmental backlash which could put an end to all the momentum we've gained in recent years in our efforts to improve and restore our environment.

Therefore, since this committee is the only committee that reviews all of EPA's programs, we have made several recommendations we have gained in recent years in our efforts to improve and restore our environment.

ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

The committee feels that if the Agency had considered environmental and economic consequences of both their standards and the State standards which they approved, many of the problems we are now faced with might not have occurred. Therefore, the committee has included funds and language in the bill to require the Environmental Protection Agency to consider the environmental impact along with the economic and technical considerations of their actions, except where prohibited by law, as authorized by the National Environmental Policy Act.

DELAY INCREASES COST AND POLLUTION

Testimony has convinced the committee that a great deal of unnecessary delay results from the present procedures involving the preparation of environmental impact statements as required by the National Environmental Policy Act. The committee in no way objects to the preparation of impact statements and in fact strongly supports the intent of the National Environmental Policy Act. The problems, the committee is convinced, rest more with the present procedures involved in the impact statement review process.

At the present time impact statements are prepared by an agency at the operating level. The statements then move up the management review chain prior to their release as a draft impact statement. This procedure by itself is time consuming. After the draft statement is approved by the Agency internally, it is forwarded to the Environmental Protection Agency and the Council on Environmental Quality for their review and comment.

The review by the Environmental Protection Agency may take 60 to 90 days, or in some cases, even longer. The Council on Environmental Quality reviews the same draft statement, but is not required to comment.

The record reveals that many of the comments by the Environmental Protection Agency are negative in nature. In these cases, additional delay is encountered while EPA's comments are reviewed and the plans adjusted, where practical, to comply with EPA's objections. In addition, the Agency will often keep a draft statement for 60 or 90 days or even longer, and in some cases, even ask for an extension in the review time and then return the draft statement with no comments.

All of this creates unnecessary delay in the planning process and escalates the cost unreasonably. The major problem frequently is not with the preparation of the statements, but rather with the

lengthy review process which increases costs and contributes toward shortages and delay.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT REVIEW GROUP

Therefore, the committee has recommended steps to speed up the process. The committee has provided \$250,000 and 14 positions in the budget of the Environmental Protection Agency to supplement existing personnel and resources. Four of these positions would be located in Washington and one each would be located in the 10 regional offices of the Agency. These high level specialists would work with agencies, such as the Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Department of Transportation, during the initial planning stages of a project when mutually agreeable with and requested by the initiating agency so that the views of the Environmental Protection Agency could be considered during the project development stage. These individuals would have sufficient authority to comment in behalf of the Agency. In addition, they would become fully familiar with the project as it is being developed, thereby eliminating the current practice of review by individuals who are totally unfamiliar with the project and must do, or at least should do, a great deal of preparatory research. In addition, the recommendation would serve to eliminate the need for someone here in Washington to comment on the environmental aspects of a project hundreds or perhaps even several thousands of miles from Washington, in an area of the country he may never have seen.

With this procedure the committee would expect the Environmental Protection Agency to reduce the formal review process from months down to days.

In those cases where an environmental impact statement is required in connection with a project that is already under construction, the cost/benefit ratio should be based on the cost to complete the project versus the total benefits of the project. The review of impact statements prepared for ongoing projects should in no event exceed 10 working days.

SUBSTITUTE CHEMICALS

Last year, in the report on the fiscal year 1973 appropriation bill, the committee took note of the Administrator's questionable action regarding the banning of DDT. In taking that action, the Administrator overrode the findings of the Federal hearing examiner, who ruled, based on the evidence at hand, that no reason existed for banning DDT.

The committee concluded that:

The Committee is convinced that the Administrator's decision on DDT raises serious questions. DDT has been widely used throughout the world and has reportedly saved millions of human lives through increased food production and disease eradication. According to information provided to the Committee, throughout the many years of use, DDT has produced no known harmful effect to human health when properly used. The decision is within the power of the Administrator though doubtless this matter will eventually have to be settled by the courts.

It is to be noted that the Administrator says that in many respects the best substitutes constitute a real hazard—so much so that he has asked the Committee, and the Committee has acted favorably, for a training program for the substitutes.

He plans to turn to substitutes with which we have far less experience, are readily admitted to be highly toxic, and require a far greater frequency of application for a lesser result.

Testimony before the committee this year further substantiated the questionableness of replacing a chemical that over a period of 30-some years has produced no known harmful effects to humans with chemicals about which little is known other than they can be highly toxic to humans.

In the Administrator's ban on DDT he stated that:

The activity of DDT in the food chain and its impact on organisms . . . constitute an unknown, unquantifiable risk to man and lower organisms.

Banning a chemical to which 500 million people have been exposed without a single confirmed case of illness being attributed to it—according to the World Health Organization—and replacing that chemical with chemicals that are known to be highly toxic to man is truly an incredible decision. In fact, the Administrator's findings regarding the recommended substitute stated that the recommended substitute is dangerous to users and presents a risk to them—however—an opportunity to train users will minimize the risk and keep down the number of accidents.

UNSUPPORTABLE PRIORITIES

A decision that a chemical must be banned because it "may" or "could," or stating it another way, "may not" or "could not" be a threat to wildlife and replacing it with a chemical that "is" dangerous to humans would seem to represent a clearly unsupportable set of priorities.

The committee calls for a complete and thorough review based on scientific evidence of the decision banning DDT, taking into consideration all the costs and benefits and the importance of protecting the Nation's supply of food and fiber. The need for this review is amplified by a recent statement by the President of the National Academy of Sciences concerning the testimony at the DDT hearing:

Two-thirds of what I read I can only call trash; it was not science.

The committee recommends adding \$5 million to the bill for the testing of substitute chemicals. By providing this money the committee will expect the Agency to avoid taking actions based on insufficient knowledge like they have done in the past.

ARBITRARY DEADLINES

The committee is extremely concerned about the proliferation of legislation being passed by the Congress which places arbitrary deadlines on the Environmental Protection Agency. Some of these deadlines have even gone so far as to require an invention or the development of new technology by a given date.

Testimony before the committee indicates that the Water Pollution Control

Act Amendments of 1972 impose over 40 deadlines on the Agency. The Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1972 imposes additional deadlines, as does the Noise Control Act. In addition the Solid Waste Disposal Act and the Clean Air Act also contain numerous deadlines.

In many cases, these legislative deadlines have been imposed upon the Agency after passage of the annual appropriation bill. Since the deadlines are mandated in the law, the Agency must often use resources from other high-priority programs to comply with the law. This was the case recently when the Agency proposed to transfer \$6 million from the solid waste program and \$3.5 million from the Great Lakes program to comply with deadlines imposed by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Noise Control Act. The committee directed the Agency not to transfer funds from these high-priority programs and recommended instead a supplemental appropriation to meet these new legislative mandates.

The committee is convinced that many of these arbitrary deadlines are forcing the Agency to frequently make unsound decisions or to take ill-conceived actions. The use of deadlines in statutes or regulations may help to encourage a development, but the use of deadlines to attempt to force new inventions or new discoveries would appear to be impractical. The committee is convinced that the excessive use of deadlines results in the classical situation of "haste makes waste."

Therefore, the committee has recommended language in the bill providing that funds may not be transferred to meet deadlines. During fiscal year 1974 if legislation is passed calling for additional deadlines, then the Agency will be required to seek a supplemental appropriation. This technique will preclude the transfer of funds and people from high-priority programs merely to meet a deadline with no consideration of the priority of the action called for by the deadline.

STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

Because of all the problems discussed above, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,000,000 for a complete and thorough review of the programs of the Environmental Protection Agency. The studies shall be conducted under contract with the National Academy of Sciences which has a reputation for technical competence and complete objectivity, and shall include, but not be limited to:

First. The estimated cost of pollution abatement activities over the next decade and the benefits to be derived versus the cost. If we are to spend \$287 billion over the next decade, as estimated by EPA, how can we get the maximum pollution control for our money?

Second. The degree to which environmental regulations have contributed or will contribute to the current and the long-term energy crisis;

Third. The effect of emission control standards on the cost and performance of automobiles, including the cost/benefit implications of present standards;

Fourth. The benefits and hazards to

humans of agricultural and home use chemicals, such as pesticides, herbicides, rodenticides and fertilizers; and the effect on food and fiber production and the protection of human health of the inability to use those chemicals now banned or restricted; and

Fifth. The utilization of scientific and technical personnel and the identification of policy level positions that should be staffed with scientific or technical personnel.

The committee feels that this study will provide the information needed to better assess where we are headed and whether or not the cost of getting there is equal to the benefits. EPA will be expected to submit periodic reports to the committee on the progress of these studies. Copies of the final report shall be provided to the appropriate executive departments and agencies and to the Congress.

THE NEED FOR SCIENTIFIC STUDIES

The committee is concerned that many decisions, such as the banning of DDT and DES, may have been made without adequate scientific facts.

The following table provided the committee indicates that the substitutes for DDT are more toxic than DDT. The figures in the table show how much of a chemical must be used in order to cause acute oral toxicity in rats; in other words, the smaller the figures in the table, the more toxic the chemical. Therefore, the table shows that DDT is the least toxic of all the chemicals listed.

COMPARATIVE ACUTE ORAL TOXICITY FOR RATS OF VARIOUS CHEMICALS¹

Chemical	Males	Females
DDT	217.0	
Methyl parathion	14.0	24.0
Guthion	13.0	11.0
Azodrin	17.0	20.0
Lannate (methomyl)	(24.0)	
Ethion	65.0	27.0
EPN	36.0	7.7
Tritliion (methyl)	98.0	120.0
Di-Syston (disoltotan)	6.8	2.3
Demeton	6.2	2.5
Bidrin	21.0	16.0
Endrin	18.0	7.5
Monitor	15.6	13.0
Thimet (phorate)	2.3	1.1
Phosphamidon	24.0	24.0
Thiodan (Endosulfan)	43.0	18.0
Parathion	13.0	3.6
Temic (aldicarb)	.8	.6

¹ Source: Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Similarly, the committee asked the Food and Drug Administration how much of a banned substance a human would have to consume to equal the amounts given experimental animals. The Acting Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration replied as follows in a letter of May 17, 1973:

The following are ingredients that have been banned as a result of the lack of proof of safety, and because they induced cancer in laboratory testing of animals. The equivalencies of required intake by man of affected products are, of course, just simple mathematical projections. They are intended only to provide a general perspective of required consumption based on the levels of carcinogens used in laboratory experiments.

Cyclamate.—A 12-ounce bottle of soft drink may have contained from one-

fourth to 1 gram of sodium cyclamate. An adult would have had to drink from 138 to 552 12-ounce bottles of soft drink a day to get an amount comparable to that causing effects in mice and rats.

Oil of Calamus.—In order to get an amount comparable to that which caused effects in rats, a person would have to drink 250 quarts of vermouth per day.

Safrole.—person would have to drink 613 12-ounce bottles of root beer flavored soft drink or eat 220 pounds of hard candy per day to get an amount comparable to that which caused effects in rats.

1,2 - dihydro-2,2,4-trimethylquinoline: polymerized.—A plasticizer used in packaging material. If all foods in the diet were to be packaged in this material, a person would have to eat 300,000 times the average daily diet to get an amount comparable to that which caused effects in rats.

4,4'-methylenebis (2-chloroaniline).—A plastic curing agent used in food contact surfaces. If all foods in the diet were exposed to this material, a person would have to eat 100,000 times the average daily diet to get an amount comparable to that which caused effects in rats.

DES.—Based on findings of 5 percent of liver samples containing 2 ppb of DES, and assuming that 2 percent of the average diet is beef liver, a person would have to consume 5 million pounds of liver per year for 50 years to equal the intake from one treatment of day-after oral contraceptives.

Examples such as these, which translate abstract scientific studies into their real-life equivalents, help illustrate why commonsense is needed. The regulatory agencies under this bill should try to include such examples in future decisions so that the public will not become unduly alarmed.

COMMITTEE ACTIONS TO INSURE BALANCED DECISIONS

Because of these concerns, the committee has taken the following actions to help insure that future regulatory decisions will have a sound scientific and economic basis:

Provided \$200,000 for a study of the scientific basis for the Delaney Clause.

Provided such sums as may be necessary to enable the Consumer Product Safety Commission to establish an economic analysis capability.

Provided \$5,000,000 for the Environmental Protection Agency to prepare environmental and economic impact statements on all of their actions.

Provided \$5,000,000 for the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a complete review, analysis, and evaluation of the Environmental Protection Agency, and to make appropriate recommendations.

Provided \$1,000,000 to the National Industrial Pollution Control Council to study the effects of environmental requirements on the competitive position of American business.

There are three committee amendments that we propose to offer today to this bill which I think will prevent much of the dissension and differences of view that have prevailed.

The first amendment concerns the

Rural Development Act which was just recently passed by the Congress and signed by the President. Certainly nothing had more support throughout the Congress and throughout the country than the development of rural America, because we all recognize that the Rural Development Act was intended to provide programs to help keep rural America strong, which in turn would prevent the aggravation of many city problems by keeping more and more rural people from flocking into the cities which are already too crowded.

The President's budget included \$200 million for industrial development loans, and \$100 million for community facility loans.

But we found that the Office of Management and Budget had used the Rural Development Act to justify freezing all the programs that were already in existence to aid in the development of rural America.

Funds for water grants and sewage grants had been frozen.

Housing was frozen.

We asked Mr. William Erwin, Assistant Secretary for Rural Development, in the hearings before our committee: "What plans do you have for us to replace these action programs which have been eliminated?" At that time he was not able to satisfactorily answer that question. This is no reflection on Mr. Erwin, who is a very capable person. But at the time he appeared before the committee he had not had time to develop any definite plans. That being the case, the committee took money that was sent down by the Office of Management and Budget for rural development in the abstract, and put it back into the action programs such as rural electrification, housing, and water and sewer programs that had been destroyed or had been held up by the Office of Management and Budget.

We decided if they had no definite plan, the thing to do with the \$200 million for industrial development was to give \$20 million for some experimental work until such time as they could come up with a definite plan. We did the same thing with community development loans when we provided \$10 million of the \$100 million requested, pending development of definite plans. I have met with Mr. Erwin this morning, and he has convinced me they have now come up with concrete plans. On this basis, I will offer an amendment to provide \$100 million for industrial development loans and \$50 million for community facility loans. These are insured loans, and these amendments will not increase the budget totals. I hope the committee will support these amendments.

I understand there may be an amendment offered to provide administrative funds to the 1890 colleges. It was this committee which added funds above the budget in previous years to assure that the 1890 colleges received the funds they need and deserve. They have done a marvelous job since we started to provide these additional Government funds for research. Up until this year we have required that they prove their project in advance so that they could get good results. We have taken that provision out

this year because they have done such a good job it is no longer needed. They have made tremendous progress, and the committee is proud of its role in helping make this possible.

A report came out that because of limitation of administrative funds for the program the Cooperative State Research Service would not provide a liaison officer for the 1890 colleges. We agree there should be a liaison officer, and we will expect the Department of Agriculture to provide a liaison officer. But this can be done without additional funds. There is no need for additional funds, and I would oppose such an amendment. I repeat again, the 1890 colleges are doing a wonderful job, and the department should continue to give them all the assistance required.

The final committee amendment will provide \$2.8 million for a new toxicological laboratory at the National Center for Toxicological Research in Pine Bluff, Ark. The National Center is doing important research on low dosage testing of chemicals. It is hoped that this research will eventually help us to establish standards which are based upon realistic levels. The need for realistic standards is something I have been advocating since 1965 when I wrote a book: "That We May Live." I am proud that in 1965 I pointed out the need to do something about our environment, but I said that we also have to see that American industry continues to produce and that our standard of living continues at its present high level. I said we could easily get rid of much of the pollution in New York City if all of the folks there all moved out for a month, or quit living. We have to protect human health, and we support all actions necessary to do so. But we must also set priorities putting first things first.

There are more than 17 Congressional committees that review EPA programs, and more than 20 committees that review FDA programs. I do not know how many departments and agencies there are concerned with these topics, but everyone seems to want to use the current enthusiasm for these programs to get permission to build a new laboratory.

At the same time, we realized several years ago that we on this committee and in the Congress have been providing the money to staff the laboratory space that we already have, but which is not being used because of personnel ceilings imposed by the Office of Management and Budget. We have laboratories all over the United States today running at half blast or less because they cannot get the personnel under the ceiling to make use of the facility. So this year when the FDA came before us for funds for a laboratory in Pine Bluff, Ark., we had in our minds the question of doing something now, quickly, using facilities that are already available, and not going out and building new facilities.

Since that time we have discussed the matter further, and the Administration is convinced that they have a need for this laboratory and that it is at the right location. On the basis of this additional information, we expect to offer an amendment that will provide \$2.8 mil-

lion for the Pine Bluff Laboratory. In doing that, we realize that it will take time to complete it. It cannot be ready until July of 1976.

I see my friend, the gentleman from New York, JIM DELANEY, on the floor. The Delaney amendment I think is known as far and wide in this country as any one piece of legislation of which I know. I want to say further that it represents one of the finest provisions I ever knew to be in the law of the land, but when it was passed we had measuring devices which would show 50 parts per billion as "the practical equivalent of zero." We now have devices which can measure 50 parts per trillion, or 1,000 times more sensitive. When the law was first passed, things could be at zero and we could have a zero tolerance, but now I have become convinced there is no possible chance of anything having a zero tolerance because the instruments we have now are so sensitive, as was described to our committee, that they could isolate a dime in a billion dollars or separate 1 second from 100 years. When we get measuring devices that sensitive, we can find a trace of anything in almost anything.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have in this committee provided for a study of the Delaney amendment. After conferring with the distinguished author of that amendment, I personally have agreed that we can accept an amendment to the bill which will enable the Food and Drug Administration to bring together the existing information so we may have it in one place so we may decide what we want to do.

The problem we have again is that with the changing times and with the instruments we have which have become so sensitive we can find traces of anything any place any time, we need to do something, and the amendment offered by Mr. DELANEY will enable us to do something without causing further delay.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, what does the gentleman mean when he says it is the intention to bring this research together? There are five or six agencies now performing the kind of research that is implicit in the gentleman's statement.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman has just answered his own question. It is to bring together the information those five or six agencies have so we will have it in one place.

Mr. YATES. In what way will they bring it together? For instance the National Institute for Cancer is conducting certain research and the National Environmental Agency is. Other agencies are doing the same.

Mr. WHITTEN. When we say bring it together, it is a country boy's expression meaning to bring it together in one place and look at it. That is what I mean.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman wants them to coordinate the research then?

Mr. WHITTEN. Once we get it together they might consider that is the thing to do and we might agree. Cer-

tainly I am not going to do anything without consulting with the gentleman from New York, the author of the amendment. We do not know where to start now because we have six or eight agencies dealing with it in various stages of development, but we do not have any central place to bring it together.

I was trying to say we are going to do these things to bring existing information together and to formulate the questions about what do we do next.

There is one other problem which concerns me. I read in today's paper that the President of the United States is thinking about stopping the export of American food so that we will have plenty to eat at home. Let us analyze that. I am sure he means well. I am sure the statement probably is correct. But if we are short of food, if prices are too high, there is one answer: More production.

More production means there has to be profit for the fellow who produces the food. I was here during World War II when we kept cotton production in the United States at 46 cents a pound but sent it abroad for \$1.40. I say to the Members what we need to do is to promote increased production and not chastise and kick around those who are already producing.

We are all familiar with the fact that we have had what some consider tremendously high prices on beef. The Committee's report shows that actually we have some of the least expensive beef in the world. But we would all agree that even lower prices will be good. What is going to cause that to happen? More meat; not chastising the producer so that he does like you and I and moves to town. We need to fix it so that it is more attractive for him to produce more beef so the prices will go down.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I shall be glad to yield, after I give one more example of what I am talking about.

I apologize for using such a simple illustration, but farm income, the percentage of the gross national product that goes to farmers, has decreased from 7 percent 20 years ago to 3 percent today.

Members will say, "So what?" I say this is the reason we have had an average over a 20-year period of more than 400,000 leaving the farm every year. If this exodus continues, how are we going to eat? I say we have to have fair prices to encourage the farmer to continue farming, or they will all leave and then we will have really high food prices.

Let us look at it another way.

Investments in agriculture have now reached the astronomical figure of over \$341 billion, which is roughly equal to one-half the market value of all the stock on all the stock markets of the United States, or about three-fifths of the value of the capital assets of all corporations in the United States.

Let me tell the Members something else: those in agriculture have gotten down to the point where they are getting a return on their investments of only 3.6 percent. Unless we get back to the time of kings and the time of tyrants, we cannot make a fellow stay on the

farm against his will and farm until he goes broke. He will sell it to some subdivider and move to town and get on some of the various government programs to keep him eating, and he can do it in every State I know of.

Three and three-tenths billion dollars in this bill is to restore capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Many ask: Why do we have that provision in the bill?

Because we have a law that says to the farmer "you have to sell your farm products at world prices," but when he buys a cotton picker or any piece of equipment or hires labor, he has to pay American prices which are much higher.

Under the Agricultural Act of 1970, we promised him "You sell to the textile mills of the United States at world prices, and we will make up the difference through an annual appropriation."

I voted against that bill because I knew that it would result in the attacks which can be read in the daily press everyday, but that is the situation. Luckily, that law runs out this year, and they are writing a new one.

The amendment to limit payments to \$20,000 seems to me to be out of place here, because this law expires and we are writing a new act, and we should keep the promises we made in the 1970 Act until a new law replaces it.

I said then and I say now that it is a bad thing when those engaged in agriculture have to depend on an annual appropriations from Congress for part of their cost and for all of their profits. Are the Members surprised that over 400,000 leave the farm every year? I am not. If we do not wake up and realize that this 5 percent or less takes care of all these basic needs which enable the rest of us to live so well, and enables the rest of us to do something else, we will one day find they are no longer farming and we will all be in trouble.

I know that I hear every year folks refer to the farm program as though it were a relief program for those engaged in agriculture.

Do Members know why the first farm program was passed? Study the history. Farm purchasing power went down to such a low level in the 1920's and 1930's that they did not buy anything. When they did not buy anything industry could not sell anything. When industry could not sell anything they could not hire anybody, and it pulled us all down to the great depression. That is the reason why it happened.

The farm program was written to restore the purchasing power of those engaged in agriculture. When they got to where they could buy, it worked on up to the top, and we have had prosperity ever since.

But it seems as if we have to have a war or depression about once every generation, because the new people who come along will not believe history. I say we should believe in history, and should not repeat the mistakes of the past. We should avoid unwise revision of the farm program.

I say to the Members that we have brought to the House a bill which attempts to take care of many, many things. One of the things that we have

restored is the agricultural conservation program, which was started in the 1930's.

I grant that every man should take care of the land to which he has title in his lifetime for his children, for my children, and for all of us, but the records show that they have not.

Our supply of land has gone down to less than 50 percent of what it was. No longer can a man wear a farm out and have it said, "Move West, young man."

We started this program, and this program reached such proportions that a great part of this great Nation of ours was restored. Thousands of dams were built, to put in water, so that we could grow cattle with the use of those pools. Millions and millions of miles of terraces were built. Erosion was stopped.

We got 1.1 million Americans to put up about 70 percent of the money to do this work. And then all of a sudden, on December 26, this program was ended by Executive Order without the consent or even consultation with the Congress, this in spite of the fact that on September 29 the administration had announced it would approve a program for \$140 million.

I should like to read to the Members a statement from a speech of mine which was quoted by a Virginia newspaper on June 5, 1973.

This is addressed to me. It says:

SIR: The local county paper quoted from one of your talks on April 19.

We knew you would be interested that we feel the same way.

Let me read this quote:

We could leave to our children all the money in the world, and a wornout land, and in effect we would leave them nothing. On the other hand, if we leave them rich land with soil erosion stopped, with rivers and harbors free of pollution, and our hillsides once again in trees, they'll make it fine whatever our financial plight, for with a rich country behind them, they could establish their own financial system.

Think about it. What could be more important? That is why we have again restored the agricultural conservation program.

I deplore the fact that some folks have been so shortsighted in recent weeks as to criticize folks of wealth who put up 70 percent of the cost of restoring land for future generations. My goodness, they are a whole lot ahead of the rich men we read about in the Bible. If they can get the rich people to put up 70 percent of the cost to preserve the land for the future they deserve to be commended, and the fellow who gets them to do it deserves a pat on the back.

My friends, I could talk on and on, but we have to finish this bill tonight.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a general question, rather than one directed to this particular bill. But it is stimulated by this bill.

The gentleman is the cochairman of what I regard as a very important group, one that has been set up to try to establish certain budgetary procedures for the

Congress; and I, for one, am disturbed to hear that 2 weeks from the beginning of fiscal year 1974 this House and the other body, too, for that matter, seem to have done very little indeed to act on the recommendations of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman could tell us in that connection to what extent this appropriation bill, taken with the previous one that has passed the House, and the other appropriations bills that may be in the mill within the House Committee are moving in the direction of staying under the \$268 billion ceiling which the leadership in this House and in the other body both said last January they wanted to follow out, but for which we have been unable to establish procedures to carry out?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say that this bill is under the budget by \$120 million and is \$3.5 billion below last year. I also will state this: It is surprising perhaps to the Members of Congress, but the Committee on Appropriations has kept its total appropriations under the budget for 20 years. It is in the other areas where Congress has exceeded the budget, as the gentleman from New York knows, through backdoor spending and various and sundry other means.

The bill which the gentleman refers to has not been before the Committee on Rules, and I have not had a chance to talk to the chairman. The gentleman from Florida, Mr. PEPPER, a distinguished member of that committee, told me yesterday that members of the Committee on Rules have discussed it. They are going to have an early hearing, and he hopes that it will be a full hearing and it will be a fair hearing.

Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) that we have stayed below the budget, but it takes more than that to accomplish what he refers to, because we have done that; we have stayed below the budget for 20 years.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, is it a fair statement that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) does not expect this budget control bill will be enacted this year and, therefore, we are likely to have to depend on the Committee on Appropriations again if we really mean to stay below these ceilings which we have established for ourselves?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have always tried to have high expectations, and I have heard promises, some of which I take with a grain of salt.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) whether there is any money in this bill for the export subsidy programs. I am not talking about food for peace; I am talking about the export subsidies that accompanied the Soviet wheat deal.

Mr. WHITTEN. Funds in this bill are for restoration of losses by CCC for fiscal year 1972. That was prior to the actual Russian wheat sale.

So insofar as any direct moneys in this bill, I do not know of any. There may be, but I do not know of any.

May I say that on the Russian wheat deal I do not personally feel that it would have made a whole lot of difference whether people knew about it in advance or not, because the international operators know in advance practically everything that is occurring in the world. I do think we made a serious mistake in that deal, however. We sold \$1,100,000,000 worth of grain to the Russians, spread over a period of 3 years, and the terms were not favorable. We should have spread the deliveries over a period of 3 years.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the chairman of our Subcommittee on Agricultural, Environmental and Consumer Protection for his penetrating and accurate analysis of this most important appropriations bill. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) has no peer in this field. His vast knowledge, gained from years of experience, his sincere interest and deep understanding of the problems of farmers and rural people have made it possible for this committee to present a bill for our consideration that will adequately meet the needs of farmers, rural people, and all the consumers of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, we have kept the funding well within the proposed budget ceiling. As a matter of fact, the question the gentleman just raised could be answered in this way: That the Committee on Appropriations has kept the funding level \$3.2 billion below last year. It is beyond the Committee on Appropriations where these problems come.

From the outset of our hearings last February, we believed that ours was a bigger job than just funding a few farm and rural programs, along with the environmental functions on a routine basis. We in the field of agriculture were convinced then—as most everyone else is now—that we had a responsibility to the whole Nation—to every consumer—and to every other country who has need of our food and fiber and is able to pay for it.

Today, at long last, the public is starting to understand the incredibly important role the farmer plays in our national life—his contribution to our national well-being and security—his contribution to our international relations.

Our Nation's agricultural plant is unsurpassed in the world for its productivity. Fewer than 3 million farmers produce the greatest abundance and variety of food not only for the 205 million people here in our country, but last year we exported more than \$11 billion worth abroad. No other single industry contributes so much toward attaining a favorable balance of trade.

Those who attack the recent Russian wheat sales should take a look at the contribution it makes to all America and not just to the farm segment of our economy. In these days when we are importing an increasingly vast amount of foreign crude oil I would hate to think

what our balance of trade deficit would be without the farmers of our Nation. We need the farm exports and we need more farm exports and not less.

May I point out in this context that for each \$100 million of agricultural product exports some 5,000 domestic jobs at home in the cities are created. Our increased farm exports last year meant well over 100,000 new jobs off the farm. This is a distinct benefit to Mr. VANIK's district and one which I am sure he is very glad of having. Without those exports these new job opportunities in the cities could not have come about.

Consumers, understandably, have been and still are concerned about the cost of food. I think they are beginning to understand that farmers and farm programs are not at fault. American consumers still get the best food buy of any country in the world. Less than 16 percent of our total disposable income in this country goes for food.

It may not make the average wage earner's pocketbook any fatter and it might not make the average housewife any happier, but it should be some solace to them to know that as of May 30 of this year sirloin steak in Washington, D.C., one of the four highest cost-of-living areas in the Nation, was selling at the bargain price of \$1.79 a pound while it was \$3.84 in Germany, \$4.03 in Stockholm, \$12.86 in Tokyo. Bacon was 99 cents in Washington, \$3.09 in Paris, and \$2.33 a pound in Copenhagen.

These are just a few examples of comparative food costs around the world. You will note that I did not pick the backward, underdeveloped countries for comparison but, rather chose the highly industrialized, prosperous nations.

The housewife is indeed well treated by farmers and farm programs. Consumers can continue to get an abundance of food at reasonable prices if they but try to understand the unique problems that farmers have to contend with and support the kinds of programs which permit the American farmer to produce to capacity.

First of all, the public has to understand the farmer is just as much a victim of inflation as everyone else is and maybe more so. The chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) pointed out quite rightly that the farmer gets an average return of 3.6 percent on his investment. The normal business in this country gets an average return of 12 percent on its investment. The farm economy runs at one-third the return on its investment that other businesses in this country get. The farmer is the only guy in business today who buys everything he has to use for production at retail and then is forced to sell his products at wholesale prices.

It is an old cliche but so very true that the farmer is constantly caught in a cost-price squeeze. In this day of highly technological and mechanized farming, farm costs are exorbitant. Fertilizer and weed and pesticide chemical prices have more than doubled in the last 10 years. A tractor costing \$2,500 in 1965 now costs more than \$5,000. Combines for harvesting wheat and feed grains cost more than

\$20,000. This gives you some idea of how inflation has hit the farmer.

But note that choice beef on the Omaha market was selling for the same price during the old OPA days in 1951, at the time of the Korean war, as it was selling for last year. You could buy a 1951 top-of-the-line Chevrolet automobile for \$1,570, yet just last year we finally got the price of beef back on the hoof to where it was when you could buy that Chevrolet or any other automobile of that sort for about one-third of what you pay for it today.

In wheat, for instance, on the Minneapolis market, the major milling center in this country, the wheat price today is no higher than it was 25 years ago.

Wheat, the basic ingredient for the staff of life, bread, does not cost any more today than it did 25 years ago, yet the housewife in the grocery store is paying three times as much for a loaf of bread. The answer to the problem of high food prices does not lie in the price of grain at the farm level. If the farmer does not receive an adequate return on his investment, if the farmer does not receive a fair price on his products, then all we are going to see is scarcity.

Mr. Chairman, the farmer today must be a businessman. If he cannot meet his costs of production he cannot produce for very long before he faces bankruptcy or mortgage foreclosure. It is that simple.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the chairman of the subcommittee mentioned the statement by the President with respect to control of exports when they tend to disturb domestic supplies. Does the gentleman agree with the President's view that we are at a point where we have to insure that domestic supplies are adequate?

As a Member of this body for almost 19 years, I have voted for extensive subsidies to develop farm research, increase productivity on the farm, and to provide encouragement for agricultural production. I think that is important. But, by the same token, is not the American taxpayer who plowed in so much to develop agricultural research and productivity and other incentives over the years, entitled to the first chance at domestic production. Shouldn't exports be limited to that part of the production which is over the domestic need?

Does the gentleman think it makes good sense to export ourselves into a condition of want?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Certainly I do not want to create a condition of want in the United States. But let me commend my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, for his votes in favor of the farm programs, and in favor of farm research. Those votes over the last decade and a half or two decades have given the American consumers what I have just pointed out, meat that costs half as much as meat sells for in Europe, one-quarter what it sells for in Japan. These programs have given the American consumers the opportunity to have wheat available in this Nation, and not a short-

age. Granted the price is higher than it was in the depression days on the farms 2 or 3 years ago. But the price of wheat today, even after this Russian wheat sale, is still only half as much here at home as the \$4.30 price that wheat now brings in Europe. All these programs that my colleague has voted for, have given us an adequate supply at prices roughly half what the rest of the world pays.

If we are to engage in export controls two things are going to happen. First, if we say we are going to stop the shipment overseas of agricultural commodities—and mind you, today the rest of the world, which is holding a great number of our dollars as this negative balance of payment thing has gone on, and, indeed the Japanese alone have over \$4 billion in our money in surplus from last year—remember that the only thing they want to buy from the United States are agricultural commodities because it is about the only basic industry left in this country that is competitive on the world market—so if we cut off the export of agricultural commodities then the run on our dollar that began in the last few months will continue at an unprecedented rate that could very well bring the dollar's worth to a disastrously lower level.

If you desire to set export controls then we ought to set them at a point where the domestic price will be really high enough so that the farmer can continue to produce. If the gentleman from Ohio would propose to set export controls as to drive the prices of grain and beef down to where they were a couple of years ago then the average farmer could not continue to produce and we would have worse shortages even with export controls.

Mr. VANIK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield further.

Mr. VANIK. But to return to the original point on the subsidy programs which are supported by the taxpayers, I believe they ought to be directed to those who produce for domestic needs. If the farmer wants to produce over and above domestic needs and for export, that is up to him, but he should not have both. He should not have both taxpayer-supported subsidies and the advantage of exporting his products to the point where such exports jeopardize the American food supplies.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Not at all. The farmer has a yardstick that he can use. He has the parity index on his purchasing power where he buys products that are made in our American steel mills and in our other industrial areas.

This parity index gives him an idea of how he is doing vis-a-vis the rest of the economy. As we point out, he has not been doing too well. He has just begun to come back into his own. I am sure the American farmer will be more than happy to reserve a part of his production at parity price for domestic consumption, but he cannot do it for less than parity price. I do not think any thoughtful person in the city would have him do it. Then if the price for the rest of his production goes above parity be-

cause of the demands as far as the rest of the world, fine. We have got a situation we can live with.

But until the farmer gets the parity or fair price, a farmer cannot see his goods driven down in price by artificial barriers that preclude his exporting into a market that is willing to pay a fair price.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I might say to the gentleman that this Member feels that these payments of support for incentive make a lot of sense if they insure adequate food supplies for the American people, but I do not believe that the taxpayer should be called on to subsidize the production of agricultural products, to a level when domestic supplies are reduced below need and consumer prices escalate. I think export ought to stand on its own.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I think the gentleman will be happy to hear that under the farm bill that just passed the Senate—the farm bill that, incidentally, I support—at the present price levels the American taxpayer would not pay one nickel in agricultural support prices. So this new concept of target pricing could well answer the question that the gentleman is bringing up.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman from North Dakota referred to wheat. I think that maybe something ought to be put in the RECORD concerning feed grains. The question is not whether there is an adequate supply. The Department's own figures show there will be a 900-million-bushel carryover at the end of this fiscal year. The sole question is whether other segments of the economy want to force the producers of feed grains to sell at less than world market price. That is the sole question involved: Should other segments of the economy be able to force agricultural producers to sell commodities at less than their value? That is what is involved.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Let me go on to point out that to keep this farm plant going we need programs for conservation such as REAP, the water bank program, watershed and flood control and all other soil and water conservation measures that minimize the hazards of erosion, drought, flood, and other disasters and preserve the soil for future generations.

Income incentives—like commodity loans and price supports in previous programs—and the new "target price" program being proposed this year—give the farmer the basic assurance that he can at least plant his crop and—God willing—he can harvest it and sell it at a price where he can stay in business, and consumers can depend on an adequate supply of food.

These are the programs we need to stimulate the production that keeps our

country well fed and with an adequate supply of fiber from our Nation's farms.

As the Congressman from the Nation's most rural State, I believe the bill before us is responsive to the essential needs of farmers. I think it also responds fully and adequately to the needs of consumers and to the basic safeguards in protecting and enhancing our Nation's environment.

This bill also funds some of the principal regulatory agencies, including the Federal meat and poultry inspection program, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Food and Drug Administration, the Federal Trade Commission, and the new Consumer Product Safety Commission. Each of these Agencies has tremendous individual power over every aspect of American life.

Holding such power, they need our special attention, as well as funds. We believe these Agencies should use their powers responsibly, acting only on the basis of scientific fact and with due consideration to the economic and social impact of their decisions. They must also always proceed with a sense of priorities, placing that which is dangerous to health ahead of that which is merely undesirable or unesthetic.

Some time ago the Food and Drug Administration, because of the terms of the Delaney amendment, cut out the use of diethylstilbestrol as a cattle feed. There is a question about the use of diethylstilbestrol, but in cutting this out, they increased the cost of production of our beef by some 17 percent. The consumer now has to pay the additional 17 percent for the cost of beef because we no longer have stilbestrol.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The consumer is healthier for not having destilbestrol.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. As my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) points out, the consumer feels healthier because of not having stilbestrol. This is what the farmer wants because a farmer is going to sell more meat if the consumer knows it is a healthy and viable product.

Let me point out what developed when the Food and Drug Administration people were before our committee. I asked Dr. Edwards how much stilbestrol was found in the animals and he answered that it was two parts per billion. I asked him where it was found, whether it was in the skeletal meat, and he said no, it was only in the liver and kidney, up to two parts per billion, and he said on that basis they banned it.

Then I said to Dr. Edwards, "Did not your agency only 2 months ago OK the use of the morning after birth control pill?" He said yes they had. I asked him how much stilbestrol it contained, and then the slide rule boys got busy and they came out with the number of milligrams. I asked the doctor how many pounds of liver a housewife would have to eat to make up for one of these birth control pills, and the slide rule boys got busy again and came up with the answer of 55,000 pounds. This brings the question, "Is it all right to take the birth

control pill that gives the same amount of stilbestrol as would be contained in 55,000 pounds of liver but it is too bad if it is found in the liver?" Then there was some chuckling in the back of the room and I commented, "There must be more to this story than has been brought out." And they said, "Yes, there is. It is not just one pill but it is five pills, one pill taken each day 5 days in a row."

So that would come up to about 275,000 pounds of contaminated liver.

These are the things that point out the fact that we do need the study of the products and the application of the Delaney amendment and other rules and regulations relating to products which the consumer uses in his home as well as what he consumes as food. I think all of us are in favor of this and our committee has been responsive to this.

There must also be a consideration of the competitive effects of regulatory decisions. Many small businesses are having difficulty complying with the complex regulations being promulgated. They should receive all permissible help or else the result may be the achieving of one set of social objectives at the expense of another. The maintenance of competition—a goal of the Federal Trade Commission—may be endangered by edicts of the EPA or FDA or the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

The goal of increasing exports may also be hampered by excessive regulation. The committee has heard allegations that some foreign countries are trying to entice American industry overseas by establishing less stringent regulatory policies. The new Consumer Product Safety Act tacitly recognizes this problem by permitting different export standards. The Federal Trade Commission is also becoming concerned about this problem.

The committee is concerned that many decisions such as the banning of DDT and DES may have been made without adequate scientific facts.

For this reason the committee took the following action to help insure that future regulatory decisions will have a sound scientific and economic basis.

We took also action in some other fields.

For instance, the committee provided \$200,000 for a study of the scientific basis for the Delaney clause.

The committee provided such sums as may be necessary to enable the Consumer Product Safety Commission to establish an economic analysis capability.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Delaney clause, may I quote to my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota, the comments of Dr. Saffiotti, who as the gentleman knows is at the National Cancer Institute and is one of the most outstanding cancer research people in the Nation. He says this in a study that appeared in the March issue of "Preventive Medicine":

My opinion is that the Delaney clause is most effective and scientifically sound piece of legislation. I should like to see it extended

to other sources of exposure besides food, e.g. household products and particularly drinking water, whose standards do not measure up to present requirements for food products.

The Delaney clause is useful in protecting the consumers of America. It should be strengthened rather than weakened.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. That is why we ask for this money for the study, and if it is found necessary we can strengthen the Delaney clause or somehow make it more responsive, but we want to know the total picture.

But there are scientists, as the gentleman knows, as knowledgeable and renowned as the gentleman my friend just quoted, who take a position 180 degrees opposite the opinion quoted.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not believe that is true. They would say \$200,000 is totally inadequate. All it provides for is the calling together of a new panel to discuss the Delaney amendment. That has been done on several occasions recently. It could not possibly serve to carry on any significant research. I recognize there is in the report approval for the transfer of other funds but I think the Agency may well hesitate to do that because in doing so it will be taking money from other activities of the Agency.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I think the gentleman from Illinois will agree, however, we need to have more facts on the record concerning this whole field of Federal regulation.

Mr. YATES. Of course. As a matter of fact I joined in my dissent to the committee report in saying that we do need more facts and that I would hope the committee would provide more money for research. I think the more we know about this field the better it will be for the people of this country.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I would like to say in the committee we have provided \$5 million for the Environmental Protection Agency to prepare environmental and economic impact statements on all of their actions.

Provided \$5 million for the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a complete review, analysis and evaluation of the Environmental Protection Agency, and to make appropriate recommendations.

Provided \$1 million to the National Industrial Pollution Control Council to study the effects of environmental requirements on the competitive position of American business.

We have also adequately funded and authorized sufficient lending capacity for many of the rural development programs, including REA and RTA, rural housing and such community development programs as loans and grants for water and waste disposal systems.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think our committee has come up with one of the most sensible and acceptable appropriation bills in my 8 years on this committee.

I commend it to the members for their favorable consideration.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I would

like to hear from the gentleman from North Dakota concerning his opinion on the need for establishing a reserve food program. I do not think that is contemplated in this appropriation, but I would like to hear his views.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I would be more than happy to do so.

Those of us from rural areas for a long time have proposed the use of reserve supplies of agricultural commodities controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and releasable only at full parity and in times of need.

This feeling, I am sure, is shared by all of us from both sides of the political aisle in the farm belt, if we can get this type of commodity reserve program.

In the past, however, it has not functioned this way. They have been subject to dumping by various Secretaries of Agriculture, whether Republican or Democrat. They have reacted in the same way. It is tempting to have the food, to let it go, and they have let it go and kept farm prices at a ruinously low price.

A commodity reserve releasable at parity would be an excellent safeguard for the consumers of America, and I think it would have the support of all of us who represent rural America.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, is there any provision for that in bill before the other body?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. There is some provision for that. There were provisions for it in separate legislation in this field, and I am sure the gentleman from Ohio will have an opportunity to take a stand on it in the near future.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I want especially to commend my neighbor from North Dakota for a very fine and splendid presentation of these important matters.

I would also like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN). I would like to say that this report should be must reading for every Member of this Congress, and for many, many more people. It is a splendid report.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to my colleague on the subcommittee.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, inherent in the number of attacks which have been made on this legislation today and in many of the arguments which will be presented, will be that the farmer is overly prosperous or that he is making too much money in comparison with other segments of our economy.

I think now, in the preliminary debate, it would be well to mention a couple of facts which were brought to the attention of the subcommittee during the hearings. The Farm Credit Administration witnesses pointed out to us that the assets of the farmer have increased about

two to three times since 1950. However, the debt of our farmers has increased six-fold since 1950.

Along that same line and in the same tenor, the evidence was that our farmers in 1971, which was the last year in which we have statistics available made a return of 3.8 percent on their investments. We know, Mr. Chairman, that if we put our money in savings accounts in banks or savings and loan institutions or in common stocks, we know that we can make two and three times as much return on our investment as our farmers are making now in the last year in which we have statistics available.

I think these general observations are very appropriate as we begin to discuss and debate this bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I appreciate my distinguished friend from North Dakota yielding to me.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Can the gentleman tell me if there is any money in this bill which provides for administrative expense of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Yes, there is.

Mr. FINDLEY. I raise this question because in previous years I have asked the committee members if we could see the day when this insurance program would be entirely self financing. As long as 8 or 10 years ago I had the response, "We are working toward that end, but not now."

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Has the gentleman read the testimony in the hearing, by the head of the Federal crop insurance program.

Mr. FINDLEY. No, I have not.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. That is in the hearing book. If the gentleman will look at the hearings and then ask his questions, I believe perhaps he will find that was brought out quite explicitly and in great detail, as to the matter with which he is concerned.

Mr. FINDLEY. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Is a case made for administrative expenses to be paid out of the public treasury, as against getting the administrative expenses out of the fees charged for the insurance?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. A case was made, yes.

Mr. FINDLEY. I would be interested to see a persuasive case.

May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) if he has any indication as to when the full cost of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation expenses will be met fully by the assessments made against those who buy the insurance?

Mr. WHITTEN. I personally do not.

As the gentleman knows, I have dealt with this program for a long time. I remember when it went completely broke.

I have had many letters from those who are engaged in the insurance field, asking about getting the Government out of this insurance program. In every in-

stance I have written back to them and said, "As soon as you will take it over they will be glad to."

This is an area where it was difficult to get insurance.

The amount of the premiums to be paid, and the amount of the administrative cost provided in this bill, were recommended by the Office of Management and Budget, which is not known to be very generous with its approval of funds for agricultural programs.

May I say to the gentleman that where we have not had crop insurance and where we have had various disasters, this program is by far the most economical protection we can have against weather and other hazards, and is probably 10 times as economical as having to provide disaster relief through appropriations.

May I say again that we followed the recommendations of the Office of Management and Budget. I personally hope that action will not be taken to charge all of the administrative cost of the program against premium income. If this should happen the program probably would not be able to operate.

Mr. FINDLEY. I should like to make it plain that I do not object to the Federal crop insurance program. I do object to the general revenue picking up the cost of administration. After all these years the corporation should have enough experience to adjust its rates for insurance to a sufficient level to cover the cost of the program.

Mr. WHITTEN. In theory I could not differ with the gentleman. But in those areas where the crop insurance program has operated there is tremendous risk, and the risk is sufficiently great that the private insurance companies have not been interested.

I believe we have to take that into consideration. We have to maintain the program, because it is far more economical to keep farmers engaged in agriculture with a program where they pay for their own protection than any other way.

Mr. FINDLEY. As a matter of fact, there are private insurance companies which offer almost identical coverage, but they raise a very valid complaint that they have unfair competition because the Government program is not fully paid for by the premiums charged.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have had those kinds of letters. I have replied, "Please make us an offer for this program," I have not had a single response.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately I was not able to be here during quite all of the general debate. I wonder if there has been any discussion of the Federal contribution to the cotton promotion program, and whether there is any money in this bill for cotton sale promotion?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. There has been no discussion as yet. I will be glad to yield to the chairman of the committee for his comments on the cotton promotion fund.

Mr. WHITTEN. There is no money in the bill for cotton promotion. There is some language in the committee's report

in which the committee discusses the statement by the gentleman from Iowa. It is on page 37 of the report.

I do not know whether the gentleman has had an opportunity to read the report or not. However, I suggest he look at page 37. Hereafter, all budgets have to be sent to the Department for their prior approval. We have not appropriated funds directly for that program.

The agriculture law that expires this year has a provision in it which provides for the provision of these funds. The gentleman from Illinois who just spoke has a certain feeling as to whether program operations are in line with the intentions of the law. However, the funds are provided by law, and not by appropriations in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. So that there can be money made available for Cotton, Inc.; is that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the money made available for Cotton, Inc. is under the basic law and not under this appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. And available through the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right, but that again relates to the farm legislation that expires this year.

Mr. GROSS. Does this legislation affect that? I do not suppose it does, since this is an appropriation bill and would be subject to a point of order. It does not change anything, does it, in that regard?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this bill does not.

But we have made some pointed comments in our report. Activities covered by these special research funds must have prior approval of the Department.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) yield on that same point?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) inform this body whether or not a third annual incremental payment of \$10 million has been actually disbursed by the Commodity Credit Corporation for research and promotion to benefit Cotton, Inc.?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the latest report I have is that it has not been.

Mr. FINDLEY. I understand there is some dispute over the propriety or the correctness of the operations of the Cotton, Inc., and that that has caused a delay in approval. I understand they have been setting aside some of their resources from the dollar-a-bale checkoff and, instead of spending those funds, have been expending the other funds.

That being the case, it would seem to me an amendment could be offered to this appropriation bill which would effectively prohibit the expenditure of that third incremental \$10 million payment.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not think so. May I say I do not think that would be necessary. I do not think it would lie with this bill, because there is no money in this bill for that purpose. I do think that authority expires this calendar year, because the law itself expires during this

calendar year. Since we expect to have an authorization bill before us shortly from the gentleman's committee, I would expect that situation will be taken care of.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would again call the gentleman's attention to page 37 of the report.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express the hope that when this bill is offered in relation to the Commodity Credit Corporation, I hope it will have the gentleman's enthusiastic support.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman is talking about the legislative bill, it is not before us.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am talking about the bill before us today.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think it would be subject to a point of order which I think would be made.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) realizes that there is no line item in the bill for that purpose. That has been mandated by Congress, it has been directed out of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it relates to the funds spent in the capital impairment, so there is no item in this bill for the Cotton Council promotional program as such.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think that is one more illustration of the reason why we ought to be working toward the day when this Commodity Credit Corporation is terminated. It is used as a shield for a lot of things like this, and it makes it impossible for Congress to work its will.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) points out is not that the Commodity Credit Corporation should be terminated, but that the backdoor spending that has been growing by leaps and bounds by legislative act to circumvent the Committee on Appropriations of this Congress ought to be done away with. This is another example of backdoor spending, and if the gentleman objects to it, the objection should have been made at the time this legislation passed, but not on the appropriations bill where we do not have a line item for it.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to seize every opportunity to shut down treasury gifts to Cotton, Inc.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, what we do here in the House today may make a few minor headlines, but it probably will not rate a place in any major news network.

WHAT IS CONGRESS DOING?

People are beginning to ask "Well, what is Congress doing?" Congress has taken action on many important matters. The action has not all been in accordance with my views and there is no claim of perfection but Congress has been struggling with many important issues. I am not sure the American people, however, are aware of it.

There are in the House and Senate

about 350 committees and subcommittees of all kinds. One special committee is conducting the Watergate hearings. But a lot of other very important things are going on in the Congress about which the people are not aware. No wonder some of them inquire "Well, what is Congress doing?"

Mr. CHAIRMAN, here we are working on a very important piece of legislation which will probably not attract in a big way the attention of the American people.

APPROPRIATIONS SCHEDULE

I was just looking at what we have scheduled for consideration in the House even from one committee, the Committee on Appropriations, for the next 2 weeks and would like to share with my colleagues the following schedule:

SCHEDULE OF APPROPRIATIONS BILLS, JUNE 1973

Friday, June 15: Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection.

Monday, June 18: District of Columbia.

Wednesday, June 20: Transportation.

Friday, June 22: Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science, and Veterans.

Tuesday, June 26: Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare.

Wednesday, June 27: Interior.

Thursday, June 28: Public Works-Atomic Energy Commission.

Friday, June 29: State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary.

CONGRESS WORKS THROUGH COMMITTEES

So, Mr. Chairman, it would indeed seem Congress is not marking time but, rather, Congress is very hard at work, as it should be. And the work of the Congress, really, according to Woodrow Wilson, who was quite a scholar of government, is performed principally in committee. I do not think this fact is widely recognized by people across the country. The day-to-day work of the committee is not often noted in the press and on radio and television, but the members of the committee have spent many, many days and nights earlier in the year in the preparation of the bills which we are bringing to the House in June. And the work continues in the Appropriations Committee and elsewhere.

The schedule for the balance of June which I have cited is just an example of what is being done through one of the agencies of the House, the Committee on Appropriations.

Other committees have been active, and we have considered and will consider, of course, much meaningful legislation. I thought it well to take stock of the situation here in order to show that we are moving along with our responsibilities. I hope we will not overdo it in presenting so many appropriation bills here this week and the following 2 weeks, but, of course, we are discharging as much of our appropriations responsibility in the House as we can before the beginning of the next fiscal year on July 1.

In addition to these measures, of course, we have passed two supplemental appropriation bills, and we will be required to pass before the 1st of July a continuing resolution involving appropriation bills.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcom-

mittee the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) and the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) for their logical and vigorous presentations to the House today. I shall not undertake to expand on what has been said. I hope the work of the committee may find favor with the Members of the House and that we may be able to complete this bill today and send it over to the other body.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY).

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) for yielding this time to me.

I want first to express my gratitude to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) and to the subcommittee members themselves for bringing to us an outstanding appropriation bill in a very complex field.

I think that they have shown an important new direction for the guidance of the Federal Government during the next year, and I congratulate them.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address two questions to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN). I am concerned because these matters relate to a situation in my district.

On page 19 of the committee report there is outlined the appropriation for Agricultural Research Services for the next year, which brings about a decrease of \$17 million in the overall appropriation for that service. The bill provides for some of our really important needs, including a \$3 million set-aside for general research purposes as may be needed.

Shortly thereafter, still on page 19 of the committee report, reference is made to the Brawley Field Station in California, also known as the Southwestern Irrigation Field Station, where important work is done in the development of cotton, sugarbeets, and in irrigation and drainage techniques. But I am not clear as to what the funding situation would be, Mr. Chairman, with respect to that particular station, and that is of great concern within my district.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield, may I say to the gentleman from California that I believe the committee went far beyond what it did in a number of instances in designating these as worthwhile activities and that they should have special attention. The reason for the committee following that course has been that through the years we have found that just about everyone in all of the communities in our country come to Washington, and want something done by somebody in the Department. The people in the Department have said to them that if they want the projects then they will have to get Congress to provide extra money, and that then the Department would do it. The fact is that if we were to draft a compilation of all these requests for extra money it would make a book about the size of a Sears Roebuck catalog, and the total of these

items would be about as much as the national budget. So what we try to do is to give the Department a certain amount of money, and tell them that within that amount of money they can deal with the problems on a priority basis.

Mr. VEYSEY. I thank the chairman for that particular explanation with regard to the problems that the committee has.

I am sure that the gentleman is well aware that with respect to the Brawley Station there has been a merging of the activities of the La Jolla Station which will be shut down, and which has been extremely instrumental in the development of certain produce crops such as canteloups and lettuce and, most importantly, in trying to fight the rising cost of food to the housewife. Hopefully these programs can be appropriately funded at the Brawley Station.

Mr. WHITTEN. I can appreciate the concern of the gentleman from California, and agree with the gentleman that there are many important projects that do need attention such as the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. VEYSEY. I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) for his reassurance.

The second question that I would like to ask relates to page 65 of the committee report dealing with the \$159 million set aside for research by the Environmental Protection Agency.

As the gentleman from Mississippi, is aware, one of the responsibilities of this agency is the enforcement of standards under the Clean Air Act. About the time the committee report was being formulated the EPA came forth with the rather startling announcement, I believe it was on the 8th of June, that their techniques and methods for measuring the health effects of levels of oxides of nitrogen in our air were faulty, and their test methods were invalid, and that they were obliged to reclassify their air controls based on this new knowledge. I also believe that they are uncertain as to what this will do with respect to the enforcement of the 1976 nitrogen oxides standards on automotive emissions under the Clean Air Act.

Therefore it seems to me that this may call for a massive and very rapid research program on the human health effects of various levels of oxides of nitrogen. I wonder if provision has been made or will be made within this appropriation bill to take care of that situation?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY) that I mentioned earlier in the debate that in 1965 I wrote a book recommending that we do something in this area. There are about 190 individuals who were willing to be identified with those views, or who were willing, at least, to have their names identified with the conclusions we came to.

Certainly in the preparation of that book, which took about 2 years, I handled hundreds and hundreds of texts, and among the approximately 200 individuals who we dealt with, I found quite a few differences of opinion.

I personally am convinced that in lots of areas the EPA has acted too hastily, frequently under the pressure of Con-

gress to come out with something. For example, they had over 40 deadlines to meet in the case of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. In order to meet a deadline, frequently they rush out without proper preparation. In their own agency I know of high level executives who have their own differences of opinion.

I am a former lawyer who has been a Member of Congress a good while. I do not feel capable of making scientific decisions. Neither do I give any such standing to my colleagues who work in this area on other committees, but we did the very best thing we could. We provided \$5 million for study in this area by the National Academy of Sciences, which the gentleman knows was created way back, I think, in the time of Abraham Lincoln. There are about 1,000 scientists who select from their own number this group. So we said all these things look to us as though they may be wrong, but we are not experts. So we put \$5 million in the bill to get the best folks we could to make a study to see what the situation is.

I might make a comment here. On a recent weekend I was driving with my wife through Virginia. I stopped at a service station and asked the fellow if he had any trouble with his gasoline supply. He said, "No, not yet." I said, "Well, how about automobiles?"

He said, "Well you are driving a 1972 car. It will take about 7 gallons to fill. It will take about 9 gallons to fill a 1973."

Much of this can be traced back to the EPA. So the Members can see why we put \$5 million in the bill to get some scientists to decide this matter. I do not want to pay for that extra 2 gallons of gas if it is uncalled for.

Mr. VEYSEY. I thank the chairman for that response and for his guiding the committee in that particular direction. I do think we are at an important point of decisionmaking in this respect. Congress has mandated a 90-percent reduction in the oxide of nitrogen emissions under the Clean Air Act by 1976, and now EPA tells us that their methods of measurement are knocked out, and the health effects are unclear.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have worked in this area for some several years. I am sure the gentleman has, too. We can talk all afternoon about this problem, but in this area we are discussing, despite our high desire, somewhere way back someone said, "You cannot change the sum total of matter." You can change it to a liquid or you can change it to a solid. You can take it out of water and put it into the air or you can bury it, but it is still there.

In the area of automobile emissions someone said, "Why can we not do like Japan does?" I do not know. Some of the scientists say the reason we cannot is because Congress set a deadline, and we have got to meet a certain date. If the auto companies have to start with the engines they presently have, they cannot meet the deadline if they take the time to start experimenting with new engines. That is the reason we look to the National Academy of Sciences. They have experts to make these decisions.

There is another reason for putting this in the bill. There are at least 17

legislative committees that have some degree of jurisdiction over EPA. Therefore, we had better get some outside referee to decide this thing, and, preferably, someone from the scientific world.

Mr. VEYSEY. I thank the chairman for his response. I trust he will make sure that there is adequate research funding for competent scientists to make the determinations as to the human health effects of this important air pollutant.

Mr. WHITTEN. Every year the EPA and the Food and Drug Administration have been before our subcommittee, we have substantially increased their appropriation.

Mr. VEYSEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER), a member of the committee.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection, of the Appropriations Committee, now brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual appropriations bill for fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Chairman, I have served on the Appropriations Committee for a period of 18 years, and during this time it has been my pleasure to serve on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. This year we have on our subcommittee a number of new members and they are all outstanding Members of the House. We have on the Democratic side Representative BILL BURLISON of Missouri, Representative NEAL SMITH of Iowa, Representative BOB CASEY of Texas, and on the Republican side, Representative KENNETH ROBINSON of Virginia. These Members are all outstanding Members of the House and have rendered yeoman service on this subcommittee.

As the chairman knows, this subcommittee is chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, one of the able Members of this Congress, and on the Republican side we have our friend, the gentleman from North Dakota, MARK ANDREWS, the ranking minority member, another able Member of this House. I feel better serving on this subcommittee when I know that we, like JAMIE WHITTEN and MARK ANDREWS, are working on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in addition I serve as a member of the subcommittees that appropriate funds for the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for the District of Columbia.

I have believed all down through the years that the Secretary of Agriculture should stand up for the American farmer. Regardless of politics, the Secretary of Agriculture should always be an outstanding man in the field of agriculture and should at all times stand on the front line and make the fight for the American farmer. I have read a number of speeches made by Secretary Butz concerning a number of matters in our agricultural program that have been under attack and he has made every attempt to see that on these particular issues he has held firm for the interests of the American farmer.

As we all know, our farmers know how

to produce and we have an adequate food supply. In every emergency, when called upon, our farmers have produced the necessary food and fiber to take care of our people, and in many instances have produced adequate supplies for assistance programs to help the free countries around the world who are in need.

We must keep in mind that we still have many serious problems in agriculture and certainly this is not the time to turn our back on the American farmer. Each year it becomes more difficult to maintain a sound agricultural economy, due to the increasing costs in labor, equipment, and the high cost per acre of good farm land.

We are now operating under phase 4 of the Economic Stabilization Act and we read articles every day in our newspapers concerning the high cost of food. It is more important today than at any time in the past that we give more time and study to the situation that prevails between the time agricultural commodities leave the farm and are sold to the time that the products go into the homes of our people for consumption. Mr. Chairman, as you well know, every investigation that has been made in the past 10 years discloses the fact that the middleman, and not the farmer, is the cause of the high price of food and agricultural commodities.

Today the energy situation appears to be serious. We are confronted daily with articles concerning shortage of electric power, natural gas, and oil. Mr. Chairman, the American farmer must have an adequate supply of gasoline, fuel oil, natural gas, and electric power to produce the food necessary for our people. We must keep in constant touch with this matter and see that this situation exists.

In this bill, Mr. Chairman, we have established a number of milestones and we have made every effort to present to the House of Representatives a good bill.

In this bill, under title II, which is the rural development program section, we recommend \$758 million for insured loans for rural electric and telephone cooperatives, but, as you know, Mr. Chairman, these funds are no longer a direct charge against the budget because the Rural Electrification Act (Public Law 93-32) removes these loans from direct Government financing. Under the rural development programs we also include \$150 million, of which \$120 million is prior year funds, for water and sewer grants which are essential if the rural to urban migration, with all of its attendant social problems, is to be reduced. Under this title we also include \$314 million in direct appropriations for housing programs, including administration, and \$2.8 billion in direct and insured loans. Under this title we have more changes from last year than in probably any other part of the bill. The changes, of course, take into consideration the passage of the Rural Development Act (Public Law 92-419) and the Rural Electrification Act (Public Law 93-32) which take many programs out of the budget. Under this title, designated as the rural development program title, we include a total of \$386 million

in direct appropriations and \$3.6 billion in the direct and insured loan programs.

Mr. Chairman, under title I of the bill, which is designated "Agricultural programs," we recommend \$813 million for the regular programs of the Department of Agriculture, including administration, research, extension, marketing, and other programs. In addition, Mr. Chairman, under this title, we recommend \$454 million for the food for peace program; \$175 million for meat and poultry inspection; and \$3.3 billion for the reimbursement for net realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, under our environmental program section which is title III we include \$516 million for the programs of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Council on Environmental Quality. In addition, \$600 million is provided for the liquidation of contract authority in the Environmental Protection Agency construction programs. The programs of the Soil Conservation Service and the agricultural conservation program total \$492 million. Under this title which is title III we have amounts which exceed \$1 billion. On our subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, we are concerned about our environment and we know full well that no longer can we live on this Earth and continue polluting the air, water, and the land upon which we live.

Under title IV, Mr. Chairman, of this bill we include \$166 million for the Food and Drug Administration, \$30 million for the Federal Trade Commission, and \$31 million for the new Consumer Product Safety Commission. This funding for the new Consumer Product Safety Commission is the first time that we have had this program in our bill. We also include \$1.5 billion which includes section 32 funds for our child nutrition programs and \$2.2 billion for the food stamp program. The total under title IV, which by the way is the second largest title in our bill, is in excess of \$3 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that we have made every effort to see that our Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, REA program, rural telephone program, research and control programs, environmental programs, ASCS programs, and all of the other agriculture programs are fully protected and we make recommendations for adequate funding for these programs. Our extension agents throughout the United States perform yeoman service for agriculture and Mr. Chairman they must be paid adequate salaries. We only have so much farmland which will produce commodities for our people and this land must be fully protected. Again I want you to know, Mr. Chairman, that I sincerely believe that the American farmer is entitled to a fair share of our national income.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention and the attention of all of the Members of the House to the fact that we still have many serious problems in agriculture and in considering this bill and the new farm bill which must be brought out for action before the close of this year, we must keep in mind that our people must have an adequate food supply and we must see that our people are clothed.

We all know that back during the depression days agriculture was in serious trouble and when agriculture is in trouble, Mr. Chairman, every facet of our economy is in trouble. Agriculture is still the largest single industry in our country. Today 3 out of every 10 positions in our country are related directly or indirectly to agriculture. Unless the American farmer has an adequate purchasing power farmers will not be able to purchase the products of labor and industry.

Mr. Chairman, the American farmer has invested in land and equipment which is necessary to operate the farms a total of over \$341 billion. This is equal to almost one-half of the market value of all of the corporate stocks on the New York Stock Exchange and is about three-fifths of the value of the capital assets of all corporations in the United States of America.

In addition to maintaining farm purchasing power we must, Mr. Chairman, also produce a sufficient supply of food to meet domestic needs and provide for export markets. We must have reserves for emergency use.

We must keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that agricultural export sales will reach \$11 billion in fiscal year 1973. This is one of the few bright spots in our overall problem of a negative balance of trade.

Our farm program must be based on long-range protections. We have had surplus from time to time but we must keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that with the exception of 1½ years we have engaged in war for a period of 30 years. We have finally brought our boys home and this, Mr. Chairman, should have taken place several years ago, therefore we must now operate as we should in a peacetime economy. Our surpluses today are at an all-time low. If we expect the American farmer to increase his investment and expand his operations so that he will be able to supply the demands of our people, we must not expect him to carry all the risk. We know that past experience has taught us that supply and demand for agricultural products is not consistent year in and year out. We have the capacity to produce in this country and it is essential that we do so.

We only have 2.9 million farms left in this country and in the House of Representatives today we only have some 47 Members who represent districts where the majority of the people receive their sole income from agriculture. As you know, Mr. Chairman, we have 435 Members in the House who are elected and cast votes for the people throughout the 50 States.

One of the major factors concerning the high cost of food is inflation and the declining value of the dollar. The price of food during the past 10 years has not increased as rapidly as other prices. Certainly I know that our people are concerned about the price of food and are concerned about this inflationary spiral through which we are passing. A good careful look will ascertain that the American farmer is not receiving in benefits what some people believe he is and between the time the commodity leaves the farm and reaches the table of the consumer is an area that must be carefully examined.

Mr. Chairman, again I want you to know that the American farmer is entitled to a fair share of our national income and we recommend this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. THOMSON).

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to direct a few questions to the chairman of the subcommittee, the honorable gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

This bill contains funding for the Rural Development Act to be administered by the Farmers Home Development Administration. Is it the understanding of the gentleman from Mississippi that all communities under 50,000 population will be able to avail themselves of community development loans?

Mr. WHITTEN. My understanding of the basic legislation is that it would be in selected areas. That is my understanding at the present time.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. The Rural Development Act is a Federal program, separate and distinct from the Federal Rural Revenue Sharing program. Is it the understanding of the gentleman from Mississippi that the Governor of any State will have any role in directing which Farmers Home offices will be able to process loans under the new Rural Development Act?

Mr. WHITTEN. The Farmers Home Administration is solely responsible for decisions on the administration of the program.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. In the opinion of the gentleman from Mississippi, does the Rural Development Act require designation of "target areas" beyond the definition of eligible communities contained in the act itself? In other words, should an effort be made to restrict the geographic impact of the Rural Development Act besides restricting its programs to smaller communities as defined in the law?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that I regret, being the chairman of this appropriations subcommittee, answering these questions without qualifying my answers by saying that I do not intend for my answers to be taken as an interpretation and therefore controlling on anyone else who looks to see what the intent is.

My feelings, as an individual and chairman of this subcommittee, are that any action taken would be limited to that which is authorized by law, and the selection would be by those as set out in the basic law to make the selection. I would hope that it would be on a broad basis and grow and develop and be generally applicable. The only hesitancy I have in answering the gentleman is that I do not want to indicate that, because I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee responsible for appropriations, that anything I say might in any way restrict or change the basic law which, after all, is controlling.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I would like to have the gentleman's opinion also on the matter of Executive orders. Would the gentleman consider an Executive order granting State Governors the authority to direct the Farmers Home Ad-

ministration to concentrate the impact of this program in a geographic area which excludes communities otherwise eligible for assistance a violation of congressional intent in passage of this act?

Mr. WHITTEN. Not having been an author of the original act, but knowing my colleagues who were responsible for it, I do not believe any legislative act was ever intended to let any Executive do the acts which the gentleman mentioned. As an individual, I hope no one has inadvertently done that.

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Rural Development, I would like to add to what the chairman of the subcommittee has said.

I would like to say that unequivocally, that would be a violation of the congressional intent of the Rural Development Act.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. We are confronted at the present time with a fait accompli. There has been, as I understand it, an Executive order which gives the Governor the right to determine where these Federal moneys will be spent. I think that is wrong.

I would like to further ask the chairman, in his opinion, is an amendment to this appropriation bill required to prevent the administration from authorizing Governors to restrict the impact of this loan program beyond the restrictions contained in the act?

Mr. WHITTEN. There is an old statement that a lawyer's opinion is worth what one pays for it, and this opinion would be that this bill, having to do with the Department of Agriculture, would not provide any authorities contrary to the legislative authority. Certainly nothing in this bill would give the President any authority that he does not have under existing law. If he is acting over and beyond it however, or agents are in his name, which is what I am sure the gentleman means, the situation should be corrected immediately. If examples are called to our attention we will see what can be done.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Would an amendment restricting the money to the use of target areas determined by Governors be an appropriate amendment to this appropriation bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. The Governors do not get any money under this bill.

I do not believe that any restriction on this act would reach the problem the gentleman has in mind. I believe that reading this debate might slow down some executives, because nobody is beyond the control of the Congress in the course of administering Federal programs. I do not believe the amendment would apply to this bill.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I hope the chairman will pursue the question.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will be glad to confer with the gentleman, and will be glad to discuss it with the head of the department. I will be glad to discuss it with FHA. From that we might find something we could do.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee for his support of the 1890 Land Grant Colleges and Tuskegee Institute of the South, and especially the Cooperative State Research Service.

Those of us who come from the big cities tend to forget, in regard to the population in the Deep South, that actually still one-half or more of the black population of this Nation lives in the 11 Southeastern States.

These colleges are probably doing the only job of training people and developing new techniques for living in rural America as small farmers and businessmen and providing a high quality life in that part of the country.

I should just like to be on record as commending the chairman for his support of these colleges through the work of the Cooperative State Research programs.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YATES. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

First, Mr. Chairman, may I associate myself with the kind remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) in his appraisal of the men who make up this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. They are indeed among the most able Members of the House.

There is no Member of the House who knows as much about agriculture as does the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WHITTEN.

I regret very much I was one of those who felt impelled to disagree with the committee on several points in this bill. The sources of our disagreement are contained in this dissent that we filed to the report. I read from that dissent:

We agree with the Committee that "agriculture is basic to us all," and that "this nation should be blessed with an abundance of pure and wholesome food." We appreciate that chemicals may be necessary to achieve that goal, but we insist that toxic chemicals harmful to the consumer must not be used.

That, Mr. Chairman, the subject of chemicals used in food production is the principal source of our disagreement with the committee. The committee's report shows its concern with the economic losses attributable to the banning of certain chemicals. We are concerned with possible human losses.

The report of the committee is replete with its condemnation of the action of regulatory agencies in banning certain chemicals. Their guns are aimed particularly with respect to the banning of DDT.

Take a look at the remarks and statements that appear on pages 57 and 58 of the report in which the committee calls for a complete and thorough review based on scientific evidence of the decision banning DDT, "taking into con-

sideration all of the costs and benefits and the importance of protecting the Nation's supply of food and fiber."

The committee then goes on to quote Dr. Handler, who is the President of the National Academy of Sciences, concerning the subject of DDT here, in which he is alleged to have claimed two-thirds of what he read in the record is called "trash." Of course, the committee said nothing about the other third of the testimony he read. That portion of the record may very well have justified the banning of DDT by the regulatory agency.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as DDT is concerned, may I again refer to the document from which I read at the time the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) was on the floor. In commenting on DDT, Dr. Umberto Saffiotti, who is one of the outstanding men in the field of cancer research, says this on page 2 of his report:

Much progress has been made in the field of carcinogenesis in recent years. We have good documentation on the carcinogenic activity of several environmental chemicals at levels lower than those previously known to be active. For example, DDT was shown in 1969 to be carcinogenic at 140 parts per million (ppm) in the diet in the strains of mice in the National Cancer Institute's study conducted at Bionetics Research Laboratories (5). It was then retested by the International Agency for Research on Cancer through large-scale multi-generation studies in two other laboratories and confirmed carcinogenic in both: in one, carcinogenic activity was detected only at 250 ppm in an inbred strain of mice; but in the other, using a non-inbred strain, a marked tumor increase was found down to the lowest tested dose, namely 2 ppm in the diet (6). In this connection it is of interest that the current tolerance levels in the United States for DDT are of 5 ppm in fish and 7 ppm in apples. Obviously these residues do not represent the total human dietary intake, but the order of magnitude of dietary contamination showing a marked carcinogenic effect in animals comes quite close to the intake levels in people.

Eventually, Mr. Chairman, that is the source of our disagreement. Yes, we say we recognize that chemicals must be used in agriculture to provide the food which the Nation needs, but please, Mr. Chairman, do not use those chemicals which may be hazardous to the health of the people of the United States. I use the words "may be" rather than the word "are." Why? Because there is no absolute proof of harm to humans that can be made. Experiments obviously cannot be performed on human beings. Science research use animals and cannot judge from animal experiments what the effect on human beings will be. As Dr. Saffiotti says: "Much as we would like to be able to determine conditions for the "safe" use of carcinogens in fact in food, no valid scientific methodology has yet been suggested in specific terms to arrive at such a determination. So, the thrust of the committee that agency decisions be based upon scientific fact must be tempered by the realization that what is scientific fact may be limited.

The Delaney amendment is important. We want to know about the foods that the people of this country are eating and the contaminants that are a part of

those foods to make sure they are not harmful.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would support additional research funds in connection with the Delaney amendment, as I stated in the report but I certainly do not go along with the remarks attacking the agency decisions which appear in this report.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to register my strong support for the agricultural-environmental and consumer protection appropriation (H.R. 3619), and to express the hope that this body will amend that measure so as to limit individual farm subsidies to \$20,000 per crop.

There are many excellent provisions in this legislation apart from the 813 million allocated for the regular programs of the Department of Agriculture. Some examples are:

Seven-hundred million dollars for insured loans for rural electric and telephone cooperatives;

Five-hundred and fourteen million dollars for the Environmental Protection Agency;

Restoration of impounded HUD water and sewer funds at a program level of \$300 million;

Thirty-one million dollars for the new Consumer Product Safety Commission;

One and one-half billion dollars for child nutrition programs.

Another critically needed feature of this bill, Mr. Chairman, is the provision which repeals the "bread tax." For 10 years now there has been a processing tax of 75 cents per bushel levied on all wheat produced in the United States for domestic consumption. The result has been a cost increase to the consumer of 2 cents per pound of bread.

I am convinced that the repeal of this tax will benefit the consumer as well as the wholesale baking industry. There is evidence that 81 major bakery plants have had to close down since January 1 of last year, and that many other independent wholesale bakeries are being threatened with imminent bankruptcy. A monopoly situation in this field will be of no benefit to the consumer, and I would suggest that repeal of the "bread tax" would serve to prevent monopolization, loss of jobs and continued inflation in the price of bread.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to join once again in an effort to reduce our preposterously generous farm subsidies, which for the most part have simply fattened the profits not of the beleaguered small farmer but of the giant agricultural interests.

The House has passed similar legislation three times in the past, but the measures have been rejected each time by the Senate. Three years ago, a \$55,000 subsidy ceiling was imposed, but this limit has proved grossly inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, it appears that this fiscal year will be marked by runaway inflation and another large budget deficit. I sincerely hope that both houses of

Congress will see fit to contribute to a financial remedy by limiting the now scandalously high farm subsidies to \$20,000 per crop. These payments constitute an unfair tax burden not just on the urban dweller, but even on the small independent farmer who is being crowded off the land and who cannot avail himself of the hundreds of thousands of dollars in handouts which go to the typical giant farm corporation.

These inflated subsidies are wasted welfare doles which are being provided by the American taxpayer to a group of businessmen who could survive quite comfortably without this assistance. I reiterate my own support for limiting these subsidies and call upon every Member of Congress to put the reins on the inflated subsidy program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I support much that is in this bill, and I want to associate myself with the remarks of both the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) in terms of the contributions that farmers have made to the economy of this country, and also in terms of the economic straits which many farmers find themselves in.

Ten years ago there were about 30,000 farmers in my district. Today I have about 15,000 left, because within 10 short years we have lost just about half of the farmers because of the economic difficulties of engaging in farming.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this bill, but before I do I want to get off my chest, as did the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) a few objections I have to the report itself although not the bill and second, one omission I find in the bill itself.

I disagree strongly, for instance, with the provision in this bill which goes along with the administration's request to reduce the special milk program from \$100 million to \$25 million.

It seems that schoolchildren are eating more and more pizza, potato chips, and soda pop, not to mention Zonkers, Ho Ho's, and Slim Jims, at the expense of more nutritional foods, including milk. If there ever is a time when we can influence their eating habits it is during their school years. Yet this budget—under which 2 billion fewer half pints of milk will be consumed than if the special milk program were funded at the \$97 million level—will hardly be a positive influence in that direction. In Wisconsin alone, 400,000 of the 460,000 students who drank milk under this program this year would be ineligible for that milk next year.

It is also true that while most schools have school lunch programs, few have school breakfast programs. For many children who do not eat breakfast at home, a half pint of milk in midmorning is their first food of the day. Under this budget, those children will get nothing to eat until noon.

I hope the Senate corrects the deficiency.

I want to spend my 5 minutes, if I can, on some of the assertions made in the

report, because the thrust of what is in the report seems to be that regulatory agencies are consistently being overzealous. Certainly we can all cite instances of arbitrariness, belligerence, and unreasonableness by virtually every Federal agency. I think also, however, that we can point to times when we see some of the regulatory agencies acting on measures before them like Casper Milquetoasts. Take the FDA, for example. The GAO report of last year stated that of 97 food manufacturing and processing sites which they inspected, they found 39 were operating under unsanitary conditions and 23 were operating under serious unsanitary conditions having potentially deleterious effects on human health and yet the FDA was not able, given their present system, to correct the situation.

If you take a look at the Federal Power Commission, far from over regulating, just last week they made in order an increase in the price of natural gas of 73 percent. I hardly think that is being overzealous in the protection of the consumer.

Now, if you want to take a look at the Department of Justice, they have said, for instance, that taconite tailings from Reserve Mining, had reduced the clarity of Lake Superior water by more than 25 percent over an area greater than 600 square miles, and yet that same Department of Justice has refused to bring that company into court.

If you take a look at the Environmental Protection Agency, it has been shot at all over the country these days. They came down with some regulations earlier in the year which scared a lot of farmers. But the fact is that the EPA listened to many of the objections raised by farmers to the standards which they were setting up for solid waste disposal, for instance. As a consequence, now regulations which farmers were worried about do not apply to them unless they have 700 dairy cattle and over 1,000 steers. That is being pretty reasonable.

The committee report raises the question of the economic impact of the Government's ban on certain chemicals. The fact is that there are other economic costs involved, too, in the use of chemicals. Those costs reflect themselves in increased health and social problems. There are about 3,000 new chemicals being synthesized each year and about 500 find their way into industrial use. Yet there is very little regulation on the problem of how to make safe the use of these compounds in the working place.

I think agencies should be encouraged rather than discouraged to exercise the regulatory powers they have in these areas.

The report also raises a question on environmental standards and the cost of the environmental standards in terms of the energy crisis. What about the other side of the coin? As the gentleman from Illinois pointed out what about the insistence of Detroit, for instance—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. OBEY. What about the insistence of Detroit, for instance, on constructing

gas-guzzling automobiles. As the minority report points out, a good portion of the mileage loss is traceable not necessarily to the new environmental equipment on automobiles but, rather, to the increased weight, which is up about 25 percent in the last 12 years for any average car in the country.

If we got the same kind of mileage that Europeans obtain with their automobiles we would save 3 million barrels of oil a day. Detroit is also ignoring some of the problems with respect to the energy crisis.

On DDT, the committee issued a table which shows that DDT is less dangerous if orally taken than some of the other alternatives, but it ignores the fact that many scientists believe that the crucial problem so far as DDT is concerned is in the long-range genetic effects which occur from the use of that chemical over years and years and years.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on for quite a while, but I do not believe there is any need to, and we do not have the time to do so today.

I know everybody wants to get out of here. However, I do want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his leadership, and I do want to read, in closing, a statement from the New York Times which discussed the Delaney clause, in which it is stated that—

In a two-day workshop last week sponsored by the New York Academy of Sciences, (they) said that on the basis of present knowledge it was impossible to determine if there was any such thing as a "safe" amount of a carcinogenic, or cancer-causing, chemical.

Citing cigarette smoking as an example, the scientists warned that the human consequences of allowing even trace amounts of cancer-causing chemicals in foods might not show up until 20 or 30 years later.

That is the point I think that has to be kept in mind when we are discussing DDT.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated at the beginning of my remarks, I intend to vote for this bill, but I did first want to address myself to some of the unbalanced accusations made in this committee report.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about several provisions of H.R. 8619 which we are considering today. As I have indicated in the Record of June 13, at pages 19520 to 19521, and in the Record of June 14 at page 19724, I intend to offer several amendments to remove and correct some objectionable features of this bill.

In addition, however, I am particularly concerned about several statements made in the committee's report (H. Rept. 93-275, June 12, 1973) on this bill.

The committee's report accuses the Environmental Protection Agency of playing "a major role in the current energy crisis." I think this statement is misleading and derogatory of an agency that has been given a mandate by the Congress to take measures which would halt decades of pollution emanating from industrial and municipal activities. It is clear that there appear to be fuel short-

ages in some parts of the country, but I am not ready to say that the cause of the fuel shortages is EPA's enforcement of statutes that we enacted. In my opinion, the responsibility for these fuel shortages, if, indeed, they exist, lies squarely in the lap of the fuels industry and the manufacturers of products which guzzle fuel in the same manner that a confirmed drunk guzzles liquor. To emphasize my point, I call the attention of my colleagues to the remarks of one of the administration's officials, Mr. Russell E. Train, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, before the Rotary Club of Washington earlier this week:

REMARKS OF HON. RUSSELL E. TRAIN, CHAIRMAN, COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BEFORE THE WASHINGTON, D.C. ROTARY CLUB, JUNE 13, 1973

Our current energy problem is complex and closely related to a wide variety of forces. Prominent among these forces is, of course, the question of environmental quality, but prices, technology, regulatory requirements, international relations, and national security considerations are also integral parts of the problem. There are some who simplistically blame the strong concern over environmental quality as the cause of our energy problems. This assertion is simply not true. I emphasize this point because there is a current tendency to make the environment the whipping boy for our energy problems.

A recent issue of a national news magazine quoted the chief executive of a major international oil company as identifying environmentalists as the major culprits in blocking new generating facilities and new refinery capacity. In my opinion, such statements obscure the facts, confuse the issues, and can only serve to delay effective solution of our energy problems.

Similarly, a spate of advertising has tried to convince the public that auto emission standards are the cause of major reductions in gasoline mileage. However, according to a study conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency, greater weight, automatic transmissions and air conditioners are more important causes of increased fuel consumption than pollution controls. Data from more than 2,000 1973 model cars show that fuel economy loss (in miles per gallon) due to pollution control systems is less than eight percent as compared to uncontrolled vehicles. By comparison, the fuel economy loss due to air conditioning averages about nine percent, and can run as high as 20 percent on a hot day in urban traffic. In addition, the fuel loss from an automatic transmission is about six percent.

EPA's engineers attribute much of the decrease in gas mileage to increases in vehicle weight. Their investigation found that over the years, new vehicles having the same model designation have become heavier. For example, the Chevrolet Impala weighed 4,000 pounds in 1958, but weighs 5,500 pounds now. And as the weight of the car has gone up, its gas efficiency has dropped. The study found that a change of only 500 pounds in the weight of 1973 vehicles—from 3,000 to 3,500—can lower the mileage from an average of 16.2 miles per gallon to 14.0 miles per gallon—a decrease in fuel economy of nearly 14 percent. A thousand pound increase in weight, from 3,000 to 4,000 pounds, could lower gas mileage from 16.2 miles per gallon to 11.2 miles per gallon—a decrease of 30 percent. The plain fact is that we need to both reduce automobile emissions and improve automobile fuel economy.

Environmental factors also have been cited as a major reason for nuclear power plant delays. However, data from the Atomic Energy Commission does not support this allegation. According to the AEC, the National Environmental Policy Act review proc-

ess is not the controlling factor in bringing a nuclear power plant into operation. The major requisite for licensing a plant is its readiness for fuel loading. And AEC data submitted to the Council in March indicate that final environmental impact statements were available, on the average, 8.2 months prior to the scheduled fuel loading.

And while environmentalists are blamed for power plant siting delays, it should be remembered that it has been nearly two and one half years since the President first submitted to Congress a "Power Plant Siting" bill. Should his most recent submission, the "Electric Facilities Siting Act of 1973," be enacted, the review and approval process for siting new plants would be simplified while giving the public earlier notice and a larger role in the decisions over power needs and how and where to meet them. And although some spokesmen for the power industry publicly lament the difficulties in getting new plants approved, the National Association of Electric Companies' position before the Congress has been that no new legislation is needed. If this legislation had been enacted, we might be two years closer to the institutional arrangements necessary to deal with some of our crucial energy problems.

Environmentalists have also been charged with hindering the construction of new petroleum refineries. Although some companies have been refused sites for new refineries, by and large the oil industry has been most reluctant to commit large sums to new refinery construction because of past uncertainty about government policies, such as oil import policies, and because of a severe shortage of cash from current company earnings. In addition, for the large international oil companies, extreme uncertainty as to their situation in the Middle East vis-a-vis the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries has created a wait-and-see attitude. Now that one of these uncertainties—the curbs on crude oil imports—has been removed, and oil company profits have improved, a number of oil companies have announced plans for expansion of existing refineries.

But the same uncertainties that hindered construction of new refineries and contributed to the shortage of distillate fuel oil this past winter, are now factors in the projected gasoline shortage this summer. Various oil companies spent large sums to advertise that they knew these shortages were coming. They blamed environmentalists. I would add a few points that were omitted from these advertisements.

Operating under conditions of uncertainty, the oil industry quite properly has turned to management science techniques—computers—to assist them in maximizing profit. According to the computers, the level of fuel oil inventory for the 1972-73 heating season did not need to be maintained at the same high level as the previous year. This made sense in terms of profits because gasoline is a more profitable product to manufacture and sell than heating oil. Unfortunately, the weather did not cooperate, and the cold snap which occurred early in the winter, after a cool, rainy autumn, unsettled the optimum production schedules, and set the stage for the supply dislocations experienced early in 1973.

It must be pointed out as well that through the first half of 1972, the U.S. refineries were not operating at peak capacity. Hopefully, now that the crude oil import restrictions have been removed, refinery production can be kept running at higher levels.

Having gotten all that off my chest, I would be less than candid not to admit that environmental awareness has brought about changes in the types of fuels we use and the conditions under which they can be used. Public concern over surface mining, land use, air pollution, wildlife, and offshore drill-

ing has in some cases delayed the use of some energy sources. These delays, however, have been part of a national effort to greatly improve measures to protect the environment.

Let us not permit our current concerns over energy supply to obscure the fact that the environmental costs of energy production are likewise very real. The high levels of lung cancer and respiratory disease, such as emphysema, in areas with high levels of air pollution is a fact, not emotional imagining. Nor is the D.C. Health Department's recent warning about dangerous carbon monoxide levels at several city intersections environmental emotionalism. An official was quoted as saying that the department has considered putting signs up that read: "Warning: This Area May Be Hazardous to Your Health." The areas cited were the corners of 16th and 17th and K Streets, 13th and F Streets, Connecticut Avenue and Ordway Street, Logan Circle and Good Hope Road, S.E., between 13th and 14th Streets. This warning was followed by the year's first area-wide pollution alert Monday. Our energy problems are serious and they are real. Our environmental concerns are likewise serious and they too are real. We need balance and restraint by both environmentalists and industry—as we pursue both objectives as matters of high priority national interest. Confrontation can only lead to polarization and irrational responses from all sides. We need to keep the problems in proper perspective. Above all, we need full disclosure of all the facts and the broadest possible public understanding of the issues.

Traditionally, our attitude toward energy has centered on more: more coal, more oil, and more gas to meet the needs of a growing nation. But unless we take steps to conserve our energy resources, we will exhaust supplies, even from new sources, in a relatively short time. There are many areas where we can start to work for energy conservation.

The General Services Administration, for instance, is constructing a new Federal office building in Manchester, New Hampshire, using advanced energy conservation techniques, with a goal of reducing energy use by 20 percent over typical buildings of the same size. The National Bureau of Standards is evaluating energy use in a full-size house as a means to develop analytical techniques for predicting energy use for new dwellings. These programs will assist the Federal government, architects and contractors to design and construct energy-efficient buildings. Current engineering and design of buildings is often outrageously wasteful of energy.

During the past two years, the President has twice directed the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to upgrade insulation standards in single and multi-family residences financed by the Federal Housing Administration. These revisions can cut heat losses by one-third in new homes, thus conserving energy in the residential sector.

Transportation offers many opportunities for saving energy. Transportation uses about 25 percent of the Nation's energy and energy efficiencies of various passenger transporting modes vary greatly. The fastest form of transportation, the airplane, is also the one that uses the most energy per passenger mile. On the ground the automobile uses much more energy per passenger mile than buses or trains. While the automobile will not be replaced as man's favorite transportation mode, at least it should be possible to shift to smaller, lighter cars. With the fuel economy characteristics of present small cars, about 22 miles per gallon instead of the current average for all cars of less than 14 miles per gallon, the annual fuel savings could be enormous. In my opinion, it is imperative that our society shift its preference to smaller cars.

In addition to our use of smaller cars, per-

haps by providing alternative forms of transportation, we can induce people to leave their cars at home during peak travel hours. I am hopeful that the up-coming Senate-House Conference on the use of the Highway Trust Fund for mass transit will result in more emphasis on mass transit solutions to urban transportation problems.

The President also has directed the Department of Commerce to work with the Council on Environmental Quality, and the Environmental Protection Agency, to develop a voluntary system of energy efficiency labels for major home appliances, and automobiles, and automobile accessories. These labels will not only provide data on energy use but, most importantly, a rating comparing the product's efficiency to similar products.

In the industrial sector, there are significant opportunities for energy conservation—in plant and process design, and even in the choice of feedstock materials. For example, in many cases significant amounts of energy can be conserved by using secondary materials in place of virgin feedstocks. In the paper industry, the energy consumption to produce pulp from recycled fiber is 70 percent less than the energy required using virgin wood pulp. Similar figures for the steel industry show a 74 percent savings in energy when scrap is used to produce steel instead of virgin iron ore. I believe we should explore aggressively the development of incentives, including tax incentives, to encourage greater recycling.

These proposals, for government, for industry, and for consumers, represent only a beginning in our efforts to conserve energy. By and large, however, they all represent measures which are difficult to implement in the short run. But there are conservation measures which can help us deal with the immediate energy problems we face—for example, the gasoline shortages projected for this summer. Driving slower, forming car pools, riding bikes, making greater use of public transportation and practicing the ancient art of walking are but a few examples of immediate ways to conserve energy.

The so-called "energy crisis" stems from the economic forces and complexity of the energy industry, from the difficulty in planning for our voracious energy appetite, from the need to satisfy social values—other than those that depend on energy, and from a failure to address our growing energy problems earlier. To blame this "crisis" solely on an increased concern over environmental quality would be a grave failure to face the problem honestly and squarely.

It seems to me that the best way to deal with the difficulties presented by our current energy position is to completely reorient our thinking about energy. In the short run, we are looking for increased energy supplies. But in the long run, we must increasingly shift our efforts from simply finding more energy supplies to concerning ourselves with how to use energy to best meet our many needs.

The committee report also points out that last year it recommended that EPA establish advisory committees to review its priorities and advise the Agency as to which contracts or grants "will provide the greatest return to the Agency in line with priorities." The report points out that the committees have been established and in this year's budget \$1.2 million is included "to provide the necessary funding for them," but that EPA has requested that a specific line item appropriation not be provided for these committees "since it creates bookkeeping requirements and adds complexity to the management of the Agency's fiscal resources." The committee has concurred in this recommendation.

I am somewhat puzzled and perplexed

at this explanation. I think it is imperative that matters of this sort be included in the bill so that we in Congress can judge their merits. But more importantly, I am concerned about these committees, their makeup and their duties and responsibilities. While I do not personally object to such advisory committees, I have some reservations about the need for them and about their influence on EPA's programs. I am particularly concerned when I see that it costs over \$1 million to support such functions. I am not convinced that this expenditure of money is either sound or necessary.

As I indicated in my remarks of June 13, I commend the committee for cutting EPA's budget for public affairs by \$2 million. I think this was a wise choice. Indeed, I think the budget for public affairs could be cut substantially more without having any great effect on the efficiency and economy of the Agency.

I also think the Congress should review the functions of the Public Affairs Office to determine whether those functions would be more appropriately lodged in other offices of the Agency. But I want to emphasize that I think the efforts taken by the Public Affairs Office of EPA in assisting citizens in their efforts to halt pollution through the filing of lawsuits, complaints, and other means should not only continue, but should be encouraged. It is my understanding of both the committee's bill and its report that these functions will continue and not be impeded in any way by this cutback. If my understanding of this cutback is inaccurate, then I expect the Environmental Protection Agency to advise me promptly.

I have examined the report of the Committee on Appropriations on the 1974 agriculture-environmental and consumer protection appropriation bill—H.R. 8619—which contains the appropriation for the Council and Office of Environmental Quality. As chairman of the subcommittee charged with legislative oversight of the Council on Environmental Quality, and as the initial sponsor of the National Environmental Policy Act which created the Council on Environmental Quality, I am troubled by the language of the Appropriation Committee report as it pertains to the CEQ appropriation for contract studies.

In the 3 years of its existence, the Council has turned out a number of policy studies, including studies on "Ocean Dumping—A National Policy," "Toxic Substances," "The Quiet Revolution in Land Use Control," "Integrated Pest Management," "The Economic Impact of Pollution Control," and "Coal Surface Mining and Reclamation." These studies have had a significant influence on major policy decisions, new policy proposals and legislative action. Studies of stream channel modification and the siting of deep water ports for supertankers will, we are told, soon be available.

At the time of the fiscal year 1974 budget presentation, the Council had selected potential study areas. These were energy conservation, land use, toxic substances, pollution financing and additional monitoring indices. These subject areas were discussed with the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment during

hearings this spring on the proposed extension of the Council's appropriation authorization. These areas reflected the Council's careful assessment of current and near-term environmental priorities and it is my understanding that the Council is continuing to refine its proposed research objectives for the next fiscal year. It is critically important that the Council not be constrained in the use of its limited study funds and in its selection of the specific studies that may come up during the year.

In view of the Council's relatively small budget of \$175,000 for research studies, the extensive list of studies mandated by the Appropriations Committee could, in practice, effectively preempt the Council's limited research capability. This would be unfortunate and certainly not consistent with the broad responsibilities that Congress gave the Council in the National Environmental Policy Act.

In examining the list of studies that the Council would be directed to perform, I note several which would seem to be largely outside of the Council's normal area of expertise and more properly the responsibility of other agencies. Indeed, several of the directed studies duplicate parallel directives of the Appropriations Committee to EPA and NIPCC. Thus, I am confident that the Appropriations Committee recognizes the need for the Council to retain its independence of professional policy judgment and to have wide discretion in the manner in which it seeks to carry out the studies in question. For example, in several cases, it seems to me that the role of the Council should more properly be a coordinative one and that it should not in such cases be expected to perform the studies itself.

I am making this comment in the expectation that the committee's directive is to be read in this light. What must be understood, however, is that the Council must not be unduly constrained by the report language in responding to the Appropriations Committee request and that the Council will be calling on other agencies under the section in the National Environmental Policy Act providing that they assist the Council on Environmental Quality in performing its functions. If the studies are proposed to be undertaken by the Council or under contract with the Council I expect the Council to first consult with my subcommittee about the scope of the studies. Moreover, I am going to insist that the studies are balanced, and do not reflect a one-sided approach.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked Mr. ANDREWS to yield to me so I might propound a question to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi, if I might have his attention.

I should like to be able to explain every item in this bill, but as I was going through the bill, I saw a reference to an item on page 2, line 13 which is not explained in the report accompanying the bill. Under title I there is provided \$813 million in appropriations, yet there is a separate item of not to exceed \$15,000 for employment. Could the gentleman tell me what this is and why it is necessary

Mr. WHITTEN. This item is for consultants, and I think it reflects how we on the committee, as well as the Department, attempt to hold down the employment of consultants. Consultants are from time to time worthwhile, and we think they should be available, within reason.

Mr. WYLIE. In other words, what the gentleman is saying is that this is a limitation on the amount of money that can be spent for consultants, not employees of the Department.

Mr. WHITTEN. Not to exceed \$15,000.

Mr. WYLIE. No more than \$15,000 can be spent for outside consultants.

Mr. WHITTEN. This is for the Office of the Secretary. In other areas of the bill there are different provisions, but for the Office of the Secretary only \$15,000 is provided.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening with interest to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who has been very active in this area for many years. Insofar as my observation of his work and his actions, and insofar as I have been able to ascertain, he has always stayed within the limits of the existing technology. I think that is what many of us sometimes fail to reflect in our actions. We grew up with the statement, "There ought to be a law."

What we mean is there ought to be some change or correction.

Statements were made with regard to the EPA and the Food and Drug Administration and various other agencies. I just want to take this time to say that in my opinion the EPA has been given so many jobs by so many of us in the Congress that nobody could do as well as they would like to do—and I certainly do not mean anything in this record or in this report or in this statement to reflect on any of the agencies that I deal with.

I am proud of the relationship that I have had as chairman of this committee—as I am sure are other members of the committee—with Mr. Ruckelshaus, Dr. Edwards, and various others. Much of what is in this bill reflects our effort to help bring about some improvement in handling the problems with which they are faced. Certainly that is what we intend.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reiterate my high regard for the gentleman from Mississippi and commend him for the outstanding job which has been done by the gentleman from Mississippi. I think our differences on these matters are not as broad as might have been indicated by our remarks today.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, before I comment on the bill before us, I want to commend and compliment the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), and the ranking minority

member, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS), along with the other members of our subcommittee who have contributed so much of their time and expertise to the development of this funding legislation.

And, when I say expertise, I mean just that. These gentlemen are all experts in the areas of agriculture, environmental, and consumer protection, and their extensive knowledge and good, sound judgment in these fields are of critical importance to American farmers and consumers, especially during the period we are going through right now.

At the same time, I want to pay tribute to our Secretary of Agriculture, who has shown himself to be a real spokesman for agriculture throughout this country and at the President's right hand. I think farmers and consumers alike owe a great deal to Secretary Butz for his efforts to maintain a strong and healthy agriculture in this country. Perhaps the biggest danger we face right now in terms of our food production and supply is the possibility that the concern over higher food prices may result in farmers being forced into an economic straitjacket, which would quickly worsen the supply problem and could create serious shortages. The Secretary has consistently counseled against such shortsighted actions, and I hope he will continue to do so.

What I am going to say next may draw some "boos" from some of my urban colleagues, but I will take that risk because it is an undeniable fact that food is still a bargain. It is not a cliché, it is not rhetoric—it is fact. We are still the best fed Nation in the world, and at the lowest cost by just about any way you want to measure it.

On page 7 in our committee report, we point out that 1 day's wages in 1952 would buy 14.4 pounds of choice beef, but that even in February of 1973 it would buy 23.2 pounds. The whole point is that despite the rise in food prices we cannot afford to lose sight of how well off we really are nationally, and we can. not afford to take legislative or administrative actions that may look good politically, but have the effect of disrupting our agricultural production and supply system.

And, while we are on the subject of food prices, it is time again to point out some of the factors that have contributed to this upward push, and will continue to do so in the future. Of course, until inflation is under control it will result in rising farm production costs as well as increased expenses for processing, packaging, transportation, labor and all the other food marketing activities that account for about 60 percent of every food dollar you spend at the retail level.

Weather has always been an important factor in food prices, perhaps more so right now than it has been for some time. Rain or cold weather at the wrong time can shoot the prices of some foods up drastically.

Fuel is another factor, and I mean not only shortages but price as well. Fuel availability to farmers for planting and harvesting is critical, but if farmers can

get fuel only at higher prices, this too would have to be reflected sooner or later in higher food prices.

But, there are some other things here, too, that will have an increasing, but perhaps more subtle, effect on food prices, and these are the costs of certain environmental and consumer protection measures which have the effect of increasing food production costs.

Our pollution control efforts, for example, are resulting in a whole new series of standards and regulations imposing restrictions on animal feedlots around the country. This means substantial additional capital investment for feedlot waste treatment facilities, which will somehow, sometime have to be reflected in food prices.

Limitations on the use of pesticides and animal feed additives are also having their effect on food production costs. If we want a clean environment we must understand that it has to be paid for, and if our legislation or our regulatory agencies go overboard in setting standards, we have to pay for that, too. As we point out in our committee report, good commonsense is an essential ingredient in all this, and we need to make certain a fair amount of it is used. So, on page 12 of our report, you will note a list of several actions we have taken to help insure that future regulatory decisions will have a sound scientific and economic basis.

We are providing \$200,000 for a study of the scientific basis for the Delaney clause; funds to enable the Consumer Product Safety Commission to establish an economic analysis capability; \$5 million for EPA to prepare environmental and economic impact statements on all of their actions; \$5 million for the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a complete review, analysis and evaluation of EPA, and \$1 million to the National Industrial Pollution Control Council to study the effects of environmental requirements on the competitive position of American business.

Because of the price-supply situation we are in this year much more criticism is being focused on "farm subsidies" than in the past, and that is why I think it more important than ever that we very clearly spell out how much of this bill and the Agriculture Department budget goes for the benefit of consumers.

Earlier this year when Secretary Butz testified before our subcommittee I asked him for a breakdown of the Agriculture Department budget showing how much is spent predominantly for the stabilization of farm income and how much goes for programs which clearly provide benefits to consumers, businessmen, and the general public. The table he provided shows that in fiscal 1973 some 66 percent of that Department's budget outlays are in the latter category. In this bill we have more than a billion dollars for environmental programs and more than \$3 billion for consumer programs, and as I pointed out in debate last year, if Members really want to get a more precise cost of the actual farm commodity programs they should look at the Commodity Credit Corporation and the reimbursements for net realized losses year after year. This bill contains \$3.3 billion for CCC.

But, beyond that, we need to make the point again that the "farm subsidies" really are consumer subsidies to the extent that they have stabilized the farm economy and our food production system, and have prevented the kind of wild market gyrations that in years past resulted in economic chaos.

I believe my colleagues on the subcommittee have covered most of the important and significant points in the bill, and I will not replot the ground they have already covered. At a later, appropriate time I will have more to say on the REAP program and on water and sewer facility grants. Now, however, I want to finish with a few comments on the REA portion of our bill.

This is the first appropriations measure since Congress enacted and President Nixon signed into law the insured and guaranteed loan program for this agency.

Public Law 93-32 establishes a revolving fund consisting mainly of principal and interest repayments from prior loans to finance new REA loans. Although the REA Administrator is authorized to make insured loans to the full extent of assets available in the revolving fund, loans and advances in any one year are subject to limitations of Congress as established by the Appropriations Committee. The amount of guaranteed loans are also limited as to amounts authorized from time to time by the Congress upon recommendation of the Appropriations Committee.

The committee in this bill recommends a total of \$758 million for the REA loan program in fiscal 1974—\$618 million for electric and \$140 million for the telephone loans. Of this amount 2 percent loans are set at \$105 million—\$80 million for the electric and \$25 million for the telephone program by agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture.

As for guaranteed loans, the committee did not establish a ceiling at this time and in lieu thereof has directed the Administrator to submit all guaranteed loans to the committee for prior approval. In addition, the committee directs REA to appear at annual budget hearings, as it has done in the past, for a full discussion of its program plans for the ensuing year. I have been highly pleased with the manner in which the present Administrator, Dave Hamil, has conducted the program since taking office. I am certain that this continued annual consideration of the REA program by our committee will be welcomed by him and will be highly beneficial to both REA and the Congress in guiding this program in the future.

Now that it has been firmly established that Congress, through the Appropriations Committee, will have annual control over the revolving fund, I find the most distressing provision in Public Law 93-32 is that which forgives the repayment of interest to the Treasury on loans made under section 3(a) of the 1936 act. The 2-percent direct loan program of the past was a taxpayer subsidy and, in my opinion, the Congress and REA have a moral commitment to repay this interest to Treasury. Over the years REA has had an outstanding record of repayment of both principal and interest. It is a shame

that this record has been broken. The most unfortunate part of it all is that foregoing interest repayments was not necessary in order to fund the insured and guaranteed loan program. This could have been done merely by deferring principal payments until due. It was not necessary to let the taxpayers down in order to establish this new program.

It is most ironic that the REA borrower—the electric cooperative or independent telephone company that serves constituents in your district and mine—is meeting his obligation by paying interest to REA, but these payments are being channeled unnecessarily into the revolving fund, not into the Treasury where they belong. Fortunately, Public Law 93-32 authorizes the Appropriations Committee to appropriate any excess funds in the revolving fund into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I am unable to be present to vote on the agriculture-environmental-consumer protection fiscal year 1974 appropriations.

Included in this bill are a number of very fine programs which I have actively supported, such as: the rural environmental assistance program; the soil and water conservation program; the rural electrification programs; the Farmers' Home Administration programs for rural housing and rural water and waste disposal; the Environmental Protection Agency programs; the consumer programs; and most especially, the Food and Nutrition Service programs.

I am voting against the agriculture appropriations bill, however, because I oppose—as I have consistently opposed in the past—the unduly large farms subsidy payments provided therein.

American taxpayers, plagued by rising costs in every area, cannot afford to pay the extravagant sums provided for large farm subsidies. Overall, we paid about \$1.9 billion in farm subsidy payments in 1972—a 77-percent increase over payments in 1971. Specifically, in payments of \$20,000 and over, in 1968 we paid \$273.3 million to 5,914 farmers. In 1972, those payments shot up to \$655.8 million to 18,585 farmers.

In addition, since the enactment in 1970 of the \$55,000 per crop subsidy limitation, we will have shoveled out up to \$23.4 million more in tax dollars than if that limitation had never been instituted. For this reason, I support my colleague Congressman SILVIO CONTE's amendment to limit those farm subsidy payments to \$20,000 per crop.

Despite the inclusion of some of the more admirable programs in this appropriations bill, I cannot, in good conscience, support the kind of robbery of my constituents' hard-earned tax money which the farm subsidy program represents.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, I will oppose the amendment when it is offered to this bill by the gentleman from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN).

The \$140,000 item at issue here is, in my opinion, a relative small contribution to this country's program for promoting sales of American tobacco overseas. This activity, administered through the Foreign Agricultural Service, has

been carried on successfully since the late 1950's under authority provided in Public Law 480. Its sole purpose is to promote the sale of American tobacco and, to the extent that the program has been utilized, it has paid substantial dividends.

In simple terms, this expenditure assists in advertising cigarettes made with American tobacco in those countries which participate. The cost is shared by American tobacco growers on a matching basis. The participating countries—namely Thailand and Austria—seek our assistance in this regard and in both instances, the working relationship has been good.

Opponents of such expenditures tell us that their motivation is to reduce smoking but I would like to point out that in both Austria and Thailand there are tobacco monopolies, run by the government, and if they do not get tobacco from American sources, it will be readily obtained elsewhere. It is also well to point out that the same governments which control these tobacco monopolies also prescribe the health laws within their borders. Why, then may I ask should we attempt to influence health standards within those areas? They are interested in getting our tobacco and have sought to participate in this program on a mutually beneficial basis.

It will be recalled that when the cigarette labeling legislation was before the Congress several years ago, it was specifically set forth in the law that the labeling was not to apply to cigarettes for export because we did not seek to force on others the standards applied within the United States.

I would like to emphasize here that the methods of advertising in these two countries are entirely consistent with the guidelines applied within the United States. I am informed that advertising is not carried on radio or television in conformity with our own standards.

Mr. Chairman, in these days when our balance of payments can stand bolstering, it ill-behooves us to undercut workable programs which have been a benefit to us. The deficit on our balance of payments for the first quarter of this year was in excess of \$10,000,000,000. One of the few bright spots has been the advantage we have had in agricultural trade. An important part of this has been our tobacco exports last year brought a net of \$597,000,000 in sales of raw tobacco and another \$200,000,000 in processed tobacco products. Our tobacco is meeting increased competition in the world market, because of pricing and other factors, and we must face the reality that there will continue to be problems. However, the Government should not take a position of opposition to the industry.

The Department of Agriculture has already eliminated the 5-cent-per-pound export subsidy on tobacco and is now trying to eliminate the barter program. Let us not take another blow at America's oldest export commodity—especially since the same inducements, provided in this bill, are available to many other commodities under Public Law 480.

Several millions of dollars are spent each year in promoting the sale of other

commodities on the same basis and the amount for tobacco is small by comparison.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, I lend my full support to the agriculture/environmental and consumer protection appropriation bill.

This legislation gives a giant boost to the fine farms across our land, including the 114,000 farms in my State of Ohio, at a time when they desperately need and richly deserve this necessary support. Ohio farmers have had the worst weather season in years. Besides having to fight adverse flooding and barely break-even farm prices in the face of spiraling inflation, farmers are now also experiencing the most severe period of fuel shortages in recent remembrance.

The passage of this bill is not only a shot in the arm for rural America, but is also a welcome tonic for our entire Nation's economy. In order to maintain a healthy agricultural climate, we must restore reasonable prices and inexorbitant purchasing power to our farmers.

Agribusiness, now responsible for 30 percent of all our country's jobs, long has been and now even more importantly is the base of our overall productivity, and must be supported strongly if we are to have continuing prosperity.

In order to feed all of our Nation in this time of sky-high food prices, we must keep the farmer down on the farm. We must do this by establishing an active rural development program that both raises farm income and stimulates the private economy by creating jobs in the rural communities.

Almost 104,000 farms had to close during the 1960's. Today, 9.4 million Americans live on farms—one person in 22, yet, one farmer produces enough food to feed 50 people. Farmers comprise less than 5 percent of our population, but have \$250 billion in assets—and are \$60 billion in debt. We have got to help them out; it now costs about \$100,000 for an aspiring farmer to get into the business.

It is now that we, as responsible Congressmen, must support our farmers in their financial risk-taking. If we do not urge them to plant those extra acres, there will even be more chaos at our supermarkets.

Despite all of our complaining Americans are better fed than anyone on Earth. The average American consumed more than 118 pounds of beef, alone, per capita last year. Yet, we spend less than 17 percent of our income for all of our food.

Let us help give America a healthy bread table, and we will fare better at the world's peace table in the years ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the dissemination of agricultural information and the coordination of informational work and programs authorized by Congress in the Department, and for general administration of the Department of Agriculture, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies

and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, and not to exceed \$15,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$10,822,000, of which \$3,029,000 shall be available for the Office of Communication and, of which total appropriation not to exceed \$612,000 may be used for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be available to be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7 U.S.C. 417), and not less than two hundred and thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture) as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (44 U.S.C. 241): *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551-558: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,500 of this amount shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE: On page 3, after line 12, insert the following language: "None of the funds provided by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries of any personnel which carries out the provisions of section 610 of the Agricultural Act of 1970."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I revere a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Eighty-eight Members are present, not a quorum. The call will be taken by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 227]

Adams	Davis, Ga.	Kluczynski
Anderson, Calif.	Dent	Landrum
Anderson, Ill.	Diggs	Litton
Arends	Edwards, Calif.	McDade
Ashbrook	Erlenborn	McSpadden
Ashley	Fisher	Macdonald
Badillo	Flowers	Mailiard
Bafalis	Flynt	Mathis, Ga.
Bell	Forsythe	Metcalfe
Blackburn	Fuqua	Mills, Ark.
Blatnik	Gettys	Moorhead, Calif.
Boggs	Gialmo	Gray
Breckinridge	Gunter	Moorhead, Pa.
Burke, Calif.	Harsha	Mosher
Chisholm	Hastings	Murphy, N.Y.
Clark	Hays	Owens
Clay	Hébert	Patman
Conable	Heckler, Mass.	Pepper
Coughlin	Horton	Powell, Ohio
Daniels, Dominick V.	Huber	Pritchard
Danielson	Ichord	Quie
	Johnson, Pa.	Reid
		Rhodes

Rogers	Sisk	Ullman
Roncalio, Wyo.	Stark	Walde
Rooney, N.Y.	Steelman	Wiggins
Rousselot	Steiger, Ariz.	Wilson, Bob
Roybal	Stephens	Winn
Ruppe	Stokes	Wydler
Schneebeck	Symms	Young, S.C.
Seiberling	Teague, Tex.	
Sikes	Treen	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. WRIGHT, 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. 8619, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, when 342 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. When the point of order of the absence of a quorum was made, the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to call for an end to all Government subsidies to Cotton, Inc., a quasi-public organization ostensibly in the business of cotton promotion and research.

Every taxpayer in this country would be outraged if he knew of the shocking situation which characterizes Cotton, Inc.

The funding for Cotton, Inc., which was instituted under section 610 of the Agriculture Act of 1970, is supposed to equal the amount of savings in cotton subsidies realized by the \$55,000 per crop limitation placed on the "big six" staple crops in 1970, and is not to exceed \$10 million per year.

These provisions, however, have not been followed. Instead, through one of the most tortured legal interpretations I have ever confronted, the Comptroller General of the United States Elmer Staats and former Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin decided that section 610 required the Secretary of Agriculture to make the \$10 million payment to Cotton, Inc. without waiting for proof of actual savings by the \$55,000 limitation.

They stated that the Secretary had discretion only over the approval or disapproval of specific projects of Cotton, Inc. and not over the amount of money to be funded to this organization in the event of savings.

With this interpretation of section 610 serving as the funding policy for Cotton, Inc., the Federal Government made complete \$10 million payments to Cotton, Inc., in both fiscal year 1971 and fiscal year 1972, without any proof of the savings effected by the \$55,000 per crop subsidy limitation.

At this point, one would naturally say to himself, "if the savings from the subsidy limitation were less than \$10 million, then the Government would have overfunded, Cotton, Inc. in fiscal years 1971 and 1972." This is exactly what happened. In 1971, for example, the savings from the subsidy limitation on cotton were \$2.2 million, but Cotton, Inc. still received \$10 million—an overfunding of Cotton, Inc. by \$7.8 million.

Ten million dollars of Cotton, Inc.'s budget is supposed to come from the \$1 per bale checkoff from the cotton producers in the private sector. Cotton, Inc., received this \$10 million contribution from the private sector in both fiscal year 1971 and fiscal year 1972. But rather than spend this money, Cotton, Inc. has put at least 12 to 15 million dollars in reserve, and has spent mostly Government funds.

In addition, Cotton, Inc. has misused this taxpayers' money. According to the Staats-Hardin interpretation, the Secretary of Agriculture could disapprove of specific projects in Cotton, Inc.'s budget, and could thus require changes in the budgetary priorities of this organization.

Well, in 1972, Cotton, Inc., budgeted an astronomical \$1,278,000 for the movement to and, renovation of, new offices in New York City and Raleigh, N.C. This \$1,278,000 budget was rejected by the Secretary of Agriculture and declared by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Richard Lyng to be an "injudicious use of funds by a quasi-public organization that is heavily dependent on tax revenues and on backing of cotton farmers."

Consequently, Cotton, Inc. was given \$800,000 for the move, and was told to cut down the excessive and exorbitant moving and renovation expenses to keep within this limit.

Rather than follow these instructions, however, Cotton, Inc., made up the \$478,000 difference by drawing upon the millions of dollars in reserve funds it received from the private sector. This was a clear violation of the decision by the Department of Agriculture to cut moving expenditures.

Included in this \$1,278,000 budget were such ludicrous items as \$25,000 for a private elevator between three floors in the New York City office; \$160,000 for the outright purchase of telephone equipment for the New York and Raleigh offices; \$95,800 for cabinetry and wood-work; \$125,000 for floor, wall, and window coverings; and, most luxurious of all, a \$7,200 granite reception room. I defy Cotton, Inc., to explain to me why these extravagant baubles are indispensable to cotton promotion and research.

Not only has the spending of Cotton, Inc., been excessive and injudicious, but the salaries paid the directors of this organization provide stark testimony to the fact that Cotton, Inc., is nothing more than a boondoggle. The company president, J. Dukes Wooters, receives a salary of \$100,000 while six of his subordinates receive annual salaries of at least \$35,000.

Not only are the salaries paid to the officials of Cotton, Inc., excessive and extravagant, but the organization itself has also been ineffectual in the promotion of cotton. When Cotton, Inc., began operation in 1970, domestic cotton consumption was 8.1 million bales. In 1972 consumption had dropped to 7.8 million bales—its lowest level since 1948.

Mr. Chairman, the sorry performance of Cotton, Inc.—its apparent lack of effectiveness, its exorbitant spending, its willingness to violate legitimate Government directives concerning these spending practices—all of these failures add up to a demand for a swift and decisive end

to all Government funding of this organization.

Cotton is the only one of the "big six" commodity crops to receive Government money for promotion and research. The money for promotion and research of corn, wheat, and feed grains comes from the private sector. I can think of no reason why cotton should receive such favored treatment.

There is no reason why we should continue to fund a cotton promotion boondoggle, while at the same time we are cutting back in many worthwhile and productive human resource programs because of the lack of funds. I call upon my colleagues to support this amendment to end this scandal once and for all.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) desire to be heard on a point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not press the point of order in view of current decisions. However, I would like to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi withdraw his point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi withdraws his point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. Chairman, I think it well that the Members hear the real story on why this provision is in the law.

Some years ago the textile industry set out to get cotton at lower prices. Against my vote, they got that provision in the law. The textile industry in the district represented by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) can now buy cotton at world prices. However, the cotton producers buy everything that they have to use at U.S. prices. They have to pay domestic prices for their cottonpickers and all their other machinery.

At the time that law was passed it was provided that Congress would pay the difference between letting the cotton mills have their cotton at world prices and a fair domestic price.

In connection with that, when the next farm bill was passed, it provided for these research funds, since the American cotton producer was having to sell his cotton at world prices and having to look to Congress for an annual appropriation. I told them it was going to end up like it is now—smeared from pillar to post.

Like my colleague from Massachusetts and others, our attention was called to the way some of these matters were handled. In our report on page 37, if the Members will read it—we stated, and I will read the last paragraph.

The Committee does not wish to prejudge the merit of these programs at this time. However, in order to provide the maximum benefits from funds made available from the Treasury and from producers as a result of Federal law, the Committee directs the Secretary to maintain annual supervision, including approval in advance, of the use of Federal funds, as well as producer funds which are collected as a result of Federal law; to maintain annual audits of Cotton, Inc.,

including surveillance of salaries paid and programs sponsored and funds spent; and to require full reports from Cotton Council International as a condition precedent to cooperation in either promotion or research, all in order to obtain maximum results and to promote the use of American cotton.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could have the Members' attention for 1 minute. Let me repeat. This fund is there because this Congress provided that the cotton producer must sell his cotton at the world price, way below any kind of world parity. They said if he would do that, Congress would make an appropriation every year to take care of him. It said further: If you put up a dollar a bale of your money for research, the Congress would provide funds to promote your cotton.

I opposed this, because I figured it would bog down along the line somewhere.

I just looked up section 610 of the Agricultural Act of 1970, and it provides that these officials shall do this.

My colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts—and my relationship is very friendly with him—does not say you shall not perform your work and do your duty. He just says after you have done it, you shall not be paid.

Mr. Chairman, this is not right; this is not fair; I hope the Members vote it down.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the unfortunate fact is that the only way the Members of this body can effectively hold up on the payment of the third \$10 million annual increment out of the U.S. Treasury to Cotton, Inc., is to support this amendment. The money has been provided on two previous annual occasions out of the resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, a form of back-door spending, which effectively keeps us from denying funds for direct expenditures. Had the direct approach been available, I should much have preferred that approach, but as it is, the only way we can get at this is by withholding salaries.

As the gentleman from Mississippi knows very well, if this amendment is adopted and becomes law, the Secretary of Agriculture is going to see to it that no employees of the Department actually carry out the third incremental expenditure of \$10 million to Cotton, Inc. This is the only practical opportunity we have to prevent this third payment.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. If I am advised correctly, the Committee on Agriculture is meeting right now writing the Act to take effect the 1st of January. I am saying, in my opinion, if this becomes effective, it is not going to be needed just as soon as they pass a new law, because the present law expires the 1st of January.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am sorry to report to the gentleman that the tentative decision made by the Committee on Agriculture was to continue the \$10 million annual funding of Cotton, Incorporated. I hope in its wisdom the House of Representatives, when it does receive the bill, will knock out that item, but, neverthe-

less, the bill before the Committee on Agriculture cannot touch the third payment of \$10 million, which was, as the gentleman points out, authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1970, which is still effective this year.

This, as he knows, was slipped in the conference report and hardly a soul in this Chamber knew what was going on. It was on that flimsy authority that the Commodity Credit Corporation has in each of the last 2 years made \$10 million available to Cotton, Incorporated.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say I just do not agree anybody slipped it in. I have explained why it was in there and I think it is sound. When we provide that any major commodity will sell on the domestic market at world prices, certainly they will be in the hole unless we bail them out in some way.

The Congress simply will not support it indefinitely, but the gentleman will agree the existing law calling for this expires as of January 1 next year and we will have a chance to act on this in connection with the general farm legislation.

Mr. FINDLEY. But by the rules of this House this is the only way we can effectively prevent the expenditure of the final 10 million.

The gentleman is a leader in agricultural legislation, and if he was not aware of what was happening in that conference report through which Cotton, Inc., is funded I think hardly anybody else in this Chamber was aware of it. The time to stop this foolish expenditure is now. If we wait until the general farm bill comes forward we will not have any way effectively to stop this payment.

Mr. WHITTEN. I cannot believe the Members of this Congress this late in the day will say to withhold this money after they have performed these services.

Mr. FINDLEY. But the Members of this body are just now awakening to the facts and this is why this amendment is offered.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the \$100,000 a year salary paid to the head of Cotton, Inc., it is my understanding that six other officials drew salaries in the \$35,000 to \$44,000 range and that the salaries of all the officials and employees amount to some \$2,140,000 a year.

Mr. FINDLEY. In fact the salary of the president at \$100,000 a year is nearly twice as much as his superior, the Secretary of Agriculture gets a year.

Mr. GROSS. That is correct, and it is my understanding the employees do not pay for their fringe benefits. This is a plush operation and especially so in view of the fact that the revenues from the cotton checkoff are somewhere between \$12 million and \$15 million, which is apparently stashed away in some 30 banks across the country and reportedly draws close to \$400,000 a year in interest. With that kind of a fund why in the world should there be an annual raid on Commodity Credit funds for \$10 million a year?

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

Mr. FINDLEY. Cotton, Inc., started under a cloud, it has continued under a darkening cloud and I think it is high time we bring in a little sunshine.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have before us this agriculture appropriation bill. We are trying to comply with the law in bringing the measure to the House of Representatives. Much is said to the effect that the basic law of the land is not good and an effort is being made now to rewrite the farm program in this appropriations measure. But the present farm program expires at the end of this year, and the Committee on Agriculture—the legislative committee—is now working—working indeed this afternoon—on drafting a new bill and it will have to do with what should be done toward the continuation or modification of this promotion program for cotton.

It just does not make any sense to load up this appropriations measure with the legislative provision and undertake to deny the House Committee on Agriculture its appropriate jurisdiction to deal with this matter.

Now, from the standpoint of the program itself, of promoting the production and marketing and overseas sales of cotton, the producer of cotton is providing \$1 per bale for this program.

The program is succeeding in that it is helping this Nation to export annually about \$11 billion—I do not have the exact figures—worth of agricultural commodities. One of those commodities, and one which leads the parade, is cotton. The program is of assistance from the standpoint of the balance of payments; from the standpoint of the need to strengthen the dollar which continues to recede. We urgently need more surpluses on exports.

I do not see why the Federal Government cannot cooperate with contributing farmers in an effort to make this program succeed and, therefore, enhance the position in world trade of the United States. Heaven knows, we need it.

Mr. Chairman, I just hope that we will not try to deal with this proposed intricate legislation here. The decision of what should be proposed about this matter should be left to the Committee on Agriculture, of which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is a member.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman mentioned that cotton farmers are contributing a dollar per bale to Cotton, Inc., but the curious fact is that Cotton, Inc., has not been utilizing that money. It has been putting it, for the most part, into a reserve fund and spending instead the \$10 million per year out of the Treasury.

Mr. MAHON. All manner of resources are being used in the field of research and cotton promotion. I believe in giving the American producer an opportunity to try to work himself out of a very difficult situation and promote this product which is so important to our world trade and to our domestic economy.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had not anticipated participating further in the argument over this fund, but in view of the statements of my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) I must respond to him to say that action should be taken here today by way of adopting this amendment because by July 1 a decision will have to be made by the Department of Agriculture with respect to approving or denying another increment of \$10 million to be paid into this promotion fund.

It is therefore of urgency that something be done today as a matter of guidance to the Department, and not wait until the legislative bill comes along. I would say further to the gentleman from Texas that, despite the spending of millions on promotion of cotton through this device of tapping Commodity Credit Corporation funds at the rate of \$10 million a year, the consumption of cotton, by the committee's own report, had slumped 400,000 bales.

Moreover, there is a reserve fund of \$12 to \$15 million that has been built up from a checkoff on every bale of cotton that is being produced. There is absolutely no reason why the taxpayers of this country should contribute through the Commodity Credit Corporation to another fund for the promotion of cotton.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will bear with me, I would like to point out again that on page 37 of the report, the committee has provided the following items: "The committee directs the Secretary to maintain annual supervision, including approval in advance, of the use of Federal funds, as well as producer funds which are collected as a result of Federal law; to maintain annual audits of Cotton, Inc., including surveillance of salaries paid and programs sponsored and funds spent; and to require full reports from Cotton Council International as a condition precedent to cooperation in either promotion or research, all in order to obtain maximum results and to promote the use of American cotton."

I know of no stronger language.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman from Mississippi, who I hope is my friend, that the Secretary has had the authority to determine whether Commodity Credit money should be put into this promotion outfit. He has made three contributions to this fund up to this point—

Mr. CONTE. Two.

Mr. GROSS. I stand corrected. This would be the third \$10 million increment.

Yes, he has had the authority, and he has recommended that \$20 million in Commodity Credit funds be handed over to Cotton, Inc. What we want to say to the Secretary today is put a stop to this and tell Cotton, Inc., to use the funds it has on hand to promote cotton.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. There is one thing I cannot understand. I should like to have the gentleman's attention. It is that the big chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who has taken the well time and time again preaching fiscal responsibility and talking about balanced budgets, stands here today and opposes us, when we are trying to save \$10 million that has been wasted of the taxpayers' money. Wasted, I say.

I would like to tell the gentleman from Iowa that I believe the gentleman who heads Cotton, Inc. was formerly with Reader's Digest, which magazine had great exposé on subsidy payments. Somehow or other he got off the payroll of Reader's Digest and now heads Cotton, Inc.

I say, if we want fiscal responsibility here today, vote for this amendment.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in times past I could raise almost as much commotion as my friend from Massachusetts. This is too serious for that.

Three years ago the committee asked the American cotton farmers to buy a package, where the farmer sold his cotton on the world markets at 12 or 15 or 18 cents below his cost. A part of that agreement was that these funds would be provided to help promote the use of his product.

The farmer has lived up to his part of the bargain. He has had to sell at that world price. Here, in the last 6 months of a law that is expiring, while the legislative committee is writing new laws, we are asked to renege on a part of that agreement.

I repeat that the committee wrote in this language that the Secretary has to report everything in the world and has to approve everything in the world in advance.

I say to my friend, despite the oratory of my good friend from Massachusetts, we do not want to renege in the last 6 months of a 3-year deal.

It was unwise to start with. I told my cotton friends that. They should never get on to a world price and an annual appropriation by the Congress, and rely on the Congress living up to a commitment. They did not listen to me, but they did rely on the Congress living up to its commitment.

Since I come from cotton country, I wrote the language as strong as I knew how, that they had to say everything was in order before action was taken.

I hope that the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am always amused when my colleague from Massachusetts takes the House floor, particularly at his expertise as an agriculturalist. He also spends a lot of time talking about fiscal responsibility—frugal on a selective basis.

I checked the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today. This House had a great opportunity yesterday to perform this very task. I notice that my good friend from Massachusetts voted "no" when he had the opportunity to cut the Arts and Humanities, on the Kemp amendment. He also voted "yea" on final passage, after admonition from the President the night before asking all Members to maintain fiscal responsibility. This inconsistency is remarkable.

This attitude is responsible, equally, to the attitude that has been maintained by the gentleman from Massachusetts regarding rural America.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope at this time that the Members of the House would vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) and support the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 125, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

AYES—234

Abzug	Dellums	Hosmer
Annunzio	Dennis	Howard
Archer	Derwinski	Hudnut
Armstrong	Devine	Hungate
Aspin	Dickinson	Hunt
Barrett	Diggs	Hutchinson
Bennett	Dingell	Jarman
Biaggi	Donohue	Johnson, Colo.
Blester	Drinan	Karth
Bingham	Dulski	Kastenmeier
Boland	Duncan	Keating
Bolling	du Pont	Kemp
Brademas	Edwards, Ala.	King
Brasco	Ellberg	Koch
Bray	Esch	Kyros
Broomfield	Eshleman	Landgrebe
Brotzman	Fascell	Latta
Brown, Calif.	Findley	Lehman
Brown, Mich.	Fish	Lent
Brown, Ohio	Ford, Gerald R.	Long, Md.
Brownhill, Va.	Ford,	Lujan
Buchanan	William D.	McClory
Burgener	Fraser	McCloskey
Burke, Fla.	Frelinghuysen	McCollister
Burke, Mass.	Frenzel	McCormack
Butler	Frey	McKay
Byron	Froehlich	McKinney
Camp	Fulton	Madden
Carey, N.Y.	Gaydos	Madigan
Carney, Ohio	Gibbons	Mallary
Cederberg	Gilman	Marazitl
Chamberlain	Goodling	Martin, Nebr.
Chisholm	Grasso	Martin, N.C.
Clancy	Green, Pa.	Mayne
Clark	Griffiths	Mazzoli
Clausen,	Gross	Mezvinsky
Don H.	Grover	Michel
Clawson, Del.	Gubser	Milford
Clay	Gude	Miller
Cleveland	Guyer	Minish
Cohen	Hamilton	Mink
Collier	Hanley	Minshall, Ohio
Collins, Ill.	Hanna	Mitchell, Md.
Collins, Tex.	Hannahan	Mitchell, N.Y.
Conte	Hansen, Idaho	Moakley
Corman	Harrington	Morgan
Cotter	Harvey	Moss
Coughlin	Hawkins	Murphy, Ill.
Crane	Hechler, W. Va.	Nedzi
Cronin	Heinz	Nelsen
Culver	Heistoski	Nix
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Hillis	Obey
Davis, Wis.	Hinshaw	O'Brien
Delaney	Hogan	Parris
Dellenback	Holtzman	Patten
	Horton	Fettis

Peyser	Sandman	Tiernan
Pike	Sarasin	Van Deerlin
Podell	Sarbanes	Vander Jagt
Powell, Ohio	Schroeder	Vanik
Price, Ill.	Seiberling	Vigorito
Quillen	Shipley	Walsh
Rallsback	Shoup	Ware
Randall	Shriver	Whalen
Rangel	Shuster	Widnall
Rees	Snyder	Williams
Regula	Stanton,	Wilson, Bob
Reuss	J. William	Wilson,
Riggle	Stanton,	Charles H., Calif.
Rinaldo	James V.	Wolff
Robison, N.Y.	Steele	Wylie
Rodino	Stokes	Wyman
Roe	Stratton	Yates
Rogers	Studds	Yatron
Roncalio, N.Y.	Sullivan	Young, Fla.
Rooney, Pa.	Symington	Young, Ill.
Rosenthal	Talcott	Zablocki
Rostenkowski	Taylor, Mo.	Zion
Roush	Taylor, N.C.	
Ryan	Thompson, N.J.	
St Germain	Thomson, Wis.	

NOES—125

Abdnor	Haley	Price, Tex.
Addabbo	Hammer-	Rarick
Alexander	schnmidt	Rhodes
Andrews, N.C.	Hansen, Wash.	Roberts
Andrews,	Henderson	Robinson, Va.
N. Dak.	Hicks	Rose
Baker	Hollifield	Roy
Beard	Holt	Runnels
Bergland	Johnson, Calif.	Ruth
Bevill	Jones, Ala.	Satterfield
Blackburn	Jones, N.C.	Saylor
Boggs	Jones, Okla.	Scherle
Bowen	Jones, Tenn.	Sebelius
Breux	Jordan	Skubitz
Brinkley	Kazan	Slack
Brooks	Ketchum	Smith, Iowa
Brynhill, N.C.	Kuykendall	Smith, N.Y.
Burleson, Tex.	Leggett	Spence
Burison, Mo.	Long, La.	Staggers
Burton	Lott	Steed
Carter	McEwen	Steiger, Ariz.
Casey, Tex.	McFall	Stephens
Chappell	McSpadden	Stubblefield
	Mahon	Stuckey
	Mann	Teague, Calif.
	Mathias, Calif.	Thornton
	Matsunaga	Towell, Nev.
	Meeds	Udall
	Melcher	Veysey
	Mizell	Waggonner
	Mollohan	Wampler
	Downing	White
	Eckhardt	Whitehurst
	Evans, Colo.	Whitten
	Flood	Wilson.
	Foley	Charles, Tex.
	Fountain	Wright
	Gettys	Wyatt
	Ginn	Young, Alaska
	Goldwater	Young, Ga.
	Gonzalez	Young, Tex.
	Gray	Zwach
	Green, Oreg.	

NOT VOTING—74

Adams	Fuqua	Pepper
Anderson,	Giaimo	Pritchard
Butler	Gunter	Quie
Calif.	Harscha	Reid
Anderson, Ill.	Hastings	Roncalio, Wyo.
Arends	Ashbrook	Rooney, N.Y.
Ashey	Hays	Rousselot
Badillo	Heckler, Mass.	Royle
Bafalis	Huber	Ruppe
Bell	Ichord	Schneebeli
Blatnik	Johnson, Pa.	Sikes
Breckinridge	Kluczynski	Sisk
Burke, Calif.	Landrum	Stark
Conable	Litton	Steelman
Conyers	McDade	Steiger, Wis.
Daniels,	Macdonald	Symms
Dominick V.	Mailiard	Teague, Tex.
Danielson	Mathis, Ga.	Thone
Dent	Metcalfe	Treen
Edwards, Calif.	Mills, Ark.	Ullman
Erlenborn	Moorhead,	Waldie
Evens, Tenn.	Calif.	Wiggins
Fisher	Moorhead, Pa.	Winn
Flowers	Mosher	Wyder
Flynt	Murphy, N.Y.	Young, S.C.
Forsythe	Owens	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE: Page 3 after line 12, insert the following: “*Provided further*, that none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, to formulate or carry out any single 1974 crop year price support program (other than for sugar and wool) under which the total amount of payments to any person or State government would be more than \$20,000.”

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I was going to offer this amendment at a later time, but I was asked by my colleagues if I would offer it at this time.

Mr. Chairman, at this time of inflation, skyrocketing food prices, and animal feed shortages, I once again offer my amendment to the agriculture appropriations bill to limit farm subsidy payments for cotton, wheat, and feed grains to \$20,000 per crop.

This amendment has been passed by the House three times—in 1968, 1969, and 1971—and last week a similar amendment passed the Senate.

In his inflation message Wednesday night, the President said and I quote:

In its consideration of new farm legislation, it is vital that the Congress put high production ahead of high prices, so that farm prosperity will not be at the cost of higher prices for the consumer. If the Congress sends me a farm bill, or any other bill, that I consider inflationary, I shall veto such a bill.

Farm prices are high. According to the price index published in the current Business Week magazine, the price of nine grocery-basket foodstuffs has increased by 47 percent from just a year ago. The market price for wheat has jumped 81 percent to \$2.98 a bushel from this time last year.

Since I first offered this amendment in 1967, the price index for food has leaped by 66 percent. By limiting production and supporting farm prices, the farm subsidy program has been a prime contributor to inflation.

The principal purpose of the farm subsidy program has been to help the family-sized farm prosper by restricting production and inflating prices.

But it should be apparent to all that while the subsidies have done their job all too well in keeping prices up, they have failed to protect the small farmer. The number of family farms decreases alarmingly every year, because people are moving off the farm and giant corporations are taking over the land.

The feed grain program, for example, has been a disaster for New England and the Northeast this year. Feed grain farmers were paid \$1.8 billion last year to restrict production.

Now, after the Russian grain deal, dairy feed costs are up 60 percent and poultry feed costs are up 91 percent over a year ago in New England. The Congress should not feel obligated to continue huge give-aways for large corporations that do not need them.

The time is ripe to end the harvest of huge farm subsidies. The present program helps neither the small farmer nor the consumer, so there cannot be any

purpose in continuing it in the present form.

One way to help the small farmer is to reduce the farm subsidies that go to large corporate farms. Large payments to big farms aggravate the competitive advantages they enjoy over small family farms. By giving huge subsidies to these corporate giants, the Federal Government is hastening the demise of the family farm.

Direct payments to farmers last year by the Federal Government totaled \$4 billion, an increase of 26 percent over 1971.

These payments were made disproportionately to large, corporate farms.

A study prepared recently for the Joint Economic Committee found that only 7 percent of the benefits from the Government's farm commodity programs go to the poorest 41 percent of U.S. farms, while the richest 7 percent receive 32 percent.

The precise figures may be new but a familiar pattern emerges: A price support program devised to help the small family farmer chiefly benefit those who least need help.

The vast majority of our constituents are worried about inflation, high taxes, wasteful Government spending and how to make ends meet. There is a limit that the American taxpayer should be asked to endure. Certainly, the payment of exorbitant subsidies to people, corporations and State governments that do not need them cannot be justified.

My amendment set a reasonable limit on subsidy payments. It insures that Federal funds are not wasted on farmers who do not need them.

Fat cat farmers are lapping up the cream from the subsidy trough. I urge my colleagues to pass this amendment to limit subsidy payments to \$20,000 per crop and put an end to this outrageous waste of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts makes a big issue of inflation and tries to somehow relate to the Members that the passage of this amendment is going to help in the battle against inflation. I submit that simply is not so. It was only a little more than a year ago when we were dumping grain at less than the cost of production in the United States, and some people with the help of the gentleman from Massachusetts opposed in the Congress and succeeded in defeating a food reserve bill. Instead of saving some of these surplus grains for when it is needed, we dumped it on the world market at less than the other nations were willing to pay. It let them accumulate dollar credits that helped to sink the dollar.

Today we need more grain but we do not have it because the Members of Congress who have traditionally been against anything that helps the farmers come in here and helped sink that food reserve bill.

If the Members want to do something about inflation, they should support a food reserve bill so when we have a food surplus we will put some of it away for the day when we do not have enough.

For the second thing, let us take a

look at the wording of the amendment. Does it do what the gentleman says it does? What it says is that the Department shall not have the money to formulate or carry on any program, in which any person receives more than \$20,000. That means if any one person in the United States gets \$20,000 in loans or anything else there will be no program whatever for that commodity, period.

There would be no program or even loans for the small farmers, as well as the big ones. That is what the amendment says. This goes to point up the danger of trying to write legislation on an appropriations bill. The amendment does not do what the author intends it to do, apparently.

In the case of the amendment eliminating the cotton promotion program, it did not limit salaries or curb abuses which I could and have supported. Instead of doing what they talked about it repealed the law while it is in its final year. I opposed eliminating Public Broadcasting for the same reason but I supported amendments to limit the same abuse complained of here.

The legislative committee has this payment limit matter under consideration now, and I understand the full committee is reporting out a bill with an effective limitation on payments per producer. The Senate has already passed one, so it is going to be settled in the legislation anyway for 1974 in the regular carefully considered manner. It will then be written in such a way that it can do what the gentleman from Massachusetts says he wants to do. Therefore, I think we ought to leave these kinds of things to the legislative committee and vote no on this amendment today.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY for the amendment offered by Mr. CONTE: None of the funds provided by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel who formulate or carry out:

(1) programs for the 1974 crop year under which the aggregate payments for the wheat, feed grains and upland cotton programs for price support, set-aside, diversion and resource adjustment to one person exceed \$20,000, or

(2) a program effective after December 31, 1973 which sanctions the sale or lease of cotton acreage allotments.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture has some \$3 or \$4 billion; it has certain obligations and authority under its charter, and that money they now have is not in this bill.

This amendment, if passed, would in no way affect the Corporation. It has 3 or 4 billions of dollars which in turn it already had with obligations under the charter under which it is formulated.

The amendment at this point would not reach funds already available with existing authority and under a charter.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi make a point of order against the substitute?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, I will make the point of order at this point, that if it be held that this goes to the action of a corporation that presently has \$3 to \$4 billion, that presently has a charter which directs it to carry out what is prohibited by this provision; that if this amendment attempts to reach that corporation which has a corporation charter, it is legislation on an appropriations bill and, therefore, subject to a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, when debating a similar amendment on the bill last year I made the following remarks:

As to my point of order, Mr. Chairman, the amendment, to which I make the point of order, goes to tying strings on the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation at the present time is a creature of statutory law originally created and incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware. It was made into a corporation so that it could perform and discharge all of the duties of a corporation, that is, sue and be sued. It had an independence created by statute. With time the Congress made it a U.S. corporation and brought forward the provisions which are incorporated in the Corporation Control Act. It appears in the compilation of statutes of February 17, page 154, 69 Stat. 1007.

In addition, the Commodity Credit Corporation by law and in the law is created for the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit, too, that the Chair, may I say, is faced with the unhappy situation of reversing those who preceded him, including the present presiding chairman, but when a law is passed and the law provides for certain authority, to change that would be to change the law and would be legislation. But the Congress, to be sure about which was passed and which appears in this, in the Corporation Control Act, title 31, at page 7455, section 849, provides that nothing shall interfere with the Commodity Credit Corporation carrying out its functions.

I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, when the Congress goes out of its way to create a corporation, not a Government agency or a Government department, but a corporation, then they have some purpose in making it a corporation. Then when they pass another act that says nothing we can later do which will prevent the corporation from discharging its duties under the law, I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding all of the rulings previously made, that when you try to prevent that corporation from discharging its functions in favor of United States agriculture, and pass a statute in the Corporation Control Act where it says you cannot do anything that will prevent the carrying out of its obligations, which is to maintain farm income, that this is clearly a method and a means or an effort to change the legislation in two acts, the Corporation Act creating the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the act in which we took into the Congress some surveillance over its operations.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes. First of all, the gentleman from Mississippi has made a similar argument on several occasions in previous years when almost identical

amendments have been offered, and each time the chair has overruled the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment which I have offered as a substitute to the Conte amendment is a limitation of salaries of personnel. Personnel, of course, includes the Secretary of Agriculture, all of his lieutenants right down to the CCC level. Even if, as the gentleman argues, the limitation could not apply to the salaries of CCC personnel, which I do not concede, nevertheless this amendment would be effective in establishing the limitation it seeks to effect, because it would go to the salary of the Secretary. All of the authority that is in the draft bill now before the Committee on Agriculture dealing with continuing farm legislation goes to the Secretary as a person.

This is a limitation on the expenditure of funds, a limitation that goes to the expenditure of salaries, and therefore entirely within the rules of the House as being germane.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further?

Mr. Chairman, if it be held that I am in error in making the point of order or that the point of order is not sustained, because the funds in this bill do not go to the corporation, do not reach to a corporation which has its own charter and which is organized under legislation, for the Chair to overrule the point of order, it would have to mean that the amendment does not go to changing that law. Therefore, if it does not go to changing that law, the legislative committee which is now presently considering new legislation would merely have to change its present provisions so it would be carried out by the corporation and thereby avoid the gentleman's provision.

The point I am making is that I am asking the Chair, in its ruling, to determine, if the point of order is overruled, whether the point of order is overruled because this goes only to the personnel as described by its author, and therefore inferentially would not reach the corporation and its charter and its employees. I would like the Chair to specify, if I may be so presumptuous, the basis on which the decision is rendered, so that the committee which is now writing the legislation will know how to write it.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman attempts to make the identical point about the sanctity of the Commodity Credit Corporation he made on earlier occasions, as early as 1963, and on each of these occasions the Chair overruled that argument. I hope the Chair will sustain its earlier positions.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WRIGHT). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) has offered an amendment, for which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) has offered a substitute.

The gentleman from Mississippi has raised a point of order against the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois on the ground that it

constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill.

The Chair has listened to the arguments and has carefully read the text of the proposed substitute. The Chair notes that the substitute would restrict funds provided by this act, providing that none of such funds should be used to pay salaries of personnel to carry out certain programs. As such, insofar as it applies to the funds provided in this act, the substitute would be a limitation on the appropriation bill and would not be legislation, and is therefore in order.

The Chair would point out that nothing in such substitute could act officially or affirmatively to inhibit payment of funds that are not provided in this act. As the Chair reads the proposed substitute, there is no language which would affect, limit, or inhibit funds other than those provided in this act.

Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical in its effect with that offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) with one vitally important exception. This amendment would effectively close the main loophole in the Agricultural Act of 1970, a loophole through which one could drive the biggest diesel tractor in America's farmland, a loophole that was used primarily by the big cotton interests of the United States to nullify the effectiveness of the payment limit at the level of \$55,000 which was written into the Agricultural Act of 1970.

Those Members who were in the Chamber at that time and voted for that limitation did so, I am sure, with the expectation that the limitation would reduce program costs. Based on estimates made by the Department of Agriculture, it was expected that the program costs would be reduced by at least \$35 million a year.

When the returns were in at the end of the first year, the program cost reduction, which could under any reasonable circumstances be applied to the effectiveness of the payment limitation, was not \$35 million, but \$2.2 million. This is the estimate by the Department of Agriculture, not mine. The figure for last year was about the same.

Mr. Chairman, the Members may ask, why? Well, it is because the drafters of the Agricultural Act of 1970, being very resourceful legislative people, also put in the act of 1970 the authority for lease and sale of cotton acreage allotments. These are valuable allotments which traditionally attach to the land and can move from one farmer to another only through the process of selling the land. But under this skillful provision the allotments separated from the land by sale and lease. These big, giant cotton operations were handed a way to subdivide their operation very easily and thus effectively avoid the limitation.

Mr. Chairman, that same language authorizing the lease and sale of cotton acreage allotments is also included in the draft of the bill that the Committee on Agriculture is about to report out, and there are not enough votes on that committee, believe me, to get that knocked out.

Now, if we want a payment limitation that is effective, the substitute language is the language to use.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this substitute with my friend, the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) and I concur with him wholeheartedly. I believe it makes a much better amendment, in that it closes off the loopholes and I urge its passage.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there is one fatal flaw in the arguments made by both the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

If we have any respect in this body for orderly conduct of the public business, we should be concerned about the increasing tendency to try to write complicated legislation through the backdoor technique of limitations on an appropriation bill.

Now, I will concede, Mr. Chairman, that there is a temptation sometimes for Members of the House or members of a committee to use the appropriation bill in this way when they are faced with the difficulty of reaching the authorizing legislation that lies ahead, 2, 3, 4, or 5 years hence, or when they are faced with a legislative committee attitude which they think is totally unsympathetic to their point of view.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY) yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG).

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY) how did the gentleman vote on the Addabbo amendment and the Long amendment when we had the supplemental? Does the gentleman recall?

Mr. FOLEY. I do not recall, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman may provide me with the answer, if he knows.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think I do know. I am quite sure that the gentleman is making just the opposite argument he made when we took those up.

I will be glad to look the matter up for the gentleman and let him know.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have just said that there are occasions when Members feel that the Legislative Committee is not sympathetic with their point of view, and they may want to express their point of view in that manner, or they may think the legislative bill is so far removed in time from possible consideration that they may want to bring it up in an appropriation bill.

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will not yield any further.

What I am trying to suggest to the Members is that as a Member of the Committee on Agriculture I can assure them that in 2 or 3 weeks we will have

on the floor an omnibus farm bill which includes sections for wheat and feed grains and cotton, and then the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) can present all the amendments they wish, and they can be formulated and perfected by the Committee at that time without the restraints of limitation on appropriation bills, as far as language is concerned. That is the time to discuss and consider this type of a proposal, not here at the very doorstep of the consideration of the omnibus farm bill.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman is the chairman of an important subcommittee writing this bill. Do you agree with me on the importance of defeating this amendment? You are knowledgeable in the field and you know the amendment does not do what they say it does. Instead of limiting payments to \$20,000 to some people, it completely eliminates a whole program which pays anyone that amount. Is that right?

Mr. FOLEY. I frankly agree with the gentleman that it is a mischievous and dangerous amendment to say nothing of the substitute. I am trying to appeal to those who want to consider these proposals to wait until they have an opportunity to do that in the consideration of the farm bill. All of the arguments can be presented at that time instead of cluttering up an appropriation bill, as we are doing here, with the consideration of a very complicated provision when there is not time for adequate debate or review.

The gentleman from Illinois I am sure will agree with me that he has every confidence in being able to offer this agricultural amendment on the farm bill.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I will have the opportunity but not to join with a limitation on payments the loophole closing language as it is joined in this amendment. The gentleman knows perfectly well I will not have a chance in the world to get unanimous consent to offer these two amendments en bloc so that the issue can be fairly joined. This is the only real chance the House has to establish effective limitations.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Illinois have worked very well today, and I am sure that they can arrange that same tandem performance 2 or 3 weeks from now.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I agree with the gentleman from Washington entirely on his position here and on the grounds that he takes.

Is it not true that if we acted on this amendment, we would affect the 1974 cotton crop in advance of an opportunity for the general agricultural bill to determine the matters that would apply to that crop?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes, indeed. The gentleman is correct. In fact these amendments may affect the 1973 crop.

Mr. ECKHARDT. And we would thus be anticipating the work of the committee of major legislative jurisdiction, would we not?

Mr. FOLEY. Indeed. And I think this House and this Committee can work its will in 2 or 3 weeks in an orderly way which gives full opportunity for discussion of and resolution of this issue. This is the worst time and circumstance in which to act.

The substitute and the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, in my earlier discussion with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) I regret that I did not at first understand clearly his question regarding my votes on two amendments to the recent supplemental appropriation bill.

I understand now that he made reference to the Addabbo amendment and the Long amendment prohibiting transfer of funds or use of appropriated funds for United States combat operations over, in, or off the shores of Cambodia. I voted for both amendments. In that case I felt there was no alternative to amending the appropriations bill. In this case a clear alternative exists in awaiting the pending omnibus farm bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Washington pretty well stated this case. The Committee on Agriculture is right now considering legislation which will completely change the basis on which payments are made and on which supports are provided. If the legislation passes as it now stands in our committee, and if prices remain stable there will not be 1 cent of subsidy paid on next year's crops. That completely changes this ballgame and makes one wonder why this amendment is offered.

The two gentlemen who have for years vied with each other as to which one could promise the most in the way of hamstringing American agriculture will not need to engage in any further contest. They will soon be able to claim that they have been able to cut some nonexistent payments. They can now devote their energies to some of the things closer to home.

Mr. Chairman, last week I voted, as did the gentlemen, for a subsidy of 55 percent on the cost of constructing merchant vessels to sail out of the Port of Boston all over the world to carry American products. I thought it was a good, sound proposition to help American commerce and American workmen. But if you are going to assume that it is well to provide for the transportation of American products, without limit as to the total cost it might be well to consider similar treatment for the production of those products that you are going to transport.

We have not been paying any such subsidy to farmers, and next year we are not even going to pay any. So it seems to me that unless you simply want to find some way of getting in the newspapers you might very well wait until

this agricultural bill comes in before you try to write it on the floor.

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BURTON. I would rise in support of the gentleman's position and in opposition to this mischievous amendment.

I think on occasion it is very desirable to resist the temptation to cast a demagogic vote that appears to be saving money because if this legislation and this amendment is adopted then the prices to the American consumers in the cities and in the suburbs are going to increase, not decrease. And for those of us who are concerned about the urban and suburban constituency, I would submit that the committee legislation is in fine order, it gives more protection than previous legislation in this regard, and that the Agricultural Committee ought to be permitted to work its will for a long-term program, and that we should not hamstring this appropriation bill with either of the two mischievous amendments pending before us.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman from California has said. I think the gentleman has well made the point that the whole purpose of any of these payments is to provide production for American consumers, and to the extent they get that production obviously the consumer will have more to eat and at less cost. It is the same thing with the transportation subsidies which the gentleman so ardently supports. When it is for transportation in one's home town then it is good, but when it is for production out on the farms, then it is wrong.

You cannot lower the cost of food to the American public by saying that the most efficient producers are to be put out of business. Obviously the cheapest food in America is produced on the best-financed and most modern equipped farms.

That is not to say we want to make all of our farms large farms, but the cheapest food in America is produced on those farms that have the best equipment. Are we going to say that we are going to drive them out of business, and then expect to reduce the cost of food to the American consumer? I think most of the Members have gone through the fourth grade, and they know that that is impossible.

I think it is perfectly clear from the standpoint first of the integrity of the legislative process that we ought to leave this thing alone until the legislative bill is before us, and it will be in the next few days.

Also I think from the standpoint of the producer that we ought to leave this thing alone, and let production be carried on in the most efficient manner that we can get. Further, from the standpoint of the consumer, I think we ought to let us produce food as cheaply as we can, rather than try to hamstring production in a way that is bound to increase the cost of food.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I believe it should be mentioned that 3 years ago when we passed the Agricultural Act of 1970 this Congress made a contract with our farmers which said that the limitation on payments would be \$55,000. Here we come back a year before that contract will expire, and tell the farmers that we are going to reduce that \$55,000 to \$20,000. I believe that is improper, and that this body should not do that.

One other point, Mr. Chairman, and it was alluded to briefly earlier, is the point that the gentleman from Massachusetts made on the affluence and the prosperity of our farmers. I want to remind this body that the latest statistics we have available point out that we can invest our money in a farming operation and get a return of 3.6 percent on our investment. We also find that if we make that same investment in bonds or stocks, or savings, that we will make twice that investment. There are a number of other facts that prove the farming sector does not have the prosperity that some of us would be led to believe.

I would implore this body, Mr. Chairman, to keep the contract we made in the Agricultural Act of 1970, and vote down the two amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the statesmen in this House of Representatives who have stood before us this afternoon and said that we ought to have some degree of orderly procedure. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has in effect said: "Will you please give us a chance to finish writing the new farm bill, which is practically perfected at this time, and present it to the Members. Are you going to cut the ground out from under us at this time and try to write the new farm program in this agricultural appropriation bill?"

It does not make sense to undertake to write a farm program on this appropriation bill. It is not fair. It is not statesmanlike. There is no practical way to do it. It should not be done.

I hope that we will let the legislative committee which has jurisdiction, and which is working on this matter, after all its careful deliberations, present to the House the bill on agriculture. The pending amendment could be offered at that time.

The House can then decide what kind of farm bill it wants to enact. The adoption of the pending amendment would represent a serious blow to farmers and consumers alike. A healthy agriculture is essential to the security of the Nation.

I urge the House to vote against this indefensible amendment, and the amendment for which it was the substitute, and let us get on with the business of considering this appropriation bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, in the last few days my son went to Europe. Luckily, a few months ago he bought German marks so he would know what he had to pay for things over there. That is the situation of our American dollar abroad. I

am told that in Paris and many of the capitals around the world hotel rates have gone up as much as four times their former rates. A decent room costs at least \$45.

Mr. Chairman, the one chance that our country has, in my opinion, to bail ourselves out of this international situation, where everybody has got our dollars, and to get them back, is that if we are going to have something to export, we have to have a rise in our agricultural production. Agricultural exports this year are something in excess of \$11 billion.

I know it is easy to vote for a limitation when we think something is a handout or a subsidy. The facts are it is not that at all.

Three years ago this Congress provided that cotton be sold in domestic markets at world prices. The textile business could not get their other raw material at world prices; they could not get their labor or equipment at world prices; but they got cotton at world prices. The producers of cotton were told if they had cotton they could sell in the domestic market at world prices, the Congress would pick up the difference. They are business people. The domestic price is different from the world price. They may not be able to get the row planter that they want, or they may have to get a small cotton picker instead of the \$35,000 cotton picker. It is going to split everything.

Mr. Chairman, we do far more than we realize. We are not only raising the cost to ourselves here at home but we are making it impossible to maintain our exports abroad. While this may look good for the moment, in the long run it is going to look bad.

In addition to that, the agreements that have been made here are that the producers would sell in the domestic market at world price and we would take up the slack.

We would be breaking faith, we would be breaking our agreement with the farmers.

Not only that, but also we would be depriving our good friend, the gentleman from Texas, and our other colleagues who are writing a general farm bill—which is awfully hard to write and get through an urban Congress—of the ability to write a good farm bill.

So let us defeat this amendment and provide for it in the legislative committee bill.

When we passed this bill 3 years ago I said it would never work and the American farmer would make a mistake to take the promise of an annual appropriation and payment. He would be the only one who sold his production at the world price on the domestic market.

I hope the Members will vote against this amendment.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I have often expressed myself in this House on the subject of the Conte amendment. For many years we have had the opportunity to limit some of our agricultural subsidies to those producers who need them most. Again this year we have the opportunity to speak up for sanity in agricultural subsidies. I urge the pas-

sage of the Conte amendment, and of the Findley amendment as well.

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. My colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) has worked for many years to impose a ceiling on farm subsidy payments, and I applaud his past and present efforts towards this reform.

The amendment we are presently considering would limit individual subsidy payments to \$20,000 per crop. While it is not a final solution to the abuses of the program, it is, indeed, a first step.

I hope this amendment will be adopted and that, in the future, the House will address itself to stronger limitations—such as \$20,000 per producer—and to the eventual elimination of the program.

Last year the Federal Government paid more than \$4 billion in price supports and farm subsidies. Yet, the small struggling farmer—whom the program was originally designed to help—received only a fraction of these payments. Instead, the rich corporate farms were getting richer and the price of food continued to rise.

We should not pay farmers for not growing crops any more than we should pay workers for not working. Our high food costs are a direct result of the problem of supply, and I hope that we can draft legislation to provide incentives to spur production rather than to curtail it.

In the interim, I am hopeful that some of the widespread abuses can be eliminated, and this amendment would be an effective tool. Therefore, I urge the strong support of my colleagues in adopting this amendment.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, we must encourage the production of fiber and food rather than discourage production through arbitrary limitations in support programs. Otherwise it is the great cities and the consumers who will suffer. A few short years ago no one would have dreamed that we would today be facing a food shortage. Then our surpluses caused a problem; today we depend on the unparalleled production of American farmers to defend the soundness of the dollar. Our farmers must be encouraged to utilize the most efficient and up to date technology; this requires heavy investment. If farmers are convinced it is not in their interest to make the necessary investments for increased production it will be an extremely serious situation for the American consumer.

Mr. Chairman, the House Agriculture Committee is sitting this very moment, under the able and distinguished leadership of Chairman POAGE of Texas to write a new farm bill. The amendment now before the House has no place in an appropriation bill, but rather should be considered with the legislation now being developed by the Agriculture Committee. This amendment is not in the interest of the consumer or the urban areas or the farmer. I urge that it be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 157, present 1, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 229]

AYES—195

Abzug	Fulton	Pike	Jones, Okla.	Morgan	Smith, N.Y.
Addabbo	Gaydos	Podell	Jones, Tenn.	Myers	Snyder
Annunzio	Gilman	Powell, Ohio	Jordan	Natcher	Spence
Archer	Grasso	Price, Ill.	Kazem	Nichols	Steed
Armstrong	Green, Pa.	Rallsback	Ketchum	O'Brien	Steiger, Ariz.
Aspin	Gross	Randall	Kuykendall	O'Hara	Stephens
Baker	Grover	Rangel	Landgrebe	O'Neill	Stubblefield
Bennett	Gubser	Rees	Leggett	Passman	Stuckey
Biaggi	Gude	Regula	Long, La.	Patman	Symington
Blester	Guyer	Reuss	Lott	Perkins	Talcott
Bingham	Haley	Riegle	McCormack	Pickle	Taylor, Mo.
Boland	Hamilton	Rinaldo	McEwen	Foage	Taylor, N.C.
Brademas	Hanley	Robison, N.Y.	McFall	Preyer	Thornton
Brasco	Hanrahan	Rodino	McKay	Price, Tex.	Tierman
Broomfield	Harrington	Roe	McSpadden	Quillen	Towell, Nev.
Brotzman	Harvey	Rogers	Madigan	Rarick	Ullman
Brown, Mich.	Hastings	Roncallo, N.Y.	Mahon	Rhodes	Veysey
Brown, Ohio	Hechler, W. Va.	Roosey, Pa.	Mann	Roberts	Vigorito
Broyhill, Va.	Heinz	Rosenthal	Melcher	Robinson, Va.	Waggonner
Buchanan	Helstoski	Rostenkowski	Mezvinsky	Rose	Wampler
Burgener	Hillis	Roush	Milford	Roy	White
Burke, Fla.	Hinshaw	Ryan	Mink	Ruth	Whitten
Burke, Mass.	Hogan	St Germain	Mizell	Satterfield	Wilson,
Byron	Holtzman	Sandman	Mollohan	Scherle	Charles, Tex.
Carey, N.Y.	Horton	Sarasin	Montgomery	Sebelius	Wright
Carney, Ohio	Hosmer	Sarbanes	Shapley	Shipley	Young, Ga.
Cederberg	Howard	Saylor	Shoup	Shriver	Young, Tex.
Chamberlain	Hudnut	Schroeder	Skrubitz	Skrubitz	Zablocki
Chisholm	Hunt	Seiberling	Smith, Iowa		
Clancy	Hutchinson	Shuster			
Clark	Johnson, Colo.	Staggers			
Clausen,	Karth	Stanton,			
Don H.	Kastenmeier	J. William			
Clawson, Del.	Keating	Stanton.			
Clay	Kemp	James V.			
Cleveland	King	Steele			
Cohen	Koch	Stokes			
Collier	Kyros	Stratton			
Conte	Latta	Studds			
Corman	Lehman	Sullivan			
Cotter	Lent	Teague, Calif.			
Coughlin	Long, Md.	Thomson, Wis.			
Crane	Lujan	Thone			
Cronin	McClory	Van Deerlin			
Davis, Wis.	McCloskey	Vander Jagt			
Delaney	McCollister	Vanik			
Dellenback	McKinney	Walsh			
Dellums	Madden	Ware			
Dennis	Mallary	Whalen			
Derwinski	Maraziti	Whitehurst			
Devine	Mayne	Widinal			
Dickinson	Mazzoli	Williams			
Dingell	Michel	Wilson, Bob			
Drinan	Miller	Wilson,			
Dulski	Minish	Charles H., Calif.			
du Pont	Mitchell, Md.	Wolff			
Esch	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wyatt			
Eshleman	Moakley	Wylie			
Fascell	Murphy, Ill.	Wymore			
Findley	Nedzi	Yates			
Fish	Nelsen	Yatron			
Ford,	Nix	Young, Alaska			
William D.	Obey	Young, Fla.			
Frelinghuysen	Parris	Young, Ill.			
Frenzel	Patten	Zion			
Frey	Pettis	Zwach			
Froehlich	Peyser				

NOES—157

Abdnor	Camp	Fraser			
Alexander	Carter	Gettys			
Andrews, N.C.	Casey, Tex.	Gibbons			
Andrews, N. Dak.	Chappell	Ginn			
Arends	Collins, Tex.	Goldwater			
Barrett	Daniel, Dan	Gonzalez			
Beard	Davis, Ga.	Goodling			
Bergland	Davis, S.C.	Gray			
Bevill	de la Garza	Green, Oreg.			
Blackburn	Denholm	Griffiths			
Boggs	Diggs	Hammer-			
Boiling	Donohue	schmidt			
Bowen	Dorn	Hanna			
Bray	Downing	Hansen, Idaho			
Breaux	Duncan	Hansen, Wash.			
Brinkley	Eckhardt	Henderson			
Brooks	Elberg	Hicks			
Brown, Calif.	Evans, Colo.	Holifield			
Broyhill, N.C.	Evins, Tenn.	Holt			
Burleson, Tex.	Flood	Hungate			
Burlison, Mo.	Foley	Jarman			
Burton	Ford, Gerald R.	Johnson, Calif.			
Butler	Jones, Ala.	Jones, N.C.			
	Fountain				

Jones, Okla.	Morgan	Smith, N.Y.
Jones, Tenn.	Myers	Snyder
Jordan	Natcher	Spence
Kazem	Nichols	Steed
Ketchum	O'Brien	Steiger, Ariz.
Kuykendall	O'Hara	Stephens
Landgrebe	O'Neill	Stubblefield
Leggett	Passman	Stuckey
Long, La.	Patman	Symington
Lott	Perkins	Talcott
McCormack	Pickle	Taylor, Mo.
McEwen	Foage	Taylor, N.C.
McFall	Preyer	Thornton
McKay	Price, Tex.	Tierman
McSpadden	Quillen	Towell, Nev.
Madigan	Rarick	Ullman
Mahon	Rhodes	Veysey
Mann	Roberts	Vigorito
Melcher	Satterfield	Waggonner
Meeds	Scherle	Wampler
Mezvinsky	Sebelius	Young, N.Y.
Milford	Shipley	Young, Ga.
Mink	Shoup	Young, Tex.
Mizell	Shriver	Zablocki
Mollohan	Skubitz	
Montgomery	Smith, Iowa	

PRESENT—1

Daniel, Robert
W., Jr.

NOT VOTING—80

Adams	Fuqua	Pepper
Anderson,	Giamo	Pritchard
Calif.	Gunter	Quie
Anderson, Ill.	Harsha	Reid
Ashbrook	Hawkins	Roncalio, Wyo.
Ashley	Hays	Rooney, N.Y.
Badillo	Hébert	Rousselot
Bafalis	Heckler, Mass.	Royal
Bell	Huber	Runnels
Blatnik	Ichord	Ruppe
Breckinridge	Burke, Calif.	Schneebeli
Burke, Calif.	Collins, Ill.	Kluczynski
Conable	Conlan	Sikes
Conable	Clyde	Landrum
Conyers	Litton	Sisk
Culver	Macdonald	Slack
Daniels,	Mathis, Ga.	Steelman
Dominick V.	Metcalfe	Symms
Danielson	Mills, Ark.	Teague, Tex.
Dent	Minshall, Ohio	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, Ala.	Moorhead,	Treen
Edwards, Calif.	Calif.	Udall
Erlenborn	Moorhead, Pa.	Waldie
Fisher	Mosher	Wiggins
Flowers	Moss	Winn
Flynt	Murphy, N.Y.	Wyder
Forsythe	Owens	Young, S.C.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

For necessary expenses for the Foreign Agricultural Service, including carrying out title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1761-1768), market development activities abroad, and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including not to exceed \$35,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1768), \$25,805,000: *Provided*, That not less than \$255,000 of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be available to obtain statistics and related facts on foreign production and full and complete information on methods used by other countries to move farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis:

Provided further, That, in addition, not to exceed \$3,117,000 of the funds appropriated by section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c), shall be merged with this appropriation and shall be available for all expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VAN DEERLIN

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN DEERLIN: On page 18, line 2, immediately before the end thereof insert the following: "Provided further, That no funds contained in this appropriation shall be available for the promotion or advertising of tobacco or any tobacco products in foreign nations."

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I think we have moved along faster than anyone dared hope this afternoon. I aim to be on my way to another coast before the day is out, and will take only 5 minutes for a little seminar in advertising. I should like to share with you some advertising which is used overseas.

The poster I hold is used in Austria. Its theme fills magazine, newspaper, and billboard space on behalf of a cigarette called Smart.

If you do not like this one, perhaps you would prefer the sexy kind of advertising which turns up in Thailand. It is the more familiar boy-meets-girl copy theme, and contains the suggestion that a cigarette will surely help stimulate romance.

I do not know about its effectiveness. And let me say at the outset I am not a moralist on this issue. I do not smoke, myself, but I have to buy cigarettes for Mrs. Van Deerlin now and then.

The advertising you have seen is for cigarettes with names like Memphis, Smart, Falling Rain, and Maharaj. These are not exactly familiar brands to you. They are made with American tobacco by foreign tobacco monopolies. The advertising you have seen may resemble our cigarette advertising. But it is very different in one respect—it is paid for by the American taxpayer.

A sum of \$140,000 in the bill we are considering this afternoon is to underwrite the expense of this advertising in Austria and Thailand. The tobacco we send to Thailand happens to be of a higher nicotine content than the domestic leaf over there, and this has caused some concern to the Government of Thailand. But nicotine content aside, it seems to me to be basically hypocritical for the same Congress which voted to take cigarette advertising off radio and television here at home, and insist upon a package label that warns young Americans about the health hazards of smoking—it is hypocritical, I believe, for this same Congress to underwrite a program of encouraging young Thais and young Austrians to take up the habit. We were underwriting the same program in Iceland and Japan until quite recently.

I will say the Agricultural Marketing Service reduced its spending for this from \$162,000 in the last year to \$140,000. But I find it incomprehensible that we should spend one penny for encouraging foreign children to smoke.

Let us end this hypocrisy now.

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

Mr. Chairman, the motion the gentleman offers would do a great disservice to over 600,000 farm families in our country, even though the amount of money involved is not large in comparison with some of the sums cited daily in this chamber.

Twenty percent of our Nation's farm families are involved in tobacco production and all would in some degree be adversely affected by an amendment which strikes another blow against a commodity which is entirely legal in our country and everywhere else in the world.

I ask the gentleman to recall that the smoking and health controversy is just that—a controversy. A lot of words have been spoken on the subject, and the rhetoric has at times been sharp, especially in the Senate. However, the so-called health problem should not be a matter of consideration in connection with our export and sales programs, whether the commodity is tobacco or something else.

Since colonial days our country has been exporting tobacco. Tobacco was in fact the first export sent back from Jamestown to the Old World. From that day to this, tobacco has been a vitally important contributor to our trade balance. Last year we sold abroad \$878.7 million worth of tobacco.

At a time when it looks as if the only area in which America can be truly competitive is agriculture, it strikes me as just plain foolish, to hurl a symbolic blow, at our overseas tobacco sales promotion efforts, particularly when it now involves only Austria and Thailand. We have done such a good job in selling tobacco in other countries that most of them now buying our tobacco in meaningful quantities, can and do finance their own promotion program.

Germany and Japan are good examples of our tobacco export sales. Last year Western Germany bought more than \$100 million worth of our tobacco. Japan bought \$87.3 million.

Remember, too, that over 700 million pounds of tobacco remains under the Government loan program. This administration increased our tobacco production by 10 percent. I personally think this increase was unwise, but the decision was made. The amendment of the distinguished gentleman from California, knocking out the sum of \$140,000 for sales promotion matching funds in Austria and Thailand, if adopted, would be compounding the farmers' problem and diminishing the effectiveness of our tobacco export program. It would be foolish to lose even one opportunity to keep this tobacco moving into world commercial channels. If we do not sell Thailand and Austria American tobacco, plenty of other tobacco-producing nations will be all too ready to step in and take over in our place.

Our Nation now has a serious balance-of-payments problem, a problem which is highly visible in the world economic spotlight. We just must turn this problem around and get our economy back on an even keel. Consequently, we simply

cannot afford to overlook any opportunity to encourage trade abroad. And when we have a surplus of any legitimate and desirable commodity available for sale—too much for domestic consumption—we should leave no stone unturned in trying to sell it. Tobacco is just such a product and if a small sum is needed to help promote its sale, the Congress should not balk at providing the money to promote it, especially when the result is to our gain and not at our loss.

In a recent statement in the RECORD, the mover of this amendment used the word "hypocrisy" in describing American policy which led to this important marketing program in Austria and Thailand. However, I fail to see hypocrisy in our efforts to sell our products abroad, especially when it helps the entire Nation, particularly in terms of our balance of payments and deficit trade problems. As I have already attempted to say, tobacco products are legally grown, controlled and marketed in our country and everywhere else. Where is the hypocrisy in a legitimate effort to sell a legal product which has been traded in international commerce for hundreds of years, and will, I predict, be so traded for many hundreds more.

Labeling requirements in our country are not germane to consideration of this program. May I remind the gentleman that the Congress itself expressly exempted the application of domestic labeling requirements to tobacco which moves into foreign commerce.

This was a wise move by the Congress, because it would be highly presumptuous for our Government to attempt to tell other sovereign nations how to handle tobacco within their own borders. That decision is their business.

One more thing: Last year tobacco excise taxes within our own borders brought in tax revenues of more than \$5.3 billion to all levels of government. Let me emphasize that income taxes, sales taxes, and other forms of taxation involving tobacco are not included in that \$5.3 billion figure. When you stack that figure against the infinitesimally small cost of all of our tobacco programs, including this nominal overseas sales promotion effort, the comparison is quite instructive.

Our total tobacco program is cheap by comparison. This fact should also be remembered today as we consider this amendment.

I see no benefit, but only harm, in striking down this inexpensive tobacco marketing program. Therefore, I urge the defeat of the amendment of the gentleman from California.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment by the gentleman from California. I am sure the Members of this House are aware that I do not make too many speeches, but this is a matter of principle which concerns me a great deal.

First, I would like to put in perspective the total picture as it relates to our tobacco exports.

The gentleman from California is talking about \$140,000 included in the

appropriations bill under consideration for the overseas promotion of tobacco and tobacco products. Need I remind the Members that this is some \$22,000 less than utilized last year. Now, \$140,000 to be used in promoting one of our most important agricultural exports which last year, including leaf tobacco and manufactured products, totaled approximately \$1 billion toward the contribution of a favorable balance of trade. A few examples of the increase in our tobacco exports, I think, are in order. An example—during the years of 1964-68, to the Japanese nation alone we averaged an annual \$37.9 million at a sale price of approximately 80 cents per pound; while in 1972 this \$37 million had increased to 87.3 million pounds at a sale price of almost a dollar per pound. And it is estimated that the exports to Japan in the year 1973 will reach or surpass \$100 million. One of the nations involved in the gentleman's amendment—Thailand—the figures show that during the average years of 1964-68, we exported annually 18.5 million pounds per year, while in 1972 this had increased to 30½ million pounds. I will not attempt here this afternoon to argue the merits of the hazards of smoking for a definite conclusion to this date has not been made. I could cite statistics where nations having a larger per capita use of tobacco have a lesser ratio of lung cancer than other nations with a much smaller per capita use.

I think it is entirely in order that this Government spend a few dollars not only for tobacco but other important agricultural commodities to enhance the demand and, more important, to restore a favorable balance of trade for this Nation. I think the sum of \$140,000 is infinitesimal when we consider in this Nation alone tobacco produces in excess of \$5 billion a year in taxes at all levels.

I hope this committee will abide by the wisdom of the Appropriations Committee in retaining this minute sum of money to continue to aid the American farmer and the Nation itself as it relates to demands for our agricultural commodities. I would remind the gentleman from California and those who are supporting his amendment that if the nations in question do not buy American-produced tobacco then certainly, with the demand of their country, they will find it elsewhere. If indeed we were the only supplier, the promotional sales would not even be necessary. I hope the committee will join with me in voting down this amendment.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the appropriate number of words.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, as we well know, the Foreign Agricultural Service makes every effort to help dispose not only of surplus commodities but commodities produced by the American farmer. As my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from California, pointed out under his amendment, Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$140,000 out of the total amount of \$25,805,000 is to be expended in Thailand, in West Germany, and in Austria, to help promote the sale of American tobacco.

Let me point out, Mr. Chairman, the

procedure that must be followed before the Agricultural Service gets into this kind of a promotion. The country involved asks the Department of Agriculture to come in to promote the sale of a commodity. That must take place, Mr. Chairman. That is what happened in Austria; that is what happened in West Germany; and that is what happened in Thailand. The three countries asked the Department of Agriculture to come in and promote the sale of American tobacco because they wanted to buy it. There was not a move made by the Department of Agriculture in these three countries, in Japan, or any other country to sell American tobacco or any other commodity, until the country involved requested that this be done.

After the request was made, Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$140,000 is to be spent for the sale of about \$233 million worth of tobacco.

Mr. Chairman, digressing just a little bit—one of the finest speeches I have ever heard since I have been a Member of Congress was made in the well of this House by our former Speaker, my friend, the Honorable John W. McCormack, when he went to the well of the House and said this in substance: They do not produce wheat in Boston; they do not produce sugar cane in Boston; they do not produce sugar beets in Boston; and they do not produce soybeans. I want the Members of this Congress to know that what is good for California is good for Boston, Mass. He further said that he lived in the United States and believed that if Kentucky was in trouble Boston and the State of Massachusetts should join with the other States and help Kentucky. The same he said would apply to Florida, New York, Texas, California, Maine, and Utah. He closed by saying that never would he join with one section of our country to destroy or fight one agricultural commodity against another. I agreed with my friend John W. McCormack and this is my position today.

Let me say to my distinguished friend from California the author of the amendment that about 3 years ago the junior Senator in the other body from the great State of California, together with a number of the Members from California came before our subcommittee and talked to us about their need for help with figs and nuts. The situation was serious, and Mr. Chairman, certainly we helped them and this House approved of our action. I say to my friend from California I will do the same tomorrow or next year because I am interested in California and if California is in trouble I am concerned and want to help.

We do not produce any sugar cane or sugar beets in my district, we do not produce any cotton in Kentucky, but that does not mean that I intend to cast the vote of my people against these commodities.

Mr. Chairman, in this particular instance we are talking about the fifth largest income producing commodity in the United States, which is produced by 700,000 farm families in 21 States. A commodity that pays into the Federal Treasury and into the treasuries of

cities and counties about \$4 billion in taxes.

Tobacco has not cost the Department of Agriculture any money.

We need the help of the Members on this amendment. I say to my distinguished friend from the State of California, when he comes to this floor and says to the Members of the Congress that they have a commodity produced in California which is not produced in the second District of Kentucky, that needs help and is in trouble I intend to march with him. I intend to help his people and to help him.

Mr. Chairman I hope this amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VAN DEERLIN) there were—ayes 53, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ABZUG

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment Offered by Ms. ABZUG: Page 17, lines 11-12, strike out "market development activities abroad."

Page 17, line 17, strike out "\$25,805,000: Provided," and insert in lieu thereof "\$13,805,000: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used, directly or indirectly, to promote the sale outside the United States of domestically produced agricultural commodities: Provided further."

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, in his address to the Nation 2 nights ago, President Nixon stated that:

In allocating the products of America's farms between markets abroad and those in the United States, we must put the American consumer first.

I agree with that statement. My amendment would take a step toward making it a reality. The bill before you contains \$12 million for the promotion abroad of the sale of domestic agricultural commodities. Most of that money is not even being spent directly by the Foreign Agricultural Service for such promotion, but is being given by the FAS to private traders and trade associations for the promotion of their goods.

In these days of rapidly rising food prices and food shortages, it is very difficult to understand why the American taxpayer—who is also the American consumer—is being asked to provide \$12 million annually to subsidize such promotion and then to pay again for them in higher prices caused by the resulting decrease in supply.

I am not opposed to trade with other nations and I am not opposed to promoting agricultural products or farm products or commodities, but I am concerned that overseas sales may provide private trade associations with opportunities to manipulate prices and supplies to the detriment of American consumers.

The Special Studies Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, of which I am a member, has recently concluded hearings into the promotional activities of the FAS. While there was no direct testimony as to whether the FAS

helped to promote the recent Russian wheat sale. Department of Agriculture witnesses did admit that the Department did not even consider the possible adverse effects of the sale on domestic prices and supplies. FAS officials also admitted that other wheat sales in whose promotion the FAS participated—most notably one to Japan—had a markedly adverse effect on consumer prices here at home.

In 1972, we exported over \$9 billion worth of agricultural commodities, while importing only about \$3 billion worth. If our agricultural exports are doing so well, there should be no need to treat agricultural interests unlike other business enterprises. But the most important point is that trade associations which are presently receiving subsidies for promotional activities should bear the full cost of these promotions.

This promotion has come out of the taxpayers' pockets in two places, in taxes and then in higher consumer prices. I think that the promotional activities by the trade associations should be subject to the same marketplace demands as other businesses and ought not to receive preferential treatment from the Government at the expense of the taxpayers.

I have no quarrel with such other FAS activities as its worldwide agricultural intelligence and reporting and data services and its coordination of Department of Agriculture activities in the foreign field, and my amendment would not affect those items.

This amendment in no way limits the export of agricultural commodities. All that it does is stop the use of the consumers' tax money to promote sales by private traders to the detriment of food prices here at home.

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

Mr. Chairman, I can fully appreciate the intent of the gentlewoman from New York. I certainly believe that we should do everything we can to protect and to help the domestic consumer. The place where I differ is that this amendment, in my opinion, would have completely the opposite effect.

Farm income is volume times price less cost; a very simple formula. If we cut out the exports, or cut out the effort to make exports, by so doing we would cut down not only production in the United States but also the number of farmers producing food, because more and more people would quit farming.

Over the past 10 or 12 years we have had some 400,000 or 500,000 people leave the farm each year. More and more of them will be leaving if we reduce exports, because by reducing exports we lessen volume, and a lesser volume multiplied by the price less cost will mean less income.

Farm income now has gone down, so that, compared to about 20 years ago, when it was 7 percent of the total income dollar, it is now down to 3 percent.

Farm return on the farm investment is down to 3.6 percent.

Let us not forget, we are dependent upon agriculture. The first thing we have to do for the consumer is to produce something for him to consume.

That is one side of it. Let us also look

at it from a national standpoint. Our balance-of-payments deficit in 1972 was \$13.8 billion. The biggest return we have, trying to keep pace with the rest of the world, is from agricultural exports which will be over \$11 billion in fiscal year 1973. While this is not the sole way in which we provide exports, it is one of the prime ways by which we try to maintain a favorable balance of payments.

Exports are essential to American domestic production because the American farmer has to make enough money to stay in business. If we did not have an export market we would all be hungry in 60 days, in my opinion.

While the intention of the amendment is good, the effect would be just the opposite.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. ABZUG. I want to make it clear that I do not disagree with a great deal of what the gentleman has said, but it has been my experience on the Government Operations Committee that there has been something very considerably wrong about the kind of promotion which has been taking place, with the aid of our money from the Federal agricultural services.

The private trade associations, that have inside information, the people like Mr. Palmby, who was with the Department of Agriculture and then with the Continental Grain Co., and before that with one of these trade associations, was in an interesting position to manipulate the wheat deal. They bought up the wheat from the poor farmers, and sold it at a tremendous profit to the Soviet Union. They were responsible for driving some very small farmers out of business, plus raising the price of wheat and meat for the American consumer.

I am merely saying that that kind of promotional activity is not a fit thing for the Government to be associated with. That kind of promotion and manipulation should come from the traders and trade associations in that business, and we should regulate them more.

They in fact are responsible for hurting the small farmers. I feel very strongly in favor of the rights of the small farmers. They have suffered. I am not suggesting by any means that this would in any way injure them.

I do not see why we should ask our taxpayers and our Government, through the Foreign Agriculture Service, to contribute money for deals that may ultimately sully them. The people with the big agricultural businesses, the operators, have enough money to promote what is necessary. I believe it is wrong to ask for this kind of an appropriation for them.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WHITTEN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish to say again that I appreciate the feelings of the gentlewoman from New York. I would point out that Mr. Palmby is no longer with the Department, and was not with the Department when this happened.

Ms. ABZUG. That is right. He was with the Continental Grain Co.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not know whether the gentlewoman heard my statement that I am in accord with the Russian wheat deal for a different reason. I do not know about the situation to which she refers, but I do know from testimony they sold about \$1.1 billion worth of grain to Russia.

Russia agreed to take \$200 million worth the first year, but the Department forgot to stipulate the total purchase should be spread over 3 years. I think that did a whole lot of damage to us, because they got the world's only supply of surplus food when we should have kept some of it for our own needs.

Mr. Chairman, I agree that mistakes have been made, but we should not cut our nose off to spite our face. If we are going to have continuing consumption by the domestic consumer, we have got to keep the people growing commodities, and in order to keep them doing that, we have got to continue the export of farm commodities.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) has good intentions in offering the amendment, but however good the intentions, the amendment should be defeated. I urge the House to vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language found in line 13, through line 22, on page 20, on the basis that it is legislation in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) makes a point of order against the language found on page 20, line 13 through line 22.

Does the gentleman from Ohio wish to be heard?

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It clearly says, "The following corporations," meaning the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation, "are authorized to make expenditures."

This is the work of the legislative committee, and I contend that this is legislation on an appropriation bill and that this ought to be handled by the Legislative Committee rather than made a part of the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), desire to be heard?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make the point that the point of order should not lie. We have language in the original act to make this authorization, and by reason of repeating it in this act, that does not change the basic law. It is already authorized.

In this situation the committee is setting a ceiling rather than creating an authority. While we use the same words and repeat the same words, the committee has, in effect, set a ceiling, so I submit that it is not subject to a point of order, because it merely repeats the law which is already authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK), wish to be heard further?

Mr. VANIK. No, Mr. Chairman. I will await the ruling of the Chair on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WRIGHT). The Chair has gone to the original source—the Government Corporation Control Act—to which reference is made on page 20 in this appropriation bill.

The Chair discovers that the budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress under this act shall be considered and legislation shall be enacted making necessary appropriations as may be authorized by law for expenditures of such corporations.

Clearly there is no question as to the right of the Congress to include in this annual appropriation bill funds for these Government corporations, several of which are included in the bill.

It appears to the Chair that this is descriptive or introductory language only and that the language does not constitute change in existing law. Therefore it is in order, and for those reasons the Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION
REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

To reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained in prior years, but not previously reimbursed, pursuant to the Act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a-11, 713a-12), \$3,301,940,000: *Provided*, That no funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to formulate or administer programs for the sale of agricultural commodities pursuant to title I of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, to any nation which sells or furnishes or which permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to North Vietnam any equipment, materials, or commodities, so long as North Vietnam is governed by a Communist regime.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VANIK

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VANIK: Page 21, line 9, strike out "\$3,301,940,000" and insert "\$2,301,940,000".

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes from the Commodity Credit Corporation \$1 billion of the appropriation which is sought by this appropriation bill.

I base this amendment on the fact that all of the information I have and all that I can glean from the report seems to indicate that the appropriation requested would be more than adequate to take

care of the needs of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I think an appropriation like this must be justified. I think this is one of the areas where this Congress can exercise some kind of control over the uncontrollable.

We have created over the years a whole maze of corporations in the Federal bureaucracy that operate within and without the Federal debt obligations of this country and which can commit the taxpayers of America at will. Faceless bureaucrats can decide how much to give, to loan, or to spend, and we fight desperately trying to control expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, I contend that every dollar, every dollar sought to support this replenishment of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be justified. We should allow enough but no more. I contend from what I have been able to determine from this bill the case has not been made for \$3,301,940,000. I take this time to find out if those on the committee who have dealt more intimately with this issue can advise me and advise you, the other members of this committee, as to what justification they can give for this tremendous appropriation to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I will be very happy to yield to the chairman of the committee to find out what justification he can submit.

Mr. MICHEL. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. Let me say to the gentleman to try to attempt a \$1 billion cut here is the phoniest thing you can possibly do and actually goes against the very purpose which I think the gentleman in the well would like to have this House accomplish.

There were times a few years ago when we were so far in arrears in restoring the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation that we were going back 6 or 7 years trying to determine what some of these commodity programs were costing us.

Only because Senator Holland in the other body and this Member insisted over the last 3 or 4 years that we completely restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation each year have we been able to tell Members of this House specifically what these commodity programs have cost us in the year immediately preceding.

Mr. VANIK. That is too late.

Mr. MICHEL. The money has already been spent and the gentleman will not have done a doggone thing with his amendment.

Mr. VANIK. How much more does this appropriation provide over and above the amount required? That has not been explained anywhere in the report, by the committee, or on the floor.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman does not understand the operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. VANIK. I certainly do.

Mr. MICHEL. In this particular instance—

Mr. VANIK. I have served on the legislative committee dealing with the corporation.

Mr. MICHEL. We are paying after the fact, it is not a question of paying up this year to be able to have the Commodity Credit Corporation programs operate next year.

Mr. VANIK. The language of the committee report says that this will provide more than a sufficient leeway. That is the committee language. How much more?

Mr. MICHEL. If the gentleman from Ohio wants to attack this, then this is not the place to do it.

Mr. VANIK. This is the place to do it. Mr. MICHEL. They were capitalized at \$14.5 billion—and I will stand corrected, and the Clerk has just nodded in the affirmative. If the gentleman from Ohio really wants to attack this—

Mr. VANIK. How much surplus is there provided in this appropriation?

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that all of us in the Congress, including myself, do not have the time to read all of the hearings. We printed nine volumes of hearings on the bill this year. Many of us just do not have time to read all of the hearings. But I would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that when the gentleman does have enough time that he should read volume 9. It brings forward the hearings from 1956 to 1957, which discussed the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Commodity Credit Corporation originally was organized under the laws of Delaware, and then it was reorganized later on by an act of Congress. That Corporation was authorized to incur an indebtedness of \$14.5 billion to carry out its functions.

Among other things, it provides money for certain food programs that go to our various schools, price support programs, and so forth. But the Corporation has certain obligations fixed by law that it has to do. It buys commodities at prices by and large which enables farmers to keep producing them, and then it sells or trades these for what the traffic will bear. It has a borrowing authority of up to \$14.5 billion, as I say.

If and when it uses up that money we have two things we can do. We can get money from the sale of commodities which it has, and we can get it by increasing their borrowing authority from \$14.5 billion to an even higher figure, or we can restore their imbalance so that the corporation will stay solvent. So, were we in effect to reduce this appropriation by \$1 billion then they would have that much less to meet the obligations they have to meet that are fixed by law. And, mind you, I think that would be a very unwise thing to do indeed.

As I say, this is a very complex matter. Just as I do not profess to understand the whole of the tax bill—and I might add that I served on the Committee on Taxation in my State legislature years ago. But in this area of CCC financing it is even far more difficult to understand. It is very complex, and this is

one of the areas where one would have to work with it for years to fully comprehend all the ramifications.

As I say, the Corporation has certain obligations incurred. It is impossible to accurately predict what the Corporation will incur in a particular year. For instance, we have had water standing on the ground in my area for a long time. So I would say to the gentleman from Ohio that his amendment would weaken the Corporation in its ability to carry out the responsibilities which are required of it by law. I plead from the bottom of my heart that we not do that, and I am sure that that is something that my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, would not wish to happen.

Mr. VANIK. If the gentleman will yield, even with all of this colloquy I fail to find out what the specific needs of this particular Corporation to provide the Corporation with precisely what it needs to pay its obligations. What is the amount? What do we need in the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay off their debt obligations that have been accumulated?

What is the exact amount? It is certainly something different than \$3,301,940,000. They must have a little gravy in there. I want to know how much there is beyond need.

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me say to the gentleman from Ohio that the gentleman may make all the points he wishes to, but it ends up with this, that the Corporation has an obligation fixed by law, and nobody knows what the obligations will be until they are incurred. Once they are incurred, then they can tell us what they need for restoration.

Mr. VANIK. But this bill says net realized losses sustained in prior years but not previously reimbursed. What is the exact amount needed to do that?

Mr. WHITTEN. \$3,457,409,000.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I think the easiest way to explain this is to say this is appropriating after the fact. This is really what it says. It is restoring the capital impairment. It is restoring the money that the Commodity Credit Corporation has spent in the last year or two because programs have been mandated to it by the Congress, and unless we put this money back, we run a bigger and bigger deficit, and we get, as our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois points out, less able to determine just what the program has been doing recently. This is why the decision was made to bring it up to date.

Mr. VANIK. Can the gentleman tell me what the amount of the leeway is in this appropriation?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. The leeway is absolutely not there. The amount that we put in was the amount we felt was spent during the last year, so we reinstitute and update not a surplus, but just up to the level of \$14.5 billion that is supposed to be in there. As I recall it, this was our best estimation of what had been spent during the past year. It is appropriation after the fact of what has been spent.

Mr. VANIK. Will the gentleman tell me whether there is any money in the Commodity Credit Corporation appro-

priation for export subsidies paid under the Commodity Export Payment Program? Do they come out of the corporation?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Yes, there is. Actually this is part of what is being reinstated, but this money was spent under the law the Congress had passed some time before, and we had to restore the money that was spent under that program.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we tried to point out that this represents what we have tried in some cases to support—domestic prices received, making them somewhat comparable to labor and industry. Then when we sell in world markets, we sell at world prices, and this figure represents the difference between the two prices. What we will do next year is anybody's guess. With all of that, I repeat again the farmer's net return is 3.6 percent of his investment.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, this is the information I was endeavoring to elicit during general debate. Since I could not get it, I decided I had better proceed with the amendment process in an endeavor to get the facts.

Mr. WHITTEN. I hope the gentleman is satisfied with the explanation.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I think it is worthwhile also to point out that if it had not been for the Russian wheat sale that has been mentioned so often, the amount of money needed to restore the capital impairment might well have been, it is estimated, \$900 million to \$1 billion more, because the Commodity Credit Corporation has not been obligated to pay as much as it would have if we had not made the sale. We made a profit from a number of Commodity Credit Corporation stored commodities as a result of that sale, so the sale resulted in a net saving to the Government.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VANIK

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VANIK: Page 21, line 17, insert the following sentence: "No funds appropriated by this act shall be used to repay the Commodity Credit Corporation for export subsidies paid under the Commodity Export Payment program."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment provides a limitation clearly.

What I seek to do here is simply to limit an appropriation under this act. I was just told by the ranking Republican member on the committee that export subsidies are paid out of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This language is an effort to restrict payment of export subsidies out of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Frankly I feel it is a great bur-

den on the taxpayers of America to pay export subsidies, to sell American agricultural products abroad when the result is to reduce the supplies in this country below the adequate need and when the result is to increase the consumers' prices throughout the United States. I think export programs are fine and they are in order, but I think when they cause these two things, when they increase the domestic prices and when they reduce the domestic supplies below a peril point, I think it is cruel and unwise to use the taxpayers' money to subsidize the exports which have this dual effect of increasing consumer prices and reducing supplies that are needed at home.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a continuation of the discussion we had with the gentlewoman from New York who offered an amendment on a more restricted basis but directed to the same thing.

Years ago we created the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of trying to keep some balance for the farmer in this Nation where we have the minimum wage and the right of labor to organize and to strike and where industry can have a markup over its cost. It was thought after the great depression that we had to have something in the law to protect the purchasing power of those who engaged in agriculture. The Commodity Credit Corporation had the duty—and not the right but the duty—to go in and support prices at certain levels and buy up surpluses and try to maintain the purchasing power of those engaged in agriculture.

When the Corporation buys up supplies in our country so as to keep a somewhat fair comparison between industry and agriculture, the only way we can move the exports is to sell them for what the world will pay. There is a price difference. The Commodity Credit Corporation picks up the tab for the differential.

I say we cannot sell abroad unless we sell at world prices. We cannot produce in the United States where we get more per hour than is paid per day in Mexico except through some means such as this.

I say this: However good the intentions are here, to cripple the organization or the Corporation which keeps that balance which is so essential to our overall well being, to cripple that Corporation at this point will be the most serious thing I can think of.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest the amendment be defeated.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the situation, the funds in this bill which go to the Commodity Credit Corporation are to reimburse CCC for obligations already incurred. Is that not correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. They are, and perhaps I did not carry my point as far as I should. If we do not restore these funds and we have surplus crops, the Corporation might get caught short and not be able to do what the law says it must do.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL GRANTS

For grants pursuant to sections 306(a) (2) and 306(a) (6) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1926), \$150,000,000 to remain available until expended, pursuant to section 306 (d) of the above Act, of which \$120,000,000 shall be derived from the unexpended balance of amounts appropriated under this head in the fiscal year 1973, largely to meet the expanding need for areas not now covered.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL: On page 26, strike out lines 16 through 22 and on page 27 strike out lines 1 and 2.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is my purpose here to knock out the \$150 million item which appears in here for rural water and sewer grants.

Some Members of this body wanted to force the Department of Agriculture to reinstate the rural water and sewer grant program in the Farmers Home Administration. The Members will recall that legislation was passed to that effect, and the President vetoed it. Members will further recall that those who favored restoring the grants then were unable to muster enough votes on an override, but suddenly the measure is with us again, this time through the back door in this Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

The facts are really unchanged. The grant program was one of several lower priority programs eliminated by the administration to avoid illegally exceeding the budget ceiling which also was set by the Congress.

No one suffered from the fact that the grant program was taken from the Department of Agriculture. Under the Clean Water Act, communities are eligible for grants up to 75 percent of the construction cost of water and sewer systems. Under the Farmers Home Administration program, they can obtain only 50 percent. Rural communities in my district are not so stupid but that they would rather have 75 percent than 50 percent grants any day.

The Environmental Protection Agency also is authorized to deliver block grants to the States. This allows local people to set their own order of priorities and to work which best fits local needs and conditions.

Revenue sharing is another source of Federal funds for communities which decide to go this way.

And Farmers Home Administration will continue to have a loan program for those communities unable to obtain necessary financing to repair or develop urgently needed facilities.

I think the recent record for the sewer and water loans made by the Farmers Home Administration was:

In 1969, there were \$164 million plus. In 1971, it was \$261 million plus. In 1972, it is practically \$300 million.

In 1973, it is \$400 million and the administration has requested an increase of \$100 million over that in the coming year.

A grant program which taxes the Nation in order to reduce the sewer and water bills for a few, it seems to me, is unjustified. The presence of another Federal water and sewer grant program may delay the construction of these facilities when localities, which otherwise would finance the cost of their own, choose instead to wait in line for a Federal grant.

In our report, on page 46, we make mention of the fact that there was only some \$30 million actually released from earlier appropriations of \$150 million, so there really is a carryover of \$120 million, or a reappropriation of that amount, together with the \$30 million, making \$150 million. It just seems to me that here is an opportunity for us to vote for a significant reduction in this bill of \$150 million and really not do violence to the water and sewer programs out in the rural areas, where adequate loan funding from other sources is available.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of anyone in the Congress I have enjoyed working with more than my colleague from Illinois. In my early years, when I was 21, I went through his area, to attend a Democratic Convention. It is one of the finest areas in the world. I enjoyed spending the night there. I realize how he could not understand what is needed in so much of the United States. They have so much abundance in his area, natural resources, fine soil, and all those things.

But there are many, many areas of this country where unless the people can get water systems and sewerage treatment systems they will have to move away and crowd our cities even more.

I have this problem in some of my area. It is not Appalachia, but some of it is on the tailend of Appalachia. We have lost some 8,000 or 10,000 people from agriculture there in the last 10 years, but we have not lost the people.

Most of these rural water systems, which require grants with which to build them, are needed. The reason for the grants is that those people live scattered all over the countryside, and these water and sewerage systems run along the highways. When they build these water systems along the highways, there are very few houses there, and they almost have to have a grant to get them built. The minute they get water and sewer systems, all of the houses then are built along the highway, and very soon it is a going proposition.

Under existing law, if you delete the funds in this bill, the Environmental Protection Agency has the authority to make grants to this kind of area, but has to make them through the Governor's office. One out of a hundred will get a grant, and the other 99 will not.

This is in the area of the Farmers Home Administration, which brings it

back home. If there is anything in this bill that will pay dividends 2, 3, or 4 years from now, it is this program.

When the grant program was ended, impounded, or reserved, or whatever anyone wants to say about it, by the administration, the expansion dropped off just like that.

I have not had any way to check the figures as to those moving to town, but I know it must have speeded up, when the administration stopped the program.

I believe that our friend has done many fine things to improve the provisions of the bill, but he has acted wrong in offering this amendment, and I hope the Members will vote the amendment down.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The amendment is saying that if we do not appropriate the money in this bill and meet the rural areas' problem they will be met by HUD money. The administration cut that back also, and if they have to divide the funds they will have less for the big cities also.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

I want to give an example of what can happen. There is a small community in my district called Menlo, with a population of about 350 people. They put in an application for a water and sewer grant. They were told it should be under revenue sharing, and that this is the way to approach it. The community was entitled to \$1,200 a year under revenue sharing. The total cost of the project naturally exceeded this amount and if my people were to benefit under the guise of revenue sharing they would have to live approximately 434 years to obtain sufficient money to complete the project.

We always pride ourselves on longevity in Iowa, but I do not believe that anyone there will live that long.

I am saying, simply, that for the small communities we have to do it this way, because they are excluded under the EPA formula. Certainly the Governor of any party, politically motivated, is not going to pay much attention to a small community of 350 people.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope we vote the amendment down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the penultimate word.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we should worry too much here today about the amount of this bill. Only yesterday, the House with the greatest of ease and glee, passed the Arts and Humanities bill which was nearly double the spending for the previous year, and that had the blessing of the Nixon administration. Why not double this bill?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that would be far too much.

Mr. GROSS. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. I said that I believe that would be far too much.

Mr. GROSS. If the House was so fiscally irresponsible as to double that bill yesterday why not double another?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. It all depends on how much money we are talking about. I supported the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) yesterday, and voted against my administration. I thought it was a bad choice by the administration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I can only wonder why there are not more Members with amendments to increase this bill in view of what happened yesterday. And before they get through with the other body and the "humanities bill," perhaps they will be inspired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RURAL HOUSING FOR DOMESTIC FARM LABOR

For financial assistance to public non-profit organizations for housing for domestic farm labor, pursuant to section 516 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1486), \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation is not available after September 30, 1973, unless the authorizing legislation is extended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHMAN: On page 27, line 7, strike "\$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000".

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, back in the 1930's I was a collector for a finance company, and I collected a lot of bills. I went out and visited the places where these people lived, and I saw how they lived.

Recently I went back down to my same area to investigate the typhoid epidemic, and these people were living in the same kind of squalor—and that is the only word you can use to describe it, "squalor"—as they have lived in for years. This type of living conditions is the only kind available for people who engage in migratory agricultural labor. As far as I was concerned, the typhoid epidemic did not constitute the main problem; it was strictly the housing problem. They had homes that were only shacks; many of the people in that area sleep in automobiles.

Mr. Chairman, the question of public health deals with people who are involved with the picking of the vegetables and the food that we eat, and I think public health is an essential expenditure for this country to be involved in.

Mr. Chairman, I could not in good conscience approve of the sum of only \$5 million for this particular portion of this bill. I think \$25 million sounds like a better figure. It is five times the amount of the appropriation for this, but to me, in relation to what we are spending in other areas of agriculture and forms of

priority, this amount of \$25 million to enable the people who are involved in our food supply in this country is not out of line.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LEHMAN) yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD).

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

I would like to say, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor, that we have held hearings, including hearings earlier in this year in Florida, involving the typhoid epidemic. As a resident of the State of Michigan, I am conscious of the fact that in our State, without the supply of migrant workers—we are the third largest employer of migrant workers in the country—without that supply, the principal cash crops we have in agriculture would not amount to very much.

Without that supply the principal cash crops we have in agriculture would not amount to very much because they would not be harvested. We have come through the war years without having that supply impeded. We know from first-hand experience what would happen if the supply of migrant labor that comes from other parts of the country and into upper Michigan in the later parts of the season were impeded or stopped somewhat in its flow. This flow is impeded largely because, among other things, living conditions of the migrant workers and their families in many parts of the country are not what they should be. In Florida, for example, where the typhoid epidemic broke out, among other problems, was the fact that here was a federally supported migrant labor residential area which had more than twice as many people living in it as it was designed for. There was no way in the world that they could have maintained safety and sanitation under those circumstances. Over 200 people were diagnosed as typhoid cases. We are told by the doctors there that at least 25 percent of them will be more or less permanent typhoid carriers. I would like to suggest to many of you gentlemen that a lot of them will be in your States and mine before the end of this agricultural season. They will be carrying with them the potential for a typhoid epidemic in any one of our States which does not have adequate sanitary living conditions to accommodate them while they are there.

This program was passed a number of years ago by the Congress, and it has been very badly underfunded, and in my opinion it has been poorly administered by the appropriate agencies of the Department of Agriculture. However, it is not too late now for us to respond and do something. I believe Congressman LEHMAN's suggestion would actually put the appropriation in line with what we have authorized in the past but not spent.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would raise the level of appropriations for Rural Housing for Domestic Farm Labor programs from \$5 million to \$25 million.

The funds would be used to provide financial assistance to public nonprofit organizations for housing for domestic farm labor, pursuant to section 516 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has authorized a total of \$50 million for these programs. To the best of my knowledge we have appropriated over the years less than half of this, and the current authorization is due to expire on October 1 of this year.

Meanwhile, there are more than \$40 million worth of grant applications pending before the Farmers Home Administration.

In spite of this, the administration has requested no funds for this program for fiscal year 1974, and it has frozen or impounded over \$1.340 million of the funds we appropriated for fiscal year 1973.

However, the committee has refused to accept the administration's lack of concern for this major problem and has recommended that we appropriate a sum of \$5 million for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for its action. I personally do not feel that \$5 million is adequate and I hope a majority of my colleagues here today will agree with me in this regard. But I do know the difficulties involved in appropriating funds that the administration refuses to request, and I would like to say that the committee has certainly taken a meritorious step by ignoring the administration's desire that no funds whatsoever be made available.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Labor, which has jurisdiction over matters dealing with agricultural workers and their dependents, it has been brought to my attention time and time again that housing is the number one problem of our migrant and seasonal workers. The conditions under which these hardworking people are forced to live are nothing short of a national disgrace.

Based on information I have received in the form of testimony before the subcommittee, from on-site staff investigative reports, and from various other communications from all over the country, I think the following account rendered to my subcommittee by a farmworker is a fairly accurate description of the situation which now prevails.

The worker told us that:

The houses are two rooms, no screens on the windows. One of the houses don't even have a window in the entire house. And, the ceiling and the roof all fall in. And this is not, you know, this is not just an isolated case. But it is common. The rats and roaches and everything imaginable. You sleep, and when you wake up in the night, the roaches fall off the roof and on your face.

Aside from the fact that the current situation is causing thousands, if not millions, of Americans to live in conditions of filth, we should be aware that this is a problem which can affect the welfare of our country as a whole.

Perhaps the most cogent illustration of this is the typhoid epidemic which occurred earlier this year in Dade County, Fla., in which nearly 200 confirmed cases of typhoid were reported. This was

clearly the most serious epidemic in modern history.

We have been advised by both the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Government Accounting Office as to the seriousness and importance of the housing crisis which now exists.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, in a publication entitled "Housing for Migrant Agricultural Workers," states that—

When migrant workers are improperly housed... the entire community suffers. The health and welfare of the individual worker is, of course, of great importance, but, because of the interaction of the worker and the welfare of the Nation, these needs become of interest to all. . . . Therefore, good housing for the migrant worker is a necessity.

In that same report, the USDA tells us that—

An estimated 750,000 to 1,000,000 domestic farmworkers and family members now migrate each season. This mobile labor force requires approximately 2.5 million bed spaces.

This report, incidentally, was issued prior to the time that this administration froze all existing funds for farm labor housing programs, and subsequently declined to request any additional funds for the coming fiscal year.

In a report issued in February of this year, the Government Accounting Office had this to say about the areas it surveyed:

In each area, low-cost, safe, decent, and sanitary housing available to migrant and other seasonal farmworkers was in short supply and few houses for farmworkers were being constructed.

It said that over the 10-year period since the housing programs began, we have provided housing for about 470 families and 345 individuals on an average annual basis. Yet the population of migrant and seasonal farmworkers numbers in the millions.

The GAO recommended that the Secretary of Agriculture require the Farmers Home Administration to "assume a leadership role in providing decent, safe, and sanitary housing to migrant and other seasonal farmworkers"—under programs authorized by the Housing Act of 1949, as amended—the act for which we are appropriating funds today.

Mr. Chairman, the evidence is overwhelming. Five million dollars is just not sufficient to do the job. It has been estimated that the administration's cutbacks have already caused the loss of nearly 20,000 new housing units in fiscal year 1973 and approximately 77,000 units which could have been available in fiscal year 1974.

This trend must not only be stopped, it must be reversed—and we can only do so by appropriating the funds provided by this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I do not deny a bit the need for housing in all rural areas. I have supported it in the past and probably will support this amendment, but I want to point out that what we

are really doing is subsidizing those growers you are talking about.

I noted a while ago both the gentlemen voted for a \$20,000 limit on loans and payments to growers of basic commodities. In effect, Government-furnished housing for migratory workers is a subsidy for growers of nonbasic commodities such as fruits and vegetables. Those growers do furnish such housing in many parts of the country. Having such housing available permits them to secure transient workers at less than they would need to pay local workers in many cases and thus a program promoted by very well meaning persons in effect helps to continue a migratory labor program on a larger basis than otherwise would be possible. When the Government builds the housing for them instead of the growers being required to furnish it themselves, it, in effect, lowers their cost of labor. Payments to people who live in the community includes the cost those people must pay for housing but with free housing for transients they can be hired for less. In that respect this is as much a subsidy or more so and to a greater extent for some growers of nonbasic commodities than what the gentlemen voted to limit for basic commodities.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

I would like to point out the \$5 million in this bill, if it were spread out among 50 States, comes to \$100,000 per State, which would build about 10 units per State. It is certainly not in line with the needs of this country. I would like to say that this \$25 million I am requesting is only equivalent to 1 week's bombing in Cambodia, and by far this is a much better thing.

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

Mr. Chairman, I, too, can appreciate the problem presented here. However, may I point out the committee added the \$5 million over the budget estimate. The budget provided nothing. It is not proper to divide the amount by 50. In my State, for instance, we do not use transient workers. There were years when they did use them and they are welcome again, but they do not appear to come through there. So there is not this problem in my area. These funds are used principally in two or three States.

In many States the big operators will deed some land to a nonprofit corporation which will put the houses up. In many instances it is a case of using Government funds to build housing for private landowners. The Office of Management and Budget cut it out entirely. Our committee after holding hearings tried to write some restrictions into the program so that the Department can make an examination to be sure that the housing is really used for transient labor. We decided that we should put \$5 million in the bill for the program. We wanted to make sure it would not be a case of the Government building housing for landowners.

As meritorious as many of these programs may seem to be, if we were to multiply all of them by \$5 million, multiply all the good things in this bill—

then I guess the bill would be for \$150 billion, because everything in this bill is good.

I thought the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LEHMAN) was going to compliment the committee for putting the funds in the bill because they were not in the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LEHMAN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LEHMAN) there were ayes 31, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN). I would point out that in an earlier colloquy with the gentleman from Mississippi I asked for the meaning of the language appearing on page 2, line 13, which says: "not to exceed \$15,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109."

The gentleman from Mississippi responded that this was for appropriations for consultants for the departmental office, and that there were other such appropriations in the bill. Indeed there are. I have gone through the bill, and I have counted 22 of them, totaling some \$1,733,000.

But the language which disturbs me greatly is found on page 45, if I may call the attention of the gentleman to line 11 and line 20.

In line 11 it says:

... including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18, . . .

The salary for a GS-18 is \$36,000, I believe.

This looks like it is for chauffeuring or transportation services, I am not sure which, but I wonder if the gentleman from Mississippi would explain the meaning of that language and the language beginning on line 20, which says:

... services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and not to exceed \$1,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$29,600,000 . . .

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I say that the first reference relates to the Consumer Product Safety Commission. This is a new Commission. It has a tremendous amount of responsibility, and the interest in it is great.

As to the information that is requested, I would point out that it includes two things, it says the hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized not to exceed the per diem rate for GS-18. It does not specify an amount for these two items. The \$30.9 million is the sum total that goes to the Commission for all its activities. The law that created the Consumer Product Safety Commission is so broad that it has the ability to issue safety standards covering more than 10,000 consumer products.

I was very much impressed with the people on the Commission. I was very

much impressed with their levelheadedness. They were largely brought together from a variety of agencies, and then they took on this additional load. I am saying that any group that we put in charge of consumer product safety in the United States, with the right to issue up to 10,000 regulations, could bring this Nation to a standstill if they are not informed and do not act judiciously.

I hesitate to try on the floor—I would be glad to look into it further—to raise any questions, but I would hate to see any restrictions imposed here, because if a man in a group like this could impose 10,000 regulations on business and on the consumer and on industry, and on anything else, I would want him to be fully informed, and this money will help him hire, on a temporary basis, the best consultants available. When you consider the tremendous impact of these decisions, we should do nothing to prevent the Commission from obtaining the best available advice. I hope the Members will go along with this.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman. I too, am having trouble understanding the language to which I referred, and this is really why I asked the question. \$30,900,000 is a considerable amount of money for the Consumer Product Safety Commission and not know what it is for. The section begins, "For necessary expenses" but then modifying language says, "including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services at rates for individuals equivalent to the rate for GS-18."

That certainly would not apply to chauffeurs, or to what does it refer?

Mr. WHITTEN. The authority, as I say, is the issuance of 10,000 regulations which just ties us all into a knot if they are not carefully drawn with all consideration of the facts. These funds can be used to hire the consultants necessary to get the facts.

I can assure the gentleman that when he looks at the nine volumes of hearings that I take my job as seriously as do the other members of this subcommittee, and the point the gentleman raised will be followed up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

RURAL DEVELOPMENT INSURANCE FUND

For loans to be insured, or made to be sold and insured, under this Fund in accordance with and subject to the provisions of 7 U.S.C. 1928 and 86 Stat. 661-664, as follows: water and sewer facility loans, \$445,000,000; industrial development loans, \$20,000,000; and community facility loans, \$10,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: Page 28, line 1, after the comma strike out "\$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000".

And on page 28, line 2 after the comma, strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this Congress last year passed legislation—and the country seemed to be well pleased with it; many folks ran on it; the President had much to say when he cited it—providing for rural development through-

out America. At the time departmental witnesses appeared before us, however, it developed that the action programs that we had before such as rural electrification had been frozen; rural housing had been frozen; water and sewer grants had been frozen. So while we were presented with a new program with a nice sounding name, with a lot of money in the budget for it, this was at the expense of the ongoing programs that had proved to be successful and efficient.

We asked Mr. Erwin, who is a very able and capable man, what his plans were at that time, and he had no plans. We shifted the funds in the budget under the rural development program and put them in the action programs where the experience had been so satisfactory. This morning I met with Mr. Erwin along with my colleague from Arkansas and several others. We have worked out a plan for \$100,000,000 which would go toward getting industrialization started in rural areas, and \$50,000,000 will be available in the proper situations for community development.

So we think that with the new level of funding, this will get them off to a good start. I did not ask him point blank, but it is my opinion this would be in line with the thinking of the new Administrator, Mr. Erwin.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of proposal of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) to increase the funds in H.R. 8619 for community development programs in the Nation's countryside. Because of my concern that the Congress fund these programs at a level which could be expected to realistically move them forward toward their goals, I advised my colleagues yesterday of my intention to offer amendments which would bring the funds provided in this bill for industrial development loans and community facilities loans up to the levels requested in the President's budget.

I recognize and thoroughly agree with the view that the Congress must act to bring Federal spending under control. I realize that all segments of the Nation must carry their share of this load. But, I could not stand passively by and watch the citizens of our countryside be forced to shoulder such an disproportionate burden of budget restraint as was proposed in this bill.

The proposal being offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, while it does not provide all that we would wish, is, I believe, a realistic compromise.

With the approval of the Housing and Development Act of 1970, the Congress took a historic step by proclaiming a national growth policy. In this action the Congress established a national policy which says that the urban and rural problems are interrelated.

It recognized that when a poor, unskilled family pulls up stakes in the country and moves to the city in search of economic survival the result is more crowded classrooms, increased strains on health and social services, and, too often, added numbers to the bulging unemployment roles. The policy recognized that the solution to these problems must involve adequate community development

in the countryside as well as renewal and remedial actions on behalf of the cities.

As a further step toward implementing its national, balanced growth policy, the Congress, last year, approved the Rural Development Act. The objectives of this act included:

Improving the quality of life of countryside residents to allow them to make a rationale choice of continuing to live in their home areas.

Making the countryside an attractive alternative place of residence for our citizens who seek a change of pace from high-pressure, city life.

Stimulating the creation of nonfarm employment by fostering community-based industries. It was hoped that new industries would be developed and that existing industries would look with favor on the prospect of locating new branches in the countryside.

Improving and expanding community facilities such as industrial parks, fire protection, community centers, and recreational facilities.

Assisting local communities in their efforts to expand and strengthen their economic bases so that they can move toward a situation in which they are self-sustaining.

Providing job opportunities and enough social development to reduce or eliminate the need many countryside residents feel to move to the cities in search of economic survival. This would aid in achieving the national objective of relieving the critical population pressures on the cities.

Passage of the Rural Development Act has raised great hopes across the land. These are hopes that once vibrant, still viable communities will be able to move back into the mainstream of the Nation's economy through redevelopment. These are the hopes of parents that their young will be able to use their skills and education to earn a living in their home communities if they wish. These are the hopes of the young for an opportunity to continue enjoying the familiarity of their homeplaces without making undue sacrifices in economic, educational, health, and recreation activities.

In declaring the national policy of balanced growth, the Congress said in 1970:

The Congress finds that the rapid growth of urban population and uneven expansion of urban development in the United States together with a decline in farm population, slower growth in rural areas, and migration to the cities, has created an imbalance between the Nation's needs and resources and seriously threatens our physical environment, and that the economic and social development of the Nation, the proper conservation of our natural resources, and the achievement of satisfactory living standards depend upon the sound, orderly, and more balanced development of all areas of the nation.

The amendment which we are considering at this time will be a major step toward achieving the sound, orderly, and more balanced development of areas of the Nation which have too often in the past received far too little attention.

It will help the Congress keep faith with the people who sent us here and to whom we gave hope with our approval of the Rural Development Act.

I urge that you vote in the interest of all our Nation's citizens and support this expansion of funding for industrial and community development in the countryside.

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I urge strong support for the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN). In my district June 5, 1971, dedicating the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System at the Port of Catoosa, Okla., President Nixon had high praise for the system, pointing out that "the new maritime States of Oklahoma and Arkansas can look forward to a whole new era of growth and development."

The President spoke at length about the financial benefits which would accrue to many sectors of the States and nations economy, pointing out that farmers would benefit two ways: Lower shipping costs coming in for fertilizer, machinery, and supplies, and lower shipping costs for crops and livestock:

In that way, farm income is boosted twice, and the benefits extend across America and around the world to everyone who depends on the beef, and the wheat, the cotton, the soybeans, all the other products of mid-America's agriculture. I believe that what is good for the farmer is good for his customers and good for America, and this project—navigation system—proves it. That's one big reason we're grateful to see this waterway go into operation.

The President further dwelt on oil and natural gas resources which have meant so much to Oklahoma and the industrial development of this country. He pointed out coal could be transported there on—

All sorts of new industries are on the way, bringing with them new jobs, new income, new vitality for communities throughout this region. Private investment planned along the waterway has passed the \$800 million mark and should soon exceed the \$1.2 billion in public funds spent in construction of this project.

Looking at America 30 years from then, the President predicted 70 million more Americans—

Now, how are we going to provide for them. How will we assure to them and the rest of us the abundance and quality of life which all deserve, and even more essential, where are they going to live. Are they going to add to the crime and congestion and the pollution that are choking our cities to death? . . . so I say, let people who want to live in the heartland of America have opportunities, have the jobs that will let them stay here and not be drawn away . . . You realize that over this next thirty years this region in which we're now standing could absorb as much as 10 percent of that growth, in other words seven million people. This region can become a new magnet for people seeking the good life, so that we can begin to see a reversal of the decades-long migration trend from rural America to urban America . . . a trend which has too often acted to deplete the countryside and overburden the cities to weaken the heart of America and add to the fat which saps our strength.

And there, Mr. Chairman, in the words of the President himself, is why Mr. WHITTEN's amendment must be adopted.

Again, Wednesday night, President Nixon said the Nation's productivity depends on the American farmer. By leaving nonprocessed farm products out of his 60-day price freeze, he recognized

that the entire economy must depend on a growing rural America. We urge adoption of Mr. WHITTEN's amendment which will increase grants and loans for rural America so that the great heartland can grow and thrive as it must for America to continue its role in the world's market. Without a growing rural America, without adequate funds to build farms and farming communities, without adequate sewer and water systems, without growing businesses and industries, full productivity cannot be maintained. The President said the Nation depends on export of agriculture products as essential to the balance of payments. Rural America must be given the funds necessary for orderly growth and development. The Nation's economy demands it.

The President's Better Communities Act takes care of the needs of urban areas, if it is enacted; it is up to the Congress to see that the rest of the Nation has the same advantages to grow and prosper as does the urban areas, which are supported by the farmer and farming community.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of Mr. WHITTEN's amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, so far as I know the members of the committee are in accord with the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an amount to provide for the preparation of Environmental Impact Statements as required by section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act on all proposed actions by the Environmental Protection Agency, except where prohibited by law, along with a statement setting forth the economic, including the increased cost to the consumer and the producer, and the technical considerations as specified by section 102(2)(B) of the same Act, \$5,000,000.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against lines 4 to 12 on page 31 on the ground that it is legislation in an appropriation bill and for the additional reason that it requires additional duties by the personnel of the agency.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a similar but different point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order against the language on page 31, lines 4 through 12, on the ground that it is legislation in an appropriation bill.

Mr. YATES. And it provides for additional duties on the part of the personnel of the agency, which is obvious from reading the language referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I do, Mr. Chairman.

This is in line with the earlier point of order, but as pointed out by the committee this authorizes and repeats that which is in the law, and we have to provide an amount for preparation and so forth, and this is in line with section 102(2)(B) of the National Environmental

Policy Act which states that all agencies of the Government shall do such and such, and it follows the language which we use in this bill. The Environmental Protection Agency, I respectfully submit, is an agency of the Government, and not only that it carries the name in its title, and being an agency of the Government it comes within the purview of the Environmental Protection Agency Act, and clearly we can make provision for funds for them to file the environmental impact statements required. For that reason I believe we are within the rule as outlined earlier here today.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, may I also be heard on my point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DINGELL. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois will cite rule 21, clause 2. I will not burden the Chair with the reading of that. I would point out the following, that at page 470 of this year's edition of the rules there appears this language:

Existing law may be repeated verbatim in appropriation bill, but the slightest change of the text causes it to be ruled out.

I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Environmental Policy Act, section 102(2)(B) which has been referred to in the report and also which has been referred to by the gentleman from Mississippi provides that:

All agencies of Government shall identify and develop methods and procedures in consultation with the Council on Environmental Policy established by title 2 of this Act which will insure that presently unquantified amenities and endowments . . . along with the economical and technical considerations.

I would point out that the language of lines 8 through 12 reads as follows, in part:

Along with a statement setting forth the economic, including the increased cost to the consumer and the producer, and the technical considerations as specified by section 102(2)(B) of the same Act, . . .

This imposes upon all agencies of Government, but particularly upon EPA, which has another burden under the National Environmental Policy Act to do that, and the duty to file an additional statement which is not presently required by law.

Referring again to the House Manual of Rules, I would point out that, quoting from page 466 at the middle of the page:

In the administration of the rule it is the practice that those upholding an item of appropriation should have the burden of showing the law authorizing it.

I submit to the Chair that the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, who is my good friend and a very able member of this body, has not borne that burden.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, after further studying the matter, I find that I am within my rights but was wrong in insisting on overruling the point of order.

There is language in the bill which makes it subject to a point of order.

To save time, I ask unanimous consent that from the language in the bill, we strike out on line 8 the words after "law," down through the word "producer," in line 10.

If we can strike that out by unanimous consent; otherwise I will offer an amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that those words be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the points of order have been withdrawn. The unanimous consent request of the gentleman from Mississippi is that the words be stricken on page 31, lines 8 through 10, beginning, "along with," and concluding with the word, "producer."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that is the request. It all goes right down to the end of the line; am I not correct? The gentleman's unanimous consent request was to strike beginning at line 8 on page 31, beginning with the word "along," down through the word "Act." That is at the end of line 11.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, inadvertently my request did not cover that, but at this point I do cover that and ask unanimous consent that those words be stricken through the word, "Act."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the unanimous consent request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 8: Strike out "along with a statement setting forth the economic, including the increased cost to the consumer and the producer, and the technical considerations as specified by section 102(2)(B) of the same Act, . . ."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

In order to assist my good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi, I would like to stress that it is the intention of the national environmental policy, environmental impact agreements should include, among other things, a clear statement of alternatives including such things as cost to consumers and producers and technical considerations.

I do this simply to make appropriate legislative history, to assist my good friend from Mississippi so that we can have a good legislative history.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague saying that, because while technically the language was out of line, the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan was very appropriate. I appreciate his saying that.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am sure this language now will be construed in the light of the very broad provisions of section 102.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For research and development activities, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed one for replacement only; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate of GS-18; purchase of reprints;

library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; \$154,175,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$13,000,000 shall be derived from the unexpended balance of amounts appropriated under this head in fiscal year 1973.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order to the lines 1 through 7 inclusive at the top of page 32. Is this the proper time to present the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not yet reached that language.

Mr. YATES. It is a part of that section, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will protect the gentleman.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an amount to provide for the testing and review of chemical substitutes prior to banning or restricting the use of any chemical by the Agency, not determined to be an imminent hazard to human health, so as to determine in advance that a substitute chemical is available that is not more harmful to humans and the environment than the chemical to be replaced, \$5,000,000.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a point of order against the language on the grounds that the language is legislation on an appropriation bill and for the additional reason that it provides for additional duties on the part of personnel of the agency not covered by present legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we have a rather tenuous, if I admit that, position that this does not require additional duties, because most of the things said here are required under basic law. However, I do not intend to present a tenuous argument to the Chair.

At this point I want to say that our report calls on them to make these determinations and the Environmental Protection Agency insists and recognizes it should. However, I cannot insist that the point of order should not be well taken.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman concede the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do, Mr. Chairman, but I have an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WRIGHT). The point of order is conceded and sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 32, line 1, insert:

"For an amount to provide for research on and testing of substitute chemicals, \$5,000,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment speaks for itself. I believe the reasoning for it is well understood. I ask that the amendment be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

I find in this bill, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi, in at least three places, this language in relation to the hiring of individuals:

The rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate of GS-18.

That is the top of the classified service. How many of these individuals are proposed to be hired under the various provisions of this bill? The number is unlimited as to those that I have discovered so far.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to my colleague from Iowa that in this instance the committee has gone along with language recommended by the Office of Management and Budget in the President's budget.

In these periods of difficulty of finding experts in this field I recognize good salaries must be offered to get scientific help. Whether we are right or wrong in going along with the Office of Management and Budget in setting that amount I do not know, but the language was not prepared by the committee. We did go along with the Office of Management and Budget as to what rates would be required to get the class of personnel we ought to have.

May I say that in this area they had so many temporary employees that we scaled them back by \$3 million below the amount of money they requested. We did feel that without more knowledge than we had we could not drop back the rate.

I would be glad to assure the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) that we could go into that field next year, but that is the situation as it stands.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, by next year, if they are able to hire an unlimited number of individuals at the rate of \$36,000 a year, it will come much too late. We are trying to maintain some kind of control on the supergrades in this government, but I do not see how it can be done if these agencies, new and old, are going to be permitted to hire unlimited numbers outside the Class Act at the GS-18 rate. If that is permitted, there will be no stopping of this thing.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) that I could not agree with him more. I know the gentleman has had long experience in this area, and we have had this experience under four or five different Presidents.

In this instance, may I say that I hope on my part that something can be done, but I do not know what we can do about it here intelligently; I just simply do not have any information.

I also have knowledge here that this committee has a problem as far as the Environmental Protection Agency is concerned. Some people call it a very real need, and it is a need we all recognize, but it makes it extremely difficult for us to use our own best judgment on some occasions, in that we yield to the tide so that at least someone will not say that we held back that which they actually needed.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Environmental Protection Agency and the other agencies are doing a good job, but we have given them too much to do. We

have been a little slow in trying to restrain them as far as personnel, because we did not want to give them the excuse that they could not hire qualified personnel.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the response by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) but I have the feeling that by this time next year we are going to have a horde of individuals, especially in these new agencies, at \$36,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

ABATEMENT AND CONTROL

For abatement and control activities, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; to remain available until expended, \$251,100,000, of which \$5,700,000 shall be derived from the unexpended balance of amounts appropriated under this head in fiscal year 1973.

For an amount to provide for a complete and thorough review, analysis, and evaluation of the Environmental Protection Agency, its programs, its accomplishments and its failures, and to recommend such changes, cancellations, or additions as necessary, to be conducted under contract with the National Academy of Sciences, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, at this point I make a point of order against the language appearing at lines 20 through 24 on page 32, and on through the first two lines of page 33.

The reason for my point of order, Mr. Chairman, is twofold. First, this is legislation in an appropriation bill; and it constitutes an appropriation of funds not previously authorized by law.

So that the language referred to is again violative of rule XXI, clause 2, and I would point out again, Mr. Chairman, that the rule should be so interpreted as to require strict compliance.

Mr. Chairman, I am quoting from page 466 of the Manual of the Rules of the House of Representatives, as follows:

In the administration of the rule, it is the practice that those upholding an item of appropriation should have the burden of showing the law authorizing it.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that neither the statute setting up the EPA nor the statute setting up the National Academy of Sciences affords the National Academy of Sciences the duty, responsibility, or power to investigate or to study EPA. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I make this point of order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I make the additional point of order that the language in the paragraph appearing at the top of page 33, containing the words, "to remain available until expended," is also subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I seem to have a little difficulty finding it at the moment, but the language setting up the National Academy of Sciences, after es-

tablishing the Academy, provides for making this kind of study when asked by any department or agency of the Government.

While we seem to have difficulty finding it—I do not know whether the Chair has it in his hands or not—it does so provide. Based on that, we have directed this agency to make such a request. That is the situation as we submit it at this time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the committee in its kindness, in the report at page 99 and page 100, under the words "limitations and legislative provisions" has set forth precisely the language which I have alluded to.

I would point out since it is clearly not a limitation and since it does not limit the level of expenditures, then it becomes, in the words of the distinguished committee, then legislation, since to exclude one is necessarily to require the expression of the other alternative. Therefore, it is conceded at page 100 of the report in the second to last paragraph to which I referred the Chair that this does in fact constitute legislation in an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not press the matter further. The language on which we rely is to be found—and we have finally found it here—March 3, 1863, and it provides in section 3 of such act:

Be it further enacted that the National Academy of Sciences shall hold an annual meeting at such place in the United States to be designated and the Academy shall when called upon by any department of the Government investigate, examine, and report on any subject of science or art the actual expenses for which are to be paid for in an appropriation which may be made for the purpose. The Academy shall receive no compensation whatever for its services to the Government of the United States.

If I may have a second to write a similar amendment to that which we substituted a while ago in a similar point of order, we will provide the money for such an expense if I might have the cooperation of my friends. I have to acknowledge the point of order at this point.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the Chair will oblige me for a second while I write the amendment, we will provide \$5 million for such study by the National Academy of Sciences, and we shall be happy to so amend the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Mississippi concedes the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do. And I beg the indulgence of the Chair that we may write an amendment to replace the section.

Mr. DINGELL. Out of deference to my good friend from Mississippi and in order to have the business of the committee go forward, I will ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to return at a time later—

Mr. WHITTEN. I think we have it ready.

Mr. DINGELL. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the language is stricken.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: For an amount for a study by the National Academy of Sciences, \$5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I heard the amendment read. All it does is provide for a study by the National Academy of Sciences. Is that the intention of the gentleman? Does he not want to describe what the study covers? I do not think the words sufficiently describe it.

I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk again report the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. "In connection with the operations of the Environmental Protection Agency."

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be revised so to read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that the amendment as corrected by the unanimous consent request should be read by the Clerk so that we will all understand precisely what is involved.

The Clerk will report the amendment as modified by the unanimous consent request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: Page 32, line 20, insert: "For an amount for a study by the National Academy of Sciences, \$5,000,000 in connection with the Environmental Protection Agency."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an amount to provide for conservation and pollution abatement practices including animal waste storage and diversion facilities and disposal of solid waste, to be transferred to and merged with the authority of the Agricultural Conservation Program (REAP) of the Department of Agriculture for the 1974 program, \$15,000,000 to remain available until expended.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, again I would note a point or order at this point, which I would reserve, and I would ask to be recognized for the purpose of striking the requisite number of words. I would ask for the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) to whom I shall direct a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) reserves a point of order.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe we can expedite the procedure here by directing a point of order, if the gentleman from Mississippi wishes, to the entire language beginning at line 3, page 33, down through the end of line 9 on

page 33. Or I would ask that an amendment be offered, in the interest of saving the time of all of us that, beginning with the words "to be transferred" on line 5 down through the end of that sentence on line 8, ending with the words, "Agriculture for the 1974 program".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Michigan would limit himself to that language I would have to admit his point of order, and I think it would be a help in the bill if we were able to leave the remainder there.

Mr. DINGELL. What I am trying to do is to expedite the situation, Mr. Chairman.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order so far as the language of the bill at page 33, beginning with the words, "to be transferred" on lines 5 and 6 down to the end of the sentence on line 8, page 33, ending with the words "Agriculture for the 1974 program".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if I might be permitted to do so, I ask unanimous consent that those words be stricken in case the other procedure might not be the appropriate way; I ask unanimous consent that the words read by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, be stricken.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, in that case I would withdraw my point of order, and I would agree with the unanimous-consent request made by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) withdraws his point of order.

The unanimous-consent request has been made to strike out the words beginning on line 5 on page 33, "to be transferred", and continuing down through and including on line 8 the words, "Agriculture for the 1974 program".

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed 7 per centum of any appropriation made available to the Environmental Protection Agency by this Act (except appropriations for "Construction Grants" and "Scientific Activities Overseas") may be transferred to any other such appropriation: *Provided*, That funds in this Act shall not be available for transfer, to comply with or enforce any deadline or due date unless such funds are identified as an appropriation to meet a specific deadline or due date.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would note a point of order against the language on page 33 in the paragraph which the Clerk has just read, and I would reserve my point of order, and I would then ask to be recognized for the purpose of striking the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan reserves a point of order.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the language again concedes as legislation in an appropriation bill, the words on page 33, line 14:

Provided, That funds in this Act shall not be available for transfer, to comply with or enforce any deadline. . . .

And so forth, down through the period at the end of the sentence on line 17.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that it be stricken. The gentleman from Mississippi may do so, or I will do so.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to ask unanimous consent that it be stricken.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The proviso beginning on line 14, page 33, including down through the end of that sentence on line 17, is without objection stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION CONTROL
COUNCIL

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of Executive Order 11523 of April 9, 1970, establishing the National Industrial Pollution Control Council, \$1,323,000.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the language beginning at line 19 with the words "Department of Commerce" going down through the bottom of page 34, starting with the words "Department of Commerce" at line 19, down through the last word at line 23 on page 34, "\$1,323,000."

Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the base of the point of order again is the requirements of rule XXI, clause 2, in which the rule provides:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for an expenditure not previously authorized by law.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that there is no authorization in law for the Department of Commerce, National Industrial Pollution Control Council. I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that under the requirement of two different statutes, referring now first to title 31, section 673—and I will read that—there is no authorization for the establishment or for the payment of funds for this particular body.

Title 31, section 673 reads as follows:

No part of the public moneys, or of any appropriation made by Congress, shall be used for the payment of compensation or expenses of any commission, council, or other similar body, or any members thereof, or for expenses in connection with any work or the results of any work or action of any commission, council, board, or other similar body, unless the creation of the same shall be or shall have been authorized by law; nor shall there be employed any detail hereafter or heretofore made or otherwise personal service from any executive department or other government establishment in connection with any such commission, council, board, or similar body.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, there is also express language in an-

other statute recently passed by the Congress to which I have referred at page 19724 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 1973, which I shall now quote.

Moreover, the committee's action, in assigning new duties to the Council, violates the spirit and intent of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-463), if not the law itself. Section 9(b) of that act specifies that advisory committees, such as this Council, "shall be utilized solely for advisory functions." Surely the study that the committee wants is beyond the scope of that law.

That is done. I would point out that there is no statutory authority for the creation of a National Industrial Pollution Control Council whatsoever; that the Council referred to was set up by an executive order signed by the President; and that he cited in so doing no statutory authority for the creation of the said National Industrial Pollution Control Council.

And I would refer again to the language of the report, Mr. Chairman, wherein we will find that there is set up \$323,000 for the regular functioning of the National Industrial Pollution Control Council, and that in the report we find it is the intention that the National Industrial Pollution Control Council shall expend \$1 million to make a study of industrial pollution for the Department of Commerce.

This clearly then, Mr. Chairman, is an attempt by the Committee on Appropriations in the legislation before us to engage in legislation and to expend money in defiance of the rules of the House and the statutes.

I would last also cite again, referring to the current issue of the House rules and manual, the prohibition against expenditures of this kind under rule XXI, clause 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the arguments made by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan. The language we have in the section is very short and it all hinges upon the Executive Order 11523 of April 9, 1970.

Frankly we presume that the President had authority to issue that order. If so we had a right to finance it. If he had no such legal right to issue such an order, the point of order patently would lie.

If he had authority to issue the Executive order, there would be no basis for the point of order.

I have to say we presume an order issued by the executive branch was authorized by law or it would not have been issued. We do not have the information available. We acted on the presumption. That is all we had.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WRIGHT). The Chair is not in a position to construe the origin of the President's authority to issue a particular Executive order. Because the Executive order is the only authority cited in this section the Chair is compelled to reiterate rule XXI, clause 2, which declares that:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as

an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, . . .

Under the meaning of the rules of the House an Executive order is not a law and does not qualify as a law and therefore the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM (REAP)

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in sections 7 to 15, 16(a), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590g-590o, 590p(a), and 590q), including not to exceed \$15,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, Interstate, and international fairs within the United States, \$15,000,000, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the programs of soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Acts making appropriations for Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection Programs, 1972 and 1973, carried out during the period July 1, 1971, to December 31, 1973, inclusive: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That no portion of the funds for the current year's program may be utilized to provide financial or technical assistance for drainage on wetlands now designated as Wetland Types 3(III), 4(IV), and 5(V) in United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Circular 39, Wetlands of the United States, 1956: *Provided further*, That necessary amounts shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1974 program of soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices, including related wild-life conserving practices and pollution abatement practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to \$160,000,000, excluding administration, except that no participant shall receive more than \$2,500, except where the participants from two or more farms or ranches join to carry out approved practices designed to conserve or improve the agricultural resources of the community): *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the current year's program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the Agricultural Conservation Program (REAP) in the participating counties, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties, and in addition, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, not to exceed 1 per centum may be made available to any other Federal, State, or local public agency for the same purpose and under the same conditions: *Provided further*, That for the current year's program \$2,500,000 shall be available for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out rural environmental practices: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming material, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That no part of

any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of Title 18 U.S.C. 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL: On page 41 after the colon in line 14 insert the following:

"Provided further, That this amount shall be available only for permanent conservation practices."

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, as we debate this bill today, my thoughts go back to 14, 15, 16 years ago, when I was first offering amendments to this particular section of the bill having to do with the old ACP program. Sometimes we were partially successful and other times not so. However, it is really interesting to look back at that effort now and see that most of the arguments we used then are just as valid today. We pointed out, for instance, a good part of the program funds went for practices directly related to crop production.

What I propose to do in this amendment is to limit these conservation practices to permanent, long-range practices. I think it is significant that over in the other body, on June 8, with an amendment offered by Senator DOLE of Kansas, that the Senate adopted to the agriculture bill in the Senate an amendment that would for all practical purposes do what I am proposing here as a limitation in amendment on this appropriation bill by limiting these funds to the long-range permanent practices.

I am not going to talk at any great length on further arguments. The Members all know them. In the REAP program, the Members have heard them discussed many times.

Today, Mr. Chairman, about 30 percent of the cost-sharing participation under REAP is for practices directly related to crop production, rather than for conservation practices as such.

In 1971, for example, Federal cost-sharing funds through REAP amounted to:

Nearly \$12 million for installing irrigation systems, land leveling, ditch lining, and the like;

Nearly \$10 million for liming materials;

More than \$4 million for control of competitive shrubs on range or pasture;

More than \$3.5 million for wells, pipelines, and the like for livestock water facilities;

Over \$122,000 for construction of permanent fences; and, we also spent more than \$30,000 for home gardens

I am not going to go on at great length

here, because we all know that REAP is not the real issue, anyway. If it were not REAP, some other program would be the vehicle.

What it all boils down to is that if we are serious about controlling Federal spending and inflation, and if we are serious about preventing an increase in taxes, then we are all going to have to stand up and take our licks in the budget.

This is not the only program the President proposes to cut back because of a low cost-benefit ratio. Just take a look at the list beginning on page 50 of the new budget document. There are 7½ pages of program cuts in virtually every Federal department and agency.

Is REAP worth a tax increase and continued inflation? Is any program on that list? That is the real question, because if we can not take our share of belt tightening in agriculture, we can be darn sure nobody else will, either.

In view of the lateness of the hour, I would simply ask for consideration of what I have proposed here in very simple language in limiting these conservation payments to the long range, permanent practices rather than production stimulants, where I feel farmers themselves can very well pay for those without being on a cost-sharing basis.

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

As has been pointed out many times, this is a big country. I mentioned earlier the wonderful area from which my friend from Illinois comes. They do not need much of anything. Nature has been very, very good to them.

If the members were to adopt his amendment, it would knock out all of New England from a national program, and many, many other areas because of their need for it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very interesting that in the debate over in the other body, when this question was raised, Senator AIKEN specifically raised several of these points in the colloquy over there in the other body and consented to and agreed to the amendment.

It seems to me that this gentleman, who has served for many years on the Agriculture Committee in the other body and is well informed, if he is agreeable to this kind of thing, we ought to very well follow suit by this action now.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, perhaps on the other side of the Capitol, all the gentleman's friends are taken care of. I point out that in much of the United States what we need are nutrients in the soil, mineral nutrients and other things in the soil. Certainly the things that go to make up the soil are essential to crops and essential to leaving a good, rich land to future generations.

I repeat again that under this program, as we all know, the holder of the land puts up about 70 percent of the cost. It is up to the community if they are willing to pay 70 percent.

This is a program which involves many people. It starts at the county level, goes to the State level, and comes to Washington. Washington works up a catalog

saying what practices are available, but the catalog is based upon what the people at the local level want, and in some areas they want nutrient building practices.

Frankly, I hate to be a party to writing restrictions that would make the program so restricted in the gentleman's district in Illinois or my district in Mississippi or any other district. It works its way up. The Department of Agriculture has a chance to go over it and work up the catalogs. Then it works its way back down, and the landowner puts up more than two-thirds of the cost, including labor, and picks from this catalog what he wants to do for future generations.

May I say that in the report we went along to a great degree with what the gentleman from Illinois is recommending. We feel impetus should be given to permanent practices, but we tried not to exclude those areas where something else might be wanted by the local people. Insofar as the land being rich and fertile and producing more, if there was ever a time in history when this country needs to produce more, it is now.

So, despite what my friend suggests as an argument for not doing this, I believe it is time we did it. I believe we owe it to future generations to protect the land for them.

As I read earlier, we can provide all of the money in the world for our children and a wornout land and leave them nothing. But if we leave them a land rich in nutrients, rich in mineral elements, with soil erosion stopped and forest areas on the hillsides, they can write their own currency and they can set up their own financial system.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MICHEL) there were—aye 23, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—CONSUMER PROGRAMS
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
WELFARE

OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Consumer Affairs, established by Executive Order 11583 of February 24, 1971, as amended, \$1,140,000, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against the language to be found on page 43, beginning with line 11 and running through line 15.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order only because I do not believe the Executive orders should be substituted for authorizations by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding an earlier ruling, I should like to point out something with respect to the Executive order:

Amending Executive Order 11583, establishing Office of Consumer Affairs. By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, Executive Order 11583,

page 24, is amended by substituting for section 1 thereof the following:

If the President of the United States has authority to issue it, the point of order should be overruled. If he does not, it should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WRIGHT). The Chair is prepared to rule.

As cited earlier, it is required that any activity for which an appropriation is contained in a general appropriation bill shall be an activity authorized by law. The Chair observes that in the stated provision two authorities are cited.

One is the Executive Order 11583; the other one is 5 U.S.C. 3109. Apparently the authorization cited, 5 U.S.C. 3109, is only for personnel.

Therefore, the Chair must conclude that the authority cited is Executive Order 11583.

The Chair, of course, is not knowledgeable as to the authority or lack of authority inherent in the President to issue such an Executive order, but the Chair believes the burden should be upon the committee to cite statutory authorization rather than Executive order, which under the rules does not qualify within the meaning of the word, "law."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask for my own information and future study, does that mean that the legislation must come before the Congress and it does not have the presumption of right, and only those who attack it can prove otherwise? Now, if the Chair proves to be right, it means that everything has to be proven verse by verse and chapter by chapter. I would presume from my own study of law and my own interpretation that that which comes here in the regular way would be in order unless proven otherwise. I think the Chair has shifted the burden onto the legislative body, as between the three branches of government, as it relates to that branch which claims the right, and I think as long as that is claimed and exercised, the burden would be on the antagonist or the gentleman who raised the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) may be entirely right in his assumption that the President, in issuing Executive Order 11583, was doing so pursuant to congressional enactment.

The Chair, lacking knowledge of the source of that authority, believes that the history of rulings from this Chair is that it has been consistently held that law, within the meaning of rule XXI, embraces statutory law enacted by Congress and does not cover Executive orders issued by the executive branch of Government.

For example, the Chair refers to a ruling made by Chairman Sparkman on July 5, 1945, in which the chair declared:

An Executive order does not meet the requirement that appropriations must be authorized by law.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have gone far afield in my discussion with my friend, the gentleman in the Chair, but do I understand that whatever commission may exist for various other actions taken by the executive branch, this cannot be advanced by the Committee on Appropriations, and is that ruling a com-

plete ruling to exclude from the appropriation process anything that is created by Executive order?

Mr. Chairman, there are some other bills coming up. I have never before heard of such an action.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot and would not rule on that question, because it involves a hypothetical situation in the future; nor can the Chair predict with certainty what some future occupant of the Chair might rule.

The Chair simply declares that under precedents heretofore cited, executive orders do not meet the test of law, as required in the rules, for the citation of an authorization for an appropriation, and for that reason the Chair sustains the point of order in the present case.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the Chairman. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

**FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Food and Drug Administration in carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (15 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.), the Import Milk Act (21 U.S.C. 141 et seq.), the Import Tea Act (21 U.S.C. 41 et seq.), the Federal Caustic Poison Act (44 Stat. 1406 et seq.), and sections 301, 311, 314, 351, 352, 354 through 360F, and 361 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 246, 262, 263, 263b through 263n, and 264), including payment in advance for special tests and analyses and adverse reaction reporting by contract; for studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement operations; for payment for publication of technical and informational materials in professional and trade journals; for payment of salaries and expenses for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18; for rental of special purpose space in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate, not to exceed \$10,000; \$158,140,-000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELANEY: Page 44, insert at the end of line 14 the following: "No part of the appropriation made by the preceding sentence may be expended for studies and similar activities respecting sections 409(c)(3)(A), 512(d)(1)(H), or 706(b)(5)(B) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments that the gentleman from New York and I are in thorough accord on. I just want to be sure they are the two amendments I have which change the amount. I wish to reserve the right to offer these amendments and not preclude the gentleman from offering his. Have we reached the point where we change the amount?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair points out to the gentleman the paragraph which begins on line—

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may return to the point just preceding the gentleman's amendment in the preceding paragraph, if the gentleman will yield.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, to return to what paragraph?

Mr. WHITTEN. The immediately preceding paragraph.

So I ask my friend from New York to wait a minute and let me get rid of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi speak of the paragraph on page 43 or page 44?

Mr. WHITTEN. Page 44.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to suggest to the gentleman that the Clerk has not yet reached that point.

Mr. WHITTEN. I was wrongly advised, then, Mr. Chairman. My amendment goes to page 44.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment desired to be offered by the gentleman from Mississippi would still be in order. Other amendments to the pending paragraph would still be in order following action by the committee on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I apologize to my colleague from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELANEY).

The Clerk reread the amendment.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, there is one particular section of this measure, H.R. 8619 now under consideration, that I am totally opposed to. I refer to the committee's recommendation to channel the sum of \$200,000 of the Food and Drug Administration's budget appropriation for additional studies with respect to the so-called Delaney amendment.

I see this type of funding as just another attempt by FDA to delay their enforcement of the present law which is on the books and has been since 1958. To be perfectly frank, we are witnessing another stall. Government is responsible for protecting the consuming public from all suspected cancer causing substances, and FDA's reluctance to take positive steps in this area is an outright dereliction of duty, besides the fact that it is a disastrous waste of money.

For years FDA has sounded like a broken record. Once again Congress and the general public hears the urgent plea for financial backing to determine if proper benefit to risk factors can be established. And while the testing goes on, hazardous chemical additives remain in our food supply. Last year money was appropriated by the Committee and approved for a U.S. Department of Agriculture Study on DES implants to be conducted at Southern Illinois University. This research is still in progress. Programs are also underway, oftentimes duplicating each other, at a significant number of Federal agencies. The National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, the National Cancer Institute, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health are all in the midst of testing programs for dangerous substances.

In the scientific community the Food

and Drug Administration has persuaded numerous organizations to undertake a broad spectrum of investigative activities. The highly respected National Academy of Science conducted its first in a series of forum seminars on toxicology and its effect of the food supply this past month—May 15, 1973. The New York Academy of Science held a major meeting January 14 through 16, 1973, while a six member Subcommittee on Nonnutritive Sweeteners recently met in Philadelphia, Pa., May 17 and 18, 1973. This group's next meeting is in progress at this very moment. Besides the previously mentioned, two new organizations have been formed. They are the Citizens Commission on Science, Law, and the Food Supply and a nonprofit corporation, comprised of the nutrition foundation and several other institutes, funded by the Rockefeller Foundation.

I emphasize that we must not have any further Government studies on the Delaney amendment at the double expense of the consumer's pocketbook and his physical well-being. We would all fare better if studies ceased or were curtailed and the law enforced against dangerous cancer causing substances.

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

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from New York would accept an amendment to the amendment he has offered, as follows:

At the end of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELANEY) change the period to a comma, and add the following: "but such language shall not restrict existing research efforts or assimilation of existing developments in this area."

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi to the amendment I have offered, because I would like to complete all of the investigations and receive final reports, compile them all, and be able to take some definite action.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would personally urge that the House would accept the amendment I have offered to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELANEY).

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELANEY)?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN to the amendment offered by Mr. DELANEY: At the end of the Delaney amendment, change the period to a comma, and add the following: "but such language shall not restrict existing research efforts or the assimilation of existing developments in this area."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELANEY).

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELANEY), as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Food and Drug Administration in carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (15 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.), the Import Milk Act (21 U.S.C. 141 et seq.), the Import Tea Act (21 U.S.C. 41 et seq.), the Federal Caustic Poison Act (44 Stat. 1406 et seq.), and sections 301, 311, 314, 351, 352, 354 through 360F, and 361 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 243, 246, 263, 263b through 263n, and 264), including payment in advance for special tests and analyses and adverse reaction reporting by contract; for studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement operations; for payment for publication of technical and informational materials in professional and trade journals; for payment of salaries and expenses for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18; for rental of special purpose space in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate, not to exceed \$10,000; \$158,140,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 44, line 14, after the semicolon, strike out "\$158,140,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$160,590,000".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, these amendments will provide \$2.8 million for construction of a new toxicology laboratory at the National Center for Toxicological Research.

These amendments are offered because of additional information which has come to the attention of the committee since the bill was marked up. Quite frankly, the Food and Drug Administration in the hearings before the committee presented only skimpy information on the need for this facility.

Laboratories which the committee had previously approved were just reaching completion, and it was the committee's feeling that some experience should be gained with these laboratories before proceeding with another large laboratory. The committee did approve three small laboratories totaling \$1 million which were to support the research program already underway. The committee was also told that the new laboratory would not be ready until July of 1976 and felt that the available funds should be used for the more urgent problems of food inspection. Finally, the committee was afraid that construction of the new laboratory would divert scarce scientific staff from the basic research program.

On the basis of the additional information now available, including a 45-page justification from the Commissioner of

Food and Drugs, the committee now feels construction of the laboratory is merited and that the FDA will be able to manage simultaneously the existing laboratories and the construction of the new laboratory.

The committee has never opposed the program at the National Center for Toxicological Research, as is indicated by the fact that the bill already includes \$11 million for the Center, but it has been concerned that the program develop in an orderly manner.

While with these amendments the committee has added the \$2.8 million as requested, it is disappointed about the quality of the presentations to the committee concerning the need for the laboratory, and will expect any future requests for laboratories to be more fully justified.

The amendments only add \$2,450,000 to the bill because \$350,000 in unused funds are available to provide the total of \$2.8 million requested.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) and the members of his committee for inserting these funds, and I know that they will be wisely spent.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to provide an appropriation of \$2.8 million for the construction of laboratory facilities at the National Center for Toxicological Research in Pine Bluff, Ark.

This Center is making a wise use for peaceful purposes of a facility originally designed for military application. For that reason, the limited number of laboratories available were not designed as typical modern toxicological laboratories. They were built to contain biological agents and protect workers from exposure from these agents. The Center is presently doing the best it can, by renovation, to make the labs functional for the next 2-year period until the new labs can be constructed.

At the time the Center was established some doubts were expressed that it would be able to recruit top people in the field. They have attracted such people on the basis of the merits of the program, its good working relationship with the University of Arkansas, the high quality of research opportunity which exists there, but most importantly by the knowledge that Congress is backing the program.

The past performance of this Center fully justifies our confidence in providing new facilities to carry forward needed and useful programs of the Center.

I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for his efforts in support of this amendment, and for the careful and dedicated work which has resulted in the bill which is before us today.

I join the gentleman from Mississippi

in supporting this amendment and in supporting the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment of facilities of or used by the Food and Drug Administration, where not otherwise provided, \$2,550,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from funds heretofore appropriated under this appropriation and not used; and for necessary expenses in connection with "Salaries and Expenses", \$5,450,000, to be derived from funds heretofore appropriated under this appropriation and not used, and to be transferred to and merged with the fiscal year 1974 appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: Page 44, line 19, after the comma, strike out \$2,550,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$5 million, and on page 44, line 22, after the comma, strike out \$5,450,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$3 million.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the early explanation applies to this item, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Product Safety Commission established by the Consumer Product Safety Act (Public Law 92-573), including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18, \$30,900,000, of which \$6,885,000 shall be placed in reserve pending determination of qualified and necessary projects.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the language beginning on line 14, which states: "of which \$6,885,000 shall be placed in reserve pending determination of qualified and necessary projects."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this was discussed somewhat earlier. The Consumer Product Safety Commission is one that many people in the United States are very much interested in. Four members of the commission were appointed and sworn in about 30 minutes before they appeared before our committee. Three of them had not been appointed, so the Members can imagine the situation they faced and that we faced.

About 75 percent of their work was by transfer from the Food and Drug Administration and other agencies, so they were not wholly inexperienced—except the commission was. They were given

an awful lot of additional duties and given a new Commission, and they wanted to add a lot of additional features, but at that time they did not have a plan. With that situation, it was the belief of the committee that, while we certainly did not want to be in the position of restraining or holding back the Consumer Product Safety Commission, we did realize that as new as they were, they could not move too fast. As I understand the rule, by putting in \$6,885,000 to be released later by the Office of Management and Budget and the committee, we were advised that the money would be prorated on an annual basis, and that this would not be so allocated until it was actually needed.

I can assure my colleagues here that so far as this committee is concerned, that when the need arises, we would be ready and willing to release anything that is needed.

May I say I spoke with the chairman of the commission, Mr. Simpson, and he is perfectly agreeable with the provisions as we have them. I think it is in the interest of good government and of the commission to keep it as we have provided.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, because of the principle involved in this matter, and because of the importance of maintaining the authority of the committee of main legislative effect, I would be constrained not to agree with my colleague to withdraw the point of order.

I am prepared to argue on the point of order or I am prepared to agree by unanimous consent to strike the language which I read, in which event I would not urge the point of order, but I do not withdraw it at the present time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my friend I am going to save him from himself, because when the old section went out, they have no money, and certainly I would not want that and he would not either, so I would agree to the unanimous-consent request that the limitation be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Mississippi is asking unanimous consent or offering an amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. I understood my friend, the gentleman from Texas, would substitute a request that would strike after the figure "\$30,900,000", the remainder of the language, that it would be unanimously withdrawn, Mr. Chairman, and I would agree.

Mr. ECKHARDT. If that were done I would withdraw my point of order but not until it were done.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the language appearing on page 45, beginning in line 14 with the words "of which" and continuing down through line 16 be stricken and a period substituted at the end of the figure "\$30,900,000."

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request offered by the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The specified language is then stricken and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and not to exceed \$1,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$29,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ECKHARDT

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ECKHARDT: Amend H.R. 8619 at page 45 by striking the period and substituting a semi-colon and by adding at the end of line 23, the following: "and an additional amount of \$2,600,000 for the said necessary expenses, none of which latter sum shall be expended for purposes other than the establishment of such a federal energy investigation task force for the investigation of the energy crisis as the Federal Trade Commission may, under such authority as it has under existing law, elect to establish."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT) is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, the investigation and testimony to date which has been made concerning the energy crisis has raised serious conflicts about the current situation. Evidence points to a general petroleum crisis or an impending one by the end of the year, that demand may outstrip oil refining capacity either later this summer or early next year. Conflicting testimony points to the probability of a severe heating oil shortage this winter. Hundreds, possibly thousands of small brand and independent service stations are being curtailed in their fuel supply or completely cut off. Significant dislocations of major oil company withdrawals from various geographic areas are in process.

Incidentally, in the Port of Houston the stevedoring companies have been denied diesel fuel and gasoline until they raised such protest that the refineries permitted them to have some.

Significant anticompetitive market structural changes are occurring at a rate that is accelerating. There is significant consumer confusion as to the genuineness of the shortage. There is widespread consumer belief—Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues are not concerned about the fuel crisis we can curtail this, but I would like order, Mr. Chairman, to complete my statement. I consider it a rather serious amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point is well taken. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I may say this is an amendment that is being considered on the Senate side at the present time in a similar bill. It is true however that a study by the Federal Trade Commission is due around the first part of July.

When that study comes in, we may have sufficient information, but I seriously doubt it.

The reason for introducing this amendment at this time is for the purpose of

being assured that the Federal Trade Commission will have the resources to properly study the crisis. I know that this question was raised before the appropriations subcommittee. The subcommittee very properly chided the Federal Trade Commission for not being more prompt in making their report. I want to compliment the committee in that respect.

Mr. Chairman, I merely urge this as a means of further strengthening such investigation.

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with what my colleague from Texas says, otherwise I would have to make a point of order, but I am in favor of what the gentleman seeks to do.

We have the biggest investigation in the history of the Federal Trade Commission in this area. It is due July 1. I just do not think we should give them additional money at this time. We should wait and see how the current study turns out.

I would hope, and I certainly can assure the gentleman that we will follow it up, but I hope he will withdraw his amendment and not compel us to have to insist upon the point of order.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I do understand correctly, do I not, that if such an amendment should come in on the Senate side, the chances are very strong the report will be before the committee before the conference?

Mr. WHITTEN. We have been promised that it would come in by July 1. I doubt if we will have completed the conference by then, and certainly the situation would be considered in any conference we have. But I agree with the gentleman that this report is badly needed. The information is needed, and if it is insufficient, I will join with him in seeing that the Federal Trade Commission will go forward with additional studies.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to hear this. I understand the chairman was involved in this, the report was somewhat impeded by the Justice Department not agreeing to subpena power for the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. WHITTEN. That has been one of the problems the Federal Trade Commission has had in the conduct of its investigation.

Mr. ECKHARDT. If we do receive a report and if it does appear necessary that further efforts should be made to fully investigate this crisis, I would assume that the conferees from the House would certainly give serious consideration to the matter at that time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Most serious consideration.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think this goes to the whole committee. As the gentleman no doubt found when he read the hearings, when

the Federal Trade Commission was before the subcommittee we asked them very sharp questions on what they were doing in regard to the energy crisis and got the clear assurance from them that they were moving with all haste. I think it is the feeling of the committee that it should be done and it is being done. If the report is not forthcoming by the first of July, the House conferees will be wholeheartedly behind the idea of adding the funds to expedite it.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I thank the gentleman. It is certainly true that he asked the sharpest of questions, and I appreciate this action.

Mr. Chairman, with these statements I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment at this time.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WRIGHT, 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. 8619) making appropriations for Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. 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.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 304, nays 3, not voting 126, as follows:

[Roll No. 230]
YEAS—304

Abdnor	Fulton	Obey
Abzug	Gaydos	O'Brien
Addabbo	Gettys	O'Hara
Alexander	Gilman	O'Neill
Andrews, N.C.	Ginn	Passman
Andrews, N. Dak.	Goldwater	Patten
Annunzio	Gonzalez	Perkins
Archer	Goodling	Pickle
Arends	Grasso	Pike
Baker	Gray	Poage
Barrett	Green, Oreg.	Podell
Beard	Green, Pa.	Powell, Ohio
Bennett	Gross	Preyer
Bergland	Grover	Price, III.
Bell	Gubser	Price, Tex.
Bevill	Guyer	Quie
Blaggi	Haley	Quillen
Blester	Hamilton	Railsback
Blackburn	Hammer-	Randall
Boland	schmidt	Rangel
Bolling	Hanley	Rees
Bowen	Hanrahan	Regula
Brademas	Hansen, Idaho	Reuss
Brasco	Hansen, Wash.	Rhodes
Bray	Harrington	Riegle
Breaux	Hastings	Rinaldo
Brinkley	Hechler, W. Va.	Roberts
Brooks	Heinz	Robinson, Va.
Broomfield	Helstoski	Robison, N.Y.
Brotzman	Henderson	Rodino
Brown, Calif.	Hicks	Roe
Brown, Mich.	Hillis	Rogers
Brown, Ohio	Hinshaw	Roncallo, N.Y.
Brownhill, N.C.	Hogan	Rooney, Pa.
Buchanan	Holfeld	Rose
Burke, Fla.	Holtzman	Rosenthal
Burke, Mass.	Horton	Roush
Burleson, Tex.	Hosmer	Rough
Burlison, Mo.	Howard	Roy
Burton	Hunt	Ruth
Butler	Hutchinson	St Germain
Byron	Jarman	Sandman
Camp	Johnson, Calif.	Sarasin
Carney, Ohio	Johnson, Colo.	Sarbanes
Carter	Jones, Ala.	Satterfield
Casey, Tex.	Jones, N.C.	Saylor
Cederberg	Jones, Tenn.	Scherle
Chamberlain	Jordan	Schroeder
Chappell	Karth	Sebelius
Chisholm	Kazen	Seiberling
Clancy	Keating	Shipley
Clark	Ketchum	Shoup
Clausen,	Koch	Shriver
Don H.	Kuykendall	Shuster
Clawson, Del	Kyros	Skubitz
Clay	Latta	Smith, Iowa
Cleveland	Lehman	Smith, N.Y.
Cochran	Lent	Spence
Cohen	Long, La.	Staggers
Collier	Long, Md.	Stanton
Collins, Tex.	Lott	J. William
Conte	Lujan	Stanton,
Corman	McClory	James V.
Cotter	McCollister	Steed
Cronin	McCormack	Steiger, Ariz.
Daniel, Dan	McEwen	Stokes
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	McFall	Stubblefield
Davis, Ga.	McKinney	Stuckey
Davis, S.C.	McSpadden	Studds
Davis, Wis.	Madden	Sullivan
de la Garza	Madigan	Symington
Delaney	Mahon	Talcott
Dellenback	Mann	Taylor, N.C.
Dellums	Maraziti	Teague, Calif.
Dennis	Martin, Nebr.	Thome
Derwinski	Martin, N.C.	Thornton
Devine	Mathias, Calif.	Tierney
Dickinson	Matsunaga	Towell, Nev.
Diggs	Mazzoli	Udall
Dingell	Meeds	Ulman
Donohue	Melcher	Vander Jagt
Dorn	Mezvinsky	Vanik
Downing	Michel	Veasey
Drinan	Milford	Vigorito
Dulski	Miller	Waggoner
Duncan	Minish	Walsh
du Pont	Mink	Wampler
Eckhardt	Mitchell, Md.	Ware
Esch	Mitchell, N.Y.	Whalen
Eshleman	Mizell	White
Evans, Colo.	Moakley	Whitehurst
Evins, Tenn.	Mollohan	Whitten
Findley	Montgomery	Widman
Flood	Morgan	Williams
Foley	Murphy, III.	Wright
Ford, Gerald R.	Myers	Wright
Ford, William D.	Natcher	Wylie
Fountain	Nedzi	Yates
Frelinghuysen	Nelsen	Yatron
Frenzel	Nichols	Young, Alaska
	Nix	

Young, Ga.	Young, Ill.	Young, Tex.	Zion
Crane	Fascell	Gibbons	Patman
		Anderson	Pepper
		Calif.	Pettis
		Anderson, Ill.	Peyser
		Armstrong	Pritchard
		Ashbrook	Rarick
		Ashley	Reid
		Aspin	Hawkins
		Badillo	Roncalio, Wyo.
		Bafalis	Hays
		Bell	Rooney, N.Y.
		Heckler, Mass.	Rousselot
		Bingham	Royal
		Blatnik	Runnels
		Boggs	Ruppe
		Breckinridge	Ryan
		Broyhill, Va.	Schneebeli
		Ichord	Sikes
		Burgener	Sisk
		Burke, Calif.	Slack
		Carey, N.Y.	Snyder
		Collins, Ill.	Kemp
		Conable	Stark
		Conlan	Steele
		Conyers	Steelman
		Coughlin	Landgrebe
		Daniels,	Steiger, Wis.
		Dominick V.	Symmons
		McCloskey	Taylor, Mo.
		anelson	Teague, Tex.
		Denholm	Thompson, N.J.
		Dent	Treen
		Edwards, Ala.	Van Deerlin
		Edwards, Calif.	Waldie
		Mathis, Ga.	Wiggins
		Eilberg	Metcalfe
		Erlenborn	Wilson, Bob
		Fish	Mills, Ark.
		Fisher	Minshall, Ohio
		Flowers	Charles H., Calif.
		Flynt	Moorehead, Calif.
		Forsythe	Charles, Tex.
		Fraser	Wilson
		Frey	Winn
		Froehlich	Wosher
		Fuqua	Wynn
		Gaimo	Wydier
		Parris	Young, Fla.
			Young, S.C.
			Zwach

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Macdonald.
Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Adams.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Wydier.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Stark with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Mailiard.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Froehlich.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Litton with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Gunter with Mr. King.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Young of Florida.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Coughlin.
Mr. Roncalio of Wyoming with Mr. Conlan.
Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Royal with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Breckinridge with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Dominick V. Daniels with Mr. Forsythe.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Moorhead of California.
Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Peyer.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Bafalis.
Mr. Gaimo with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Mallary.
Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kemp.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Griffiths with Mr. Gude.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Pritchard.
Mr. Denholm with Mr. Hudnut.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Steelman.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Mayne.
Mr. Jones of Oklahoma with Mr. Taylor of Missouri.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Huber.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Sisk with Mrs. Holt.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Aspin with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Steele.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Slack.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Owens.
Mr. Burke of California with Mr. Rouselot.
Mr. Young of South Carolina with Mr. Treen.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Parris.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Symmons.
Mr. Collins of Illinois with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 7645, DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7645) authorizing appropriations for the Department of State, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HAYS, MORGAN, ZABLOCKI, MAILLARD, and THOMSON of Wisconsin.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL), the program for

the rest of this week, if any, and the program scheduled for next week.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield, may I say that we have completed our program for this week. The program for the week of June 18, 1973, is as follows:

Monday is the Consent Calendar, and suspensions, and there are no bills.

We will take up H.R. 8658, District of Columbia appropriations for fiscal year 1974, to be followed by H.R. 8152, law enforcement assistance amendments.

We will conclude the consideration of this bill that started yesterday.

On Tuesday, we will have the Private Calendar, and the following suspensions: House Joint Resolution 499, Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws;

H.R. 689, misuse of names in collecting debts;

H.R. 5157, Canton Island contracts;

H.R. 8537, Dependents Assistance Act;

H.R. 6129, trust territories authorization;

H.R. 6338, water resources planning authorization; and

H.R. 7127, historical preservation authorization.

Following that we will take up H.R. 5464, saline water program authorization, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate, and H.R. 5094, deputy U.S. marshals reclassification, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

For Wednesday and Thursday we will take up the Department of Transportation appropriations for fiscal year 1974;

H.R. 7824, Legal Services Corporation Act, with an open rule and 2 hours of debate;

H.R. 8662, Atomic Energy Commission authorization, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 8510, National Science Foundation authorization, subject to a rule being granted.

On Friday there will be the appropriations for fiscal year 1974 for HUD, space science, and veterans appropriations.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JUNE 18, 1973

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

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT NIXON ACCEPTS CONGRESSIONAL CALL FOR FREEZE

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, surprisingly the President has in part embraced the very action which his administration fought so bitterly when it was proposed in the House Banking and Currency Committee 3 months ago.

But the freeze which the President announced last night is limited and the real test is what the administration does about long-range economic solutions during this cooling-off period.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that interest rates and rents are left untouched is more evidence that the President still does not fully grasp the economic realities facing the American consumer—or at least, the less affluent consumer. Interest rates have skyrocketed under phase III and the prime rate, alone, is up 25 percent since January 1. These increases have priced millions of Americans out of decent housing and have contributed to price increases across the entire range of consumer goods.

Many of the economic problems which the President addressed Wednesday night could have been avoided if the administration had not unleashed its strong-arm lobbying efforts to defeat the Democrat's controls measure in the House of Representatives on April 16.

Since the controls legislation was defeated in April, prices have continued to rise at an annual rate of 24 percent and the program announced Wednesday makes no attempt to roll back the administration's mistakes. There is no escaping the fact that the President is freezing prices at unconscionable levels.

The freeze will be meaningless unless there is basic economic reform and a restoration of confidence in the administration's ability to deal with tough economic problems. The track record does not inspire confidence.

On January 11, phase III was announced amidst much fanfare and repeatedly the President's economic advisors assured the Congress and the American people that the program was working in accordance with the game plan. Two and one-half months later, the President was forced to go on national television to repair some of the more obvious failures and once again we were jawboned by public relations assurances which had little substance behind them.

Last night—2½ months later—the President again returns to national television with still another program and this time we can only hope that there is more than public relations window dressing behind this effort.

The President has just about used up the credibility that any Chief Executive can generate in national television appearances and now the administration is faced with the need for hard action.

I am sure that the Congress stands ready to give legislative backing to stronger economic action. However, this is a two-way street and I hope we can gain some assurances that the adminis-

tration will no longer engage in the blind partisanship which led to the defeat of the controls legislation in April. I think it is very important that the Banking and Currency Committee maintain a close oversight on the entire economic stabilization program and that the Congress be ready to step in where the President falters. We cannot afford more mistakes like phase III.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT N. C. NIX ON INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO ENABLE THE UNITED STATES TO CONTRIBUTE ITS SHARE TO EXPENSES OF ICCS

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

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, by request, a bill to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission of Control and Supervision as provided in article 14 of the Protocol concerning the said Commission to the Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam.

The draft legislation was received by the House from the Department of State on May 21, 1973, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and subsequently referred to the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs for appropriate action.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place at this point in the RECORD the Executive communication and draft legislation transmitted therein:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith for consideration by the Congress a draft bill to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission of Control and Supervision in Vietnam.

The proposed legislation would implement the Agreement of January 27, 1973 on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam. Article 18 of that Agreement established an International Commission, composed of representatives of Canada, Hungary, Indonesia and Poland, and imposed significant responsibilities upon that Commission for supervision of many important aspects of the Agreement, including the ceasefire, the return of prisoners, and the conduct of elections. A protocol to the Agreement specifies that each of the four parties to the Agreement will defray twenty-three per cent of the Commission's costs and that each of the four Commission members will contribute two per cent.

The enclosed draft bill would authorize the appropriation to the Department of State of such funds as may be necessary to pay the United States' share of the Commission's expenses under the formula contained in the relevant protocol to the Paris Agreement. The proposed legislation is virtually identical to Public Law 88-468, which authorized appropriations for United States contributions to the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos. Because the U.S. financial responsibility under the Agreement is expressed as a percentage of an unknown total, it would not be practicable to specify a dollar amount in the proposed legislation. It is estimated, however,

that United States contributions to the Commission during the fiscal year 1974 will not exceed \$4,800,000. After enactment of the bill it is our plan to seek 1974 appropriations for U.S. contributions to the Commission under the Department of State Appropriation Act heading "Contributions to International Organizations," which is applicable to organizations for which contributions have been authorized by treaty or Act of Congress.

The strengthening of the role of the International Commission of Control and Supervision and the assurance that it would have sufficient personnel to perform its functions were major objectives of the United States in the final round of negotiations leading to the January 27 Agreement. Our continued commitment to an effective international commission will be an essential ingredient in the realization of a lasting peace in Indochina. Accordingly, we urge that the Congress give the proposed legislation early and favorable consideration.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that enactment of the enclosed draft bill would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely,

MARSHALL WRIGHT,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

H.R. 8732

A bill to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission of Control and Supervision as provided in Article 14 of the Protocol concerning the said Commission to the Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State such sums as may be necessary from time to time for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the International Commission of Control and Supervision as provided in Article 14 of the Protocol concerning the said Commission to the Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam dated January 27, 1973.

MAJORITY LEADER THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., SAYS PRESIDENT NIXON IS GOING TO HAVE TO BE A BETTER HORSE TRADER WITH SOVIET UNION

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Secretary Brezhnev of the Soviet Union begins a visit to the United States in which he will talk trade with President Nixon.

It is entirely appropriate that we explore all avenues of peaceful cooperation with the Soviet Union. But I hope the President doesn't get us into another deal like the grain sale last year to the Soviet Union.

The whole story of that sale still has never been revealed to the public. We still don't know how much it cost the American people—first as taxpayers subsidizing that sale and then as consumers paying inflated prices for the grain that was left and for meat.

On top of all that we suffered a costly dislocation of our freight transportation system: it had to hold up everything else

to make way for a crash grain haul to the ports.

The only thing the American people know for sure about this deal is that we got took.

And the President can't shift the blame for that blunder by appealing to Congress for export quota authority.

If he wants to do business with Secretary Brezhnev, the President is going to have to be a better horse trader.

CHAIRMAN BREZHNEV'S VISIT

(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, next week marks the beginning of Chairman Leonid Brezhnev's visit to the United States.

The timing of his visit is indeed fortuitous, for the United States is currently on the brink of adopting an entirely new economic policy which may have far-ranging effects on any trade agreements we now make with the Soviet Union. Additionally, it is well known that the Soviet Union and some U.S. corporations have just reached an agreement for the sale of natural gas produced in Siberia.

The United States and the Soviet Union are in an ideal bargaining position. Each has something the other wants. The Soviets' interest in the United States is primarily a commercial one. We have wheat, we have corn and other grains, we have a vast and rich technology to offer them. They have great mineral and natural gas deposits which the United States, as the world's foremost consumer, is particularly interested in. But they have something else that the United States wants: freedom for thousands of Jews seeking the right to emigrate to Israel.

We have heard much in the last few months of how restrictions have been eased. The exit tax has been suspended, and supposedly more Jews than ever have been given permission to leave Russia for Israel or the United States. But these stories do not accurately reflect the true state of affairs in the Soviet Union. Yes, the exit tax has been suspended, and the rate of emigration has increased. But there is still harassment of those wishing to leave, and there are no guarantees that the exit tax will not be reinstated once the Russians have their coveted trade concessions.

In bargaining with Chairman Brezhnev, I hope that President Nixon will remember that the Soviets need us more than we need them. There is no economic advantage to be gained from waiving the debts that the Russian Government incurred during World War II. It is unclear just how much sales to the Soviet Union will ease our balance of trade deficit, since most of the money they will use to pay U.S. companies with will come from the U.S. Government in the form of loans. They have little if anything to offer us in the area of consumer goods or industrial equipment. The natural gas deal has gone through without any special trade agreements, nor should such trade agreements be necessary in these days of fuel shortages.

We are in a uniquely strong bargaining position with Chairman Brezhnev, and what we do now will be remembered as an act either of great moral courage or one of unforgivable weakness. It is not simply a question of making the rights of Russian Jews a bargaining point. There are many foreigners in the Soviet Union who are suffering from the official harassment so favored by the KGB and other branches of the Soviet Government. If the Soviet Union wishes to expand its trade connections with the United States, that will mean a greater influx of Americans into Russia, bringing with them their culture and their literature. The Russians, if they are to derive the full benefit of these agreements, will have to ease restrictions on foreigners and Western literature—including newspapers and books—if foreigners are to freely carry on business in Russia.

There was a recent report on the New York Times of increased restrictions on foreigners in Russia. The specific incident was one in which foreigners were prevented from going to a beach which, up until a few days ago, they had been using regularly. Suddenly, the Russian Government decided that the regulations were too lax and now the beach is restricted to Russians only. This is a small incident, to be sure, but it is part of a growing pattern of harassment of foreigners.

On a simply moral level, President Nixon has an obligation to assure not only himself, but the people of the United States that the Soviets are genuinely changing their policy toward the Jews. The President is well aware of the sense of the Congress on this issue. Sizable majorities of both Houses have joined in cosponsorship of the "Freedom of Emigration Act," and we are committed to its passage. It is unconscionable for a government to deny its citizens their basic rights, particularly the right to freely emigrate. There can be no reason for denying Soviet Jews the right to emigrate other than to carry out a program of cultural genocide and official anti-Semitism.

These are strong words, but how else is one to explain Soviet attitudes toward Jews seeking permission to emigrate? Living in Russia, they are not allowed to freely practice their religion. Should they try to do so, or try to leave for a country where they may do so freely, they suffer all manner of torments, from loss of their jobs and liability to arrest for "parasitism," to total social ostracism, and even to arrest and deportation to camps in Siberia.

The Russians deny time and again that there is no "Jewish problem" in the Soviet Union. They cite time and again the fact that there is no law on the books in Russia that prevents anyone from leaving the country, as long as the departure is "justified." But they go to the greatest lengths imaginable to find reasons why no justification can be found. Until recently, knowledge of "military secrets" was the excuse used to keep entire families from emigrating when only one member of the family had been in the armed services, and at an extremely low rank, at that. Now, the excuse given for denying exit visas to intellectuals,

scientists, and Jewish activists is that they have skills which are needed by the state, and that they are too highly qualified to be permitted to leave. This is the excuse given to those who have lost their jobs because they sought permission to emigrate. If they are too highly skilled to leave, then why are they so easily dispensable from their work?

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let morality and human dignity be abandoned in the blind chase after profits. We would be doing a disservice to ourselves and the people we represent if we grant trade concessions to the Soviet Union without winning concessions from them in turn. Merely waiving the enforcement of the exit tax is not enough of a concession, for it is more than likely that it will be reimposed. Remember that—suspension does not mean permanence.

The President knows what the Russians want from him, and he knows what the American people, through their Representatives and Senators, want from the Russians. In his negotiations with Chairman Brezhnev, I wish him success. I fervently hope that we can reach the kind of agreement with the Soviet Union that will result in lasting peace and an end to the ever greater spending on weaponry that has characterized both nations' economies for so long. But at the same time I hope that President Nixon will not forget the simple moral issue of freedom in the Soviet Union—freedom for those foreign citizens who must live and do business in the Soviet Union, and freedom for those Jews who not only wish to emigrate from Russia, but for those who wish to remain in the Soviet Union and live as Jews. If the Soviet Government wants to fully participate in the 20th century, and derive the economic benefits that such participation would surely bring, then it must be made to understand that it cannot operate under a medieval mentality.

Mr. Speaker, I call on President Nixon to speak for us all in the upcoming negotiations with Chairman Brezhnev, to remind the Chairman of America's concern for the fate of Soviet Jews, and to impress deeply upon the Chairman the need for major concessions in this area. I hope for a successful completion of the summit conference in all areas, particularly in winning freedom for Soviet Jewry.

FEED MILLS NEED PRICE FREEZE ADJUSTMENT

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I support the President's efforts to check inflation, but it is clear that the temporary price freeze order must be modified in order to prevent disruption of the Nation's food supply.

The prices of raw agricultural products are not frozen, and I understand the reasoning in this, but the prices are frozen at the first processing stage and thereafter.

One result of this is that feed mills cannot sell feed at the controlled price because they cannot obtain new supplies

of the feed ingredients except at a substantially higher price.

Unless the regulations are modified promptly, Virginia poultrymen, and other users of feeds, will find their supplies cut off, because the mills cannot be expected to sell at a loss.

I have communicated today with the President and his chief economic advisers to urge prompt adjustment of the price freeze regulations to insure that the food supply chain not be broken.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of telegrams I have sent to the President, the Secretaries of the Treasury and Agriculture, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers and the Director of the Cost of Living Council, as follows:

Continuity of nation's food supply requires urgent action modifying price freeze to reflect inability of processors and distributors of agricultural products to obtain raw or initially-processed agricultural items except at prices substantially higher than their invoiced prices during base period on sales to next link in distribution chain.

Your active consideration of examples such as these is most earnestly solicited:

1. Major Virginia poultry processors have informed me today that chain store and other distributors are telling them that further orders for poultry should not be expected, because acquisition cost now is above their selling prices in the base period.

2. Virginia feedmills state that they will have to phase out supplies to poultry and egg producers and other users of feeds because they cannot obtain additional feed constituents at current prices and sell formula feeds at base period prices except at loss of fifty dollars a ton or more.

Strict adherence to price freeze regulations as presently understood can only insure rapid withering of poultry and egg supply and economic disaster for producers.

Please keep in mind that approximately eighty percent of commercial laying hens are produced under contractual arrangements with feed mills, which now see no way to continue supplying layers, broilers and turkeys without violating price control regulations.

I support the objective of the price freeze, but modification is essential to avoid disruption of food supply and encouragement of black market operations.

INTRODUCTION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) in introducing legislation entitled "The Trade Adjustment Assistance Act of 1973."

Since May 9, 1973, the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, has been holding public hearings on H.R. 6767, the Trade Reform Act of 1973. Today is the last day of our committee's public hearings on this administration-backed proposal. Beginning Monday, June 18, the committee will begin executive sessions on this legislation and it is generally predicted that a bill will be reported to the House prior to the August recess.

The Trade Reform Act of 1973 is a sweeping proposal which has the potential for an immeasurable impact on all sectors of the American economy. It is

certainly one of the most important pieces of legislation which will be considered by the 93d Congress—and it merits the careful study and scrutiny of every Member of Congress.

In earlier speeches in this Chamber, I have expressed my very deep concern about some of the provisions of H.R. 6767. I am concerned about the unlimited grants of authority which it gives to the executive agencies. I am concerned about the lack of adequate public hearings and public discussion about possible negotiations which would be permitted under this act. I am disturbed about the lack of provisions for judicial review. And in particular, I am deeply worried about the inadequacies of the assistance programs provided in the administration bill for workers, companies, and communities which might be adversely affected by trade concessions granted under the authorities provided by this bill.

I know that these concerns are shared by many members of the Ways and Means Committee and by many Members of the House. It is my expectation that H.R. 6767 will be substantially rewritten and thoroughly amended in the Ways and Means Committee. These amendments will seek to limit the discretion and range of authority which the President would be given under this bill. They will attempt to provide greater safeguards to American workers and companies and it should certainly seek to improve the forms of readjustment for those who might be adversely affected by any trade negotiations.

It is my hope that through a new round of trade negotiations and increased world economic cooperation, this bill could lead to a more prosperous America—an America with full employment, with a wide range and variety of consumer goods at stable prices. Certainly, this was the hope of all of us who worked on and voted on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. But in reviewing the actions taken under the 1962 Trade Act, one is often disappointed. In all too many cases, it seems that the United States gave more than it received from its trading partners. Under this new trade bill, I think it is important that this balance be redressed. I think it is important that we receive more than we concede.

In the meantime, thousands of American jobs have been and are being lost due to imports. Certain industries and areas of the country have been particularly hard hit by a flood of imports in such categories as shores, textiles, and increasingly, steel, and automobiles. The present forms of assistance to workers who are left unemployed or underemployed as a result of imports is totally inadequate. It is vital that an improved form of worker and firm adjustment assistance be provided. An improved form of adjustment assistance must also accompany any new trade legislation.

Let me state here that it is my hope that no one will be adversely affected by any new trade laws. With a carefully written bill and with a vigorous and strong trade negotiating team, this new bill can mean more jobs and greater prosperity for the entire nation. But it is a fact that by the nature of trade negotiations, there are almost always some

concessions on both sides. Therefore, this bill, which should bring greater prosperity and greater employment to all of us as a whole, may mean the loss or displacement of a job for a single individual. It may mean that he will have to find a new job; that he will have to be retrained; that he may have to move and break ties with the communities in which he has grown up in and formed his friendships. In other words, what will be the Nation's gain, may be, in some cases, a loss for individuals.

In a situation such as this, where actions are taken for the good of the Nation as a whole, it is right and proper and just that we make special provisions for those few who are injured by that public action.

Therefore, I am joining with my colleague from Minnesota in introducing this action which seeks to provide truly adequate and comprehensive forms of assistance to those who are suffering from imports or who may be displaced from their jobs by any future trade concessions.

The legislation which we are introducing provides for the coordinated establishment of an agency, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, which will oversee the effective administration of a full range of trade adjustment assistance programs. In the past, hundreds of petitions have been presented to the U.S. Tariff Commission for relief and assistance because of injury and unemployment caused by imports. In all too many cases the Tariff Commission has refused these petitions for relief. There are cases where the Tariff Commission has forwarded these petitions to the President for approval—with subsequent delays. After almost 2 years of delay, one such petition for relief still has not been granted. This new bill would eliminate the present cumbersome procedure for determining and developing relief and readjustment assistance. It would mandate a decision on whether relief and adjustment assistance is justifiable within 60 days, for any trade-impacted industry where production has declined and a significant number of workers are out of work or under-employed due in substantial part to increased imports or decreased exports.

There are three main types of assistance provided by this bill.

ASSISTANCE TO FIRMS

First, there is trade adjustment assistance to companies in a trade impacted industry. Primarily, this assistance will take the form of technical advice and financial assistance through existing programs—programs such as the SBA or the EDA. Tax credits would be provided for firms for the retraining of its workers so that that firm can move into a new line of production or modernize its present production line to more effectively compete with foreign imports.

ASSISTANCE TO WORKERS

Second, there are four forms of assistance provided to workers: readjustment allowance, training benefits, relocation allowances, and early retirement benefits.

Under the readjustment allowances provisions, an import-affected worker would be eligible for assistance equal to his average weekly wage up to a certain

maximum annual level. If it would be more beneficial to the worker, he could elect to apply for allowances under the various types of federally-sponsored job training programs. To qualify for this readjustment allowance, the worker would have to participate—with good faith—in job retraining. The job training programs must be geared to provide training for jobs which really exist and which have the potential for upward mobility. All too often, Federal job training programs have attempted to train people for dead-end jobs or for jobs which did not exist. The worker would be eligible for readjustment allowances equal to the time that he had worked for the firm which was import-affected. This provision is drawn from the principle established in the Amtrak legislation which provided that workers who lost their jobs because of the termination of certain passenger train routes would receive the equivalent of up to 6 years pay. Obviously, nowhere this length of time for assistance provisions would be available under this legislation, since the worker must actively seek new employment and retraining. Nevertheless, this flexible time provision is important because it will provide the family income security needed during a transition period. I might add here that these provisions which provide real opportunities for workers are in stark contrast to the provisions in the administration trade bill. For example, if a worker has to leave home or travel to another area to participate in a retraining program, the administration bill permits him a daily "subsistence" allowance of \$5, the same "subsistence level" provided in the 1962 Trade Expansion Act. The bill which we have introduced today provides for flexibility in subsistence allowances so that they will cover reasonable and necessary expenses of the worker during the transition period.

Third, the bill provides for relocation allowances for a worker and his family. This provision is similar to the language in the administration bill—with one exception. The administration bill provides for relocation or moving expenses only if the worker is the head of a household. Today's bill permits such allowances for a single worker as well.

Fourth, the bill provides for early retirement payments. When an older worker is displaced or loses his job, it is often almost impossible for him to find new employment. I am sure every Congressman has received letters or visits from workers in their fifties or early sixties who have searched and searched—even in the best of economic times—and have been unable to find any kind of employment. When a person has worked in a particular industry for years and then the entire industry is adversely affected by imports, the chances for finding new employment are even more remote. Therefore, this legislation permits a person who is 55 years of age or older to elect to receive the level of social security benefits he would be eligible for at age 62, and it permits persons over 60 adversely affected by imports to elect to receive the level of social security benefits which he would have been entitled to at age 65.

ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITIES

There are several other important provisions. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide technical and certain forms of established financial assistance to communities adversely affected by imports—as when a plant or factory closes because of competition from foreign imports. Finally, the bill provides for the development of an "early warning system" so that plants which are in danger of closing down or relocating abroad provide as much possible advance information to their employees and the Government as possible.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the provisions of this legislation will be included in any trade legislation considered by the Congress this year. Indeed, it is important that this type of legislation pass as soon as possible to assist workers, firms, and communities to adopt to the current unprecedented level of imports.

I will work for the development of trade legislation and international monetary reform which will, to the greatest extent possible, remove the need for readjustment assistance. But it is obviously needed now—and due to changing technologies, it will probably be needed in the future. We cannot expect American workers and their families, we cannot expect many American companies and regions of the country to support the continuation of an expanding international trade, unless we remove the anxiety caused by the fear of import-caused job loss. This legislation would remove that fear. It would permit greater flexibility in the commitment of American resources. It would ensure the ability of American workers to move into the more highly skilled, highly paid technological industries.

INTRODUCTION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, there are two essential elements in a successful and vigorous trade policy—temporary safeguards against injury from imports and meaningful assistance to workers, firms and communities in adjusting to changing patterns in international trade. I am introducing legislation today with my colleague from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) which would provide one of these two essential ingredients—an effective trade adjustment assistance program.

There are many compelling reasons for pursuing an energetic and open trade policy, none more important than the need to maintain friendly relations with the rest of the world. The interdependence of the nations of the world is clearly established; we are all mutually dependent on one another for our well-being. If we are to prosper, growth in the developing countries must be encouraged. But instead of the massive aid programs of the past, we should recognize our community of interests—our need on the one hand, for markets for agricultural goods and technology-intensive products and the third world's need, on the other,

for markets for low cost, labor-intensive manufactured articles.

In encouraging trade of this nature, dislocations occur, dislocations with which we must deal effectively. These dislocations occur to relatively few. From 1967-69, years of sharp increases in imports, about 60,000 jobs a year out of total work force of 80,000,000 were lost because of foreign competition. The benefits accrue to all of us—benefits of growth in national income and of growth in higher paying jobs, benefits of lower consumer prices and of increased quality and quantity of goods available, and the very large benefit, not measurable in hard cash, of increased national security.

Even though only a small proportion of the work force suffers dislocation from changes in foreign trade flows, it is manifestly unfair that these workers should have to pay for benefits we all receive. It is more than unfair; it is unthinkable. To reduce these workers' already inadequate benefits, to shorten the already short duration of their meager allowances as is proposed in the administration's Trade Reform Act of 1973, is unspeakable. To ask them at the same time to assume new burdens, new risks, so that the country at large may prosper, shows a callous disregard for individual human suffering.

Unemployment compensation and trade adjustment assistance should not be treated alike as this administration has proposed. Anyone who loses property or his means of livelihood in the national interest is entitled to compensation. The State Department, in explaining the adjustment assistance provisions of the 1962 Trade Expansion Act, declared:

There is nothing radically new about this principle; it is the same principle which has guided our legislators in assisting in the personal readjustments made necessary by military service or in assisting industry to adjust to the requirements of war production. It is, in essence, the principle that individual groups should not be expected to bear alone the burden of a policy felt to be in the interest of the nation as a whole.

The 1962 trade adjustment assistance program proved a dismal failure, but not because the principle on which it was based was unjust. It failed because of rigid eligibility criteria and inflexible administration. Assistance provisions were so hedged with restrictions as to prove virtually useless. From passage of the act in October 1962 until November 1969 the Tariff Commission denied every petition submitted to it by workers, firms, and industries. Only after the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 had shown that adjustment assistance was practicable, did the adjustment assistance program under the Trade Expansion Act begin to function at all. From December 1969 through April 1973, 77 petitions have been certified as eligible for assistance, and some 35,000 workers have received benefits.

The Trade Adjustment Assistance Act of 1973, which my colleague from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) and I are introducing today, would liberalize eligibility criteria and would establish effective administration for the program. It would also vastly improve allowances, continue fringe benefits for affected workers, make special provision for older workers, and provide

for relocation, retraining and counseling to help workers find new jobs. It would assist firms largely through loan guarantees and tax credits and would help affected communities to adjust to, and prepare for, loss of jobs in trade-impacted firms and related service industries.

The major provisions of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act of 1973 are:

First. Liberalization of eligibility criteria so that firms, workers and communities adversely affected by foreign trade flows—increased imports or decreased exports—would qualify for assistance.

Second. Transfer of responsibility for overall administration of the program to the Secretary of Labor, who would act on the advice of a newly created Interagency Committee on Trade Adjustment, modeled on the successful Interagency Committee on Economic Adjustment, which was set up to assist communities impacted by cutbacks in aerospace and defense contracts and by closings of military bases. The Secretary of Commerce framework, for administering assistance would have responsibility, within this to firms and communities.

Third. Provision of benefits to workers equal to their average weekly wage, a formula that has been used to compensate railroad workers who were displaced by Amtrak, in the interests of improved rail passenger service for the Nation at large. An arbitrary 6-year limit was put on this program. Benefits under our bill would be paid on a time-for-time basis—duration of payments equals length of previous employment. This is more equitable and is not estimated to add appreciably to the cost of the program. Maximum duration has been shown to have little relation to actual duration of payments.

Fourth. Provision of allowances to workers for retraining, counseling and relocation expenses; provision for such fringe benefits as hospital insurance and early retirement.

Fifth. Provision of assistance to firms hurt by foreign competition, with emphasis on loan guarantees and tax credits for expenses incurred in helping workers adjust.

Sixth. Establishment of an early warning system by having the Trade Adjustment Administration in the Department of Labor, in conjunction with the Interagency Committee on Trade Adjustment, monitor data showing production and employment trends and by requiring firms to give workers at least 90 days notice of a decision to relocate facilities outside the United States, if such relocation would result in any reductions in work force.

I have stressed arguments of equity for workers and of enlightened interest in world prosperity and world peace. The case for an expanded and improved trade adjustment assistance program can be made purely on grounds of economic self-interest. The best estimates of the costs of current import restrictions are from \$5 to \$8 billion. The quota system proposed in the Burke-Hartke bill would cost at least twice that. The most generous estimate of the total cost of the program we are proposing, including assist-

ance to workers, firms, and communities, comes to \$300 million a year. Economists at the Brookings Institution have suggested a lower figure. Total expenditures for manpower and employment services programs in fiscal year 1972 were \$3.2 billion. Estimates for 1974 are at the same level. \$300 million is not a large amount to add to these estimates, when offset by the enormous gains of a liberal trade policy.

A viable trade adjustment assistance program is indispensable to a vigorous, open trade policy. In the interests of justice for affected workers and of expanded trade, with all its attendant benefits for the rest of the Nation, we ask for your support of H.R. 8723, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act of 1973.

CLARENCE M. KELLEY AS DIRECTOR OF THE FBI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note the editorial endorsement of Chief Clarence M. Kelley of Kansas City by the Washington Post in its edition of Thursday, June 14, 1973.

The Washington Post prides itself as being an independent newspaper and in this editorial it demonstrates its independence.

Perhaps the first paragraph of the editorial is not completely descriptive of what follows in the remainder of the editorial. But in that first paragraph the Post praises Kelley in a way that all of the other cautions contained in the remainder of the editorial are minor by comparison.

The Washington Post is not given to passing out bouquets to anyone but, in the case of Chief Kelley, they point out that President Nixon in reaching outside of political circles in selecting Clarence Kelley has selected a professional of long experience and with considerable stature in the law enforcement field.

The editorial goes on to point out that Mr. Kelley enjoys a reputation as one of the Nation's top chiefs of police. This is so because he has made significant achievements during his years as chief of police in Kansas City. These include banishing corruption from the force, introducing a number of innovative systems and techniques, and winning wide community support.

The editorial quite wisely cautions that the Senate Judiciary Committee should take plenty of time to consider the confirmation. This is partly because of the unhappy tenure of L. Patrick Gray and also, in part, due to the recent revelations about surveillance and various undercover adventures.

We are all in agreement that there are permissible limits of investigative techniques. The editorial quite properly mentions the FBI engaging in burglary in order to collect information.

Well, the Senate Judiciary Committee will listen to Mr. Kelley's views on investigative methods and will explore in detail his record at Kansas City.

For my part as one Member of Congress who has known Chief Kelley and

has in the recent past represented a substantial segment of Kansas City, I feel confident that Clarence M. Kelley will stand the test and convince the Senate Judiciary Committee that he is a professional in the field of law enforcement. The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 14, 1973]
MR. KELLEY AND THE FUTURE OF THE FBI

In nominating Clarence M. Kelley to be Director of the FBI, President Nixon has wisely reached outside political circles and selected a professional with long experience and considerable stature in the law enforcement field. Mr. Kelley enjoys a reputation as one of the Nation's top chiefs of police, based on his achievements in banishing corruption from the Kansas City force, introducing a number of innovative systems and techniques, and winning wide community support there.

Even so, the nomination should not be whisked through the Senate in a flurry of relief at the prospect of finally giving the beleaguered FBI a capable permanent leader after 13 months of turmoil and temporizing. We do not have in mind here the predictable Senate Judiciary Committee concern with certain controversial aspects of Mr. Kelley's record, such as his approach to minority hiring in the Kansas City department, or the civil liberties aspects of the intelligence networks he has created. Rather, we are referring to the larger challenge for the Senate committee—and for Mr. Kelley—which was summed up last Friday by the FBI's Acting Director, William D. Ruckelshaus, in a commencement address at Ohio State University. Mr. Ruckelshaus said:

"The director must be able to conceptualize how the FBI fits into our societal fabric at any given historical moment. He must recognize the permissible limits of investigative techniques—what is permissible in wartime or times of extreme emergency is impermissible when the threat to our country's security is minimal—and he must communicate forcefully those limits to FBI agents. Needless to say, this takes an individual of considerable capacity."

"Further, the necessity to America of our major Federal law enforcement agency's not exceeding a wise exercise of its power is too important to leave to the judgment of one man. There must be effective oversight. . . . in my opinion neither the legislative nor the executive oversight or check is sufficient today and needs to be strengthened."

Mr. Ruckelshaus is exactly right. A long list of questions about the future of the FBI has accumulated as a result of Mr. Hoover's long, idiosyncratic reign, the unhappy tenure of L. Patrick Gray III, and recent revelations about the surveillance, undercover adventures, and bureaucratic infighting which various FBI operatives have carried on over the years. All of these matters have taken their toll in terms of misuse of resources, abuses of authority, and erosions of public confidence. If the agency is now to be restored to a position of trust and effectiveness, its mission must be redefined and recognized as redefined in ways which will ensure the wise exercise of the enormous police power which the Federal Government commands.

The central issue is that of control. The FBI has now experienced a stretch of autonomous, autocratic rule under Mr. Hoover, and a brief swing to subservience to partisan interests on the part of Mr. Gray. Somewhere between those two extremes is a middle ground which combines professional independence with legitimate accountability to Congress, the President, and the Attorney General. No aspect of reconstruction is more important than establishing the agency firmly on that rational middle ground.

Mr. Kelley and the Congress should also come to grips with the problem of what Mr. Ruckelshaus called "the permissible limits of investigative techniques." This is more than a matter of whether the FBI should

plant agents provocateurs or engage in burglary to collect information. There is, first, the strategic issue of what the Bureau ought to investigate—whether a single agency should continue to have the dual mission of probing Federal crimes and gathering political or national security intelligence as well. There is also the perennial question of techniques, which is a matter of both tactical detail and overriding principle. Mr. Kelley's views on investigative methods, especially intelligence and communications systems, should be explored in detail, precisely because in Kansas City he has pioneered in using advanced technology in areas where legal restraints are new or incomplete.

The issues of goals and governance now facing the FBI are so basic that no Director, however competent, should be expected or allowed to resolve them by himself. The Congress, which has all too often acquiesced in the doings of FBI directors, should now assert itself to provide direction and an overall design—to spell out, or more likely to hash out, what kind of Federal law enforcement agency is required and how the rights and liberties of American citizens should be protected in the process. President Nixon, the Attorney General, and Mr. Kelley should welcome clear statements of congressional intent and should cooperate in developing whatever new laws and guidelines are desirable to bolster the FBI's integrity and effectiveness. It is a major assignment, and the Senate Judiciary Committee's hearings on Mr. Kelley's nomination will be the place to start.

NEW TRADE ACT OF 1973

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

MR. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I had the privilege of appearing before the House Ways and Means Committee to present my views and recommendations with regard to the President's trade proposals.

For the information of my colleagues, I would like to insert my testimony in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE BEN B. BLACKBURN BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON NEW TRADE ACT OF 1973, JUNE 14, 1973

INTRODUCTION

Those of us who must be aware of political trends in either National or International affairs recognize that a decision has been made at the top levels of both the United States and Soviet Union Governments that expanded trade between the two nations is a desirable objective. The theory has been advanced by a spokesman for the United States that through a great expansion of trade contacts between the United States and the USSR, there will evolve a "web of vested interests" in the field of economic relationships that will somehow remove the pressures of confrontation as it has existed for the past 28 years. It is further advanced that this mingling of vested interests will prove highly beneficial in meeting the balance of payments deficits which this country now faces and will create a dependable source of petroleum products as an alternative to the instabilities of the Middle East.

The purpose of my testimony is to point out what I consider to be clear indications that these top level decisions have been dictated more by political considerations than by economic considerations.

Further, it is my purpose to point out that the political considerations which have led the leadership in this country to clasp the Soviet Union to its bosom as a profitable and beneficial trading partner are not consistent with the political considerations of the So-

viet Union's leadership. The economic arguments for expanded trade with the Soviet Union are extremely questionable when viewed in the pragmatic light of experience and the realities of the world. The benefits to the Soviet Union are obvious: she will develop within the boundaries of her own geographic borders, resources which today are denied to her by reason of the backward nature of her technology and she will have developed these resources largely through the investment of American capital, capital either provided directly by the United States taxpayer or capital invested by reason of guarantees supported by the United States taxpayer. In either event, the capital is provided as a subsidy to Soviet industries with no direct or equal benefit to the United States taxpayer.

The present economic ills could be directly traced to the Bretton Woods agreements, to our unwise monetary policy, and discriminatory trade policies of our major trading partners, Japan, Canada and the European Economic Community. Consequently, the economic rationale for expansion of the so-called East-West trade is, in the best case, of secondary importance and the primacy goes to the political considerations. And there our rationale should be guided by the criteria of whether it is in the interest of the U.S. to increase the military and subversive potential of our enemy.

While it has been firm policy for this country to separate political from economic considerations in discussion on negotiations affecting trade, we must never forget that for the Soviet Government, trade is nothing more than an extension of political policy. Every student of the Soviet system of Government and economics recognizes that every aspect of life under the Soviet system is subordinate to the political considerations.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Fifty years of trade with the Soviet Union suggests that "peaceful trade" with Communist Governments is a pipe-dream. In 1918, the Bolsheviks only occupied part of Russia. They needed western supplies to consolidate and extend their control. Edwin F. Gray, Chairman of the U.S. World Trade Board, argued for trade. "Economic isolation would not bring stable government in Russia" said Gray, and "if the people of the Bolshevik sections of Russia were given the opportunity to enjoy improved economic conditions, they would themselves bring about the establishment of a moderate and stable order." How this line, 50 years later, in spite of all historical experience, still flourishes, is one of the absurdities of the age in which we live.

Trade began, and in the 1920's, over 350 western businessmen invested in Soviet concessions. When the time came for expropriation, only the favored few, such as Dr. Armand Hammer, Chairman of Occidental Petroleum Corporation, received compensation. As a matter of fact, in addition to compensation, Dr. Hammer was permitted to take with him a fortune in expropriated czarist art treasures and jewels. It is no wonder that today Dr. Hammer is one of the strongest advocates of trade with communist governments, and that Dr. Hammer's Occidental obtained a multi-billion dollar agreement with the Soviets involving oil, gas, fertilizers and tools.

American firms built the major factories of the Five-Year Plan. Henry Ford built the Gorki auto plant which today supplies trucks for the Ho Chi Minh trail. The Stalingrad and Kharkov tractor plants produced the International Harvester 15/30 model (as well as tanks). The Chelyabinsk tractor plant produced the Caterpillar 60 tractors—and tanks of U.S. Christie design. Glen Martin, Seversky, Vultee, Douglas and Curtiss-Wright provided the Soviets with technology for an aircraft industry.

RCA transferred to the Soviets "the entire field of manufacturing and experimental activities of RCA and its subsidiaries." General Electric in the U.S., and Metropolitan Vickers

in the United Kingdom gave similar assistance.

The gift of lend lease and European reparations in the 40's was followed by the trade boom of the 1950's and 1960's. Soviet jets are based on Rolls-Royce, Junkers and BMW technology.

The massive Soviet merchant marine was 70% built outside the U.S.S.R. and all its large marine diesel engines originated outside the U.S.S.R. (from Burmeister & Wain in Denmark, Fiat in Italy, MAN in Germany). Poltava class ships—with Danish engines—carried missiles to Cuba in 1962. None of the 96 Soviet ships used on the Haiphong supply run has an identified Soviet design main engine. Most came from NATO allies—Denmark and Germany.

In 1959, the Bryant Chucking Grinder Company sold 46 Centalign-B machines to the U.S.S.R. for manufacture of miniature ball bearings—almost all used in missiles. All Soviet bearings capacity was imported in the 30's and 40's: they had no ability to mass manufacture miniature bearings.

Late in 1971, the Nixon Administration issued \$1 billion in export licenses for the Kama truck plant—the largest plant in the world—to produce 150,000 multi-axle trucks per year. There is no indigenous Soviet truck technology. A U.S. government interagency committee has concluded that multi-axle trucks are essential for war; and the Commerce Department publicly acknowledges these findings.

In brief, major American and European firms—with the knowledge and assistance of their governments—have provided the technology for the Soviet economy. Soviet technology is either imported or duplicated from imported models. A decade-long search has identified only a handful of Soviet innovations.

In direct contradiction to these findings, successive administrations have denied the impact of our technology on the Soviet military-industrial complex.

For example, in 1931 Senator Smoot queried the State Department about export of aluminum powder technology (used in explosives). An international State Department memorandum now tells us why no reply was ever made to the Senator:

"No reply was made to Senator Smoot by the Department, as the Secretary did not desire to indicate that the Department had no objections to the rendering by Mr. Hahn of technical assistance to the Soviet authorities in the production of aluminum powder, in view of the possibility of its use as a war material, and preferred to take no position at the time in regard to the matter."

In 1961, another Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, made the following statement to Congress:

". . . it would seem clear that the Soviet Union derives only the most marginal help in its economic development from the amount of U.S. goods it receives."

Then a State Department publication—presumably after investigation by its research bureau—hopefully claimed the U.S.S.R. had a "self-developed technology." In fact, there is no such thing as Soviet technology. Almost all—perhaps 90 to 95%—came directly or indirectly from the United States and its allies.

The present Administration opines vaguely about "peaceful trade" in agricultural commodities, consumer goods, capital equipment, and "know-how", but avoids the topic of risks involved in technological transfers to the Soviets and Red China.

Trucks will move ammunition or food. Computers will control a population, calculate missile orbits, as well as more peaceful equations. A ship will haul missiles or wheat. A printing press will produce truthful or propaganda material.

For 100,000 Americans and countless Allied soldiers, in Korea and Viet-Nam, "peaceful trade" has been the trade of death.

THE NATURE OF ADMINISTRATION'S NEW ECONOMIC POLICY

The present euphoria on East-West trade started with two important events: one was Mr. Nixon's trip to Mainland China and the other was the announcement of \$750 million grain "deal" with the Soviet Government. These two events were followed by the lifting of the ban on trade with the communist government of Mainland China and liberalization of trade and conditions necessary for trade with the Soviet Union. The political rationale behind these events is obviously based on a "web of vested interest." Other administration spokesmen have repeated the same theme, advocating the creation of "vested economic interests in peace" even while ideological rivalries continue. Although the enthusiasts proclaim that economics has become the leading factor in resolving international tensions, the trade is surely but the ratification of political decisions based on a confluence of U.S.-Soviet interest in Viet-Nam, China, Berlin, SALT, MFBR and European security.

This is the key. American policy for years took an ambiguous view of how much trade and economic cooperation was feasible, while Cold War tensions continued. Businessmen who went to Washington with plans, ideas and demands for trade expansion were turned away with the admonition that it wasn't yet time.

Well, apparently, the time has clearly come, and it is being proclaimed and promoted from the housetops. The Administration is promoting what has been hailed as "the contagion of confidence."

It is obvious that our grand design for "a generation of peace" is based on a desire for a stable detente among the world powers which in turn would be based on the desire for balance of power.

All these foreshadow the great interest in increased East-West trade by officials of the U.S. Government, traditional proponents of East-West trade, and considerable segment of the American business community.

POTENTIAL FOR EAST-WEST TRADE

If we all lived in a free world, which we obviously do not, the potential for East-West trade, considering the territory, population and natural resources of the Soviet Union, its satellites and Red China, would obviously be enormous. However, under the existing realities of the world in which we live and despite the substantial potential of extension of trade, the economic relationship with any particular communist governed countries is subject to the disappearance of the communist power constraint.

Under the existing conditions, the trade projections for U.S. exports to U.S.S.R., Eastern Europe, and especially Red China, are very modest.

The recent studies by the Department of Commerce, the State Department and other governmental agencies, reach the same basic conclusion as far as the projected U.S. export to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are concerned.

Under present conditions, they have estimated that U.S. exports to the U.S.S.R. in 1978 would amount to \$295.4 million. However, under "normalized" conditions, estimated 1973 U.S. exports to the U.S.S.R. should reach a figure of \$536.8 million. On the other hand, estimated 1978 figures for U.S. exports to the U.S.S.R. under "normalized" conditions would be \$683 million and under most optimistic estimates \$1,056,000,000.—Excludes any possible grain deals of the type concluded in July, 1972, whose nature and causes prevent them from being estimated. For the actual 1973 under "normalized" conditions, approximately \$425 million should be added to the estimates.

The trade projections for U.S. exports to Eastern Europe look somewhat different. While estimated 1978 exports to Eastern Europe under present conditions project a figure of \$526.3 million, the estimated 1973

U.S. exports to Eastern Europe under "normalized" conditions should reach the figure of \$1,017,000,000. The estimated 1978 U.S. exports to Eastern Europe under "normalized" conditions are expected to be \$1,371,000,000.

If we consider the total U.S. exports to the rest of the world in 1972, the communist countries' share of \$49.2 billion of U.S. exports was only 2%. The trade projections for U.S. exports to the U.S.S.R. under "normalized" conditions forecast only slight improvements in the communist countries' share of U.S. exports. The U.S. imports from major world areas in 1972 indicates that communist countries' share was an insignificant 1%. The trade projections for future U.S. imports from the U.S.S.R. also suggest very slight improvement. As far as Eastern Europe is concerned, the situation is somewhat better, while Red China, despite its size and needs ranks a poor third among communist countries.

In 1971, U.S. total exports to the rest of the world were about \$42 billion. From that sum, only \$160 million worth of exports were designated to the U.S.S.R. In 1971, the visible import of goods from the rest of the world into the United States was roughly \$45 billion, in particular the imports from the Soviet Union amounted to about \$68 million. If we take a look at the GNP per head in the Soviet Union, we will find out that according to the official Soviet figures, it is 42% of that in the United States. However, this is true only if we are prepared to accept Soviet figures at their face value. We must bear in mind that the strange accounting method used by the Soviet central planners does not consider either the quality of their economic output or the depreciation of the capital equipment. Consequently, it becomes obvious that their GNP figures are irrelevant for the purpose of estimating the trade potential with the Soviet Union. What really counts is the purchasing power of the Soviet citizens, which is insignificantly trivial as far as its implications for trade expansion are concerned.

In 1972, the total value of the United States exports to the U.S.S.R. was \$540 million. However, 58% of this amount consisted of U.S. grain exports (\$369 million). It is interesting to note that during the same period of time, \$250 million, which in proportion to the population of Poland (33 million) represents considerably larger trade transactions than the trade with the Soviet Union. We find an almost analogous situation in the case of commercial relations with Czechoslovakia.

Let us examine the trade with Red China. In 1971, that trade amounted to zero. In 1972, the sale of wheat to Mainland China amounted to \$39 million, while the total trade with the Red Chinese government was only \$44 million.

If we list the Chinese GNP, using the most favorable figures supplied by the United Nations, we find that the country with a population of some 780 million people has a GNP equivalent to Italy's (which has a population of 54 million), which is certainly not an economic giant by any means.

The other Western countries, and Japan, have a much greater stake in international trade in general than the U.S. Consequently their trade policies, which could be characterized by "balance of payments surplus syndrome," play a considerable role in tailoring their foreign economic policy including the one toward Communist bloc countries.

Two leading Western countries, as far as the trade with the Communist governments is concerned, are West Germany and Japan. West Germany was, and still is, the largest single trading partner of East Germany. Half of all East German imports from the West originates in West Germany.

Japan, on the other hand, has a sizeable commercial interest in trade with Red China. If we scrutinize the Red Chinese imports, we will find that a third of all imports comes from Japan, while West Germany provides 16% of Red China's imports. It is worth stressing that the United Kingdom sells to

the Netherlands, with a population of 12 million, ten times more than she sells to Red China.

If one includes Yugoslavia in East-West trade figures, one will observe that in spite of a relatively low GNP for the country, Yugoslavian trade with the West comes up as quite sizeable in comparison with the trade figures of the other Communist governments. Someone might ask why should there be a noticeable difference in the trade between Western countries and Yugoslavia, particularly when we consider the relatively low GNP in Yugoslavia as compared to other Communist governed countries. There is no argument but that the healthier trade relationship with Yugoslavia is a direct result of more liberal attitudes by the Yugoslavian government toward its own internal and external economic policies.

ITEMS OF PRESENT TRADE

The types of commodities exchanged in the East-West transactions are rather typical. For instance, pig bristles are shipped from Red China to the United Kingdom (the same type of commodity China has exported to the West since the 19th century), antiques and foodstuffs to the rest of the world.

The typical exports from the Soviet Union consist of raw materials, some basic commodities, and a tiny trifle of manufactured goods; among raw materials the most pronounced are chrome (displacing Rhodesian chrome on Western market), natural gas, and some oil. To this list of Soviet exports, we should add the following items: gold, some platinum, diamonds, furs, and of course vodka.

As far as Western exports to the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and Red China are concerned, the capital equipment played the paramount role. The United States' exports to the U.S.S.R. primarily consist of non-electric and electric machinery, electric apparatus and appliances, chemical elements and compounds, transportation equipment, fountains, various licenses, and production systems.

The West European and Japanese exports to the Communist governments are also characterized by high technology items. In recent years, one could have observed numerous transfers of entire plants from Western European countries and Japan to the Eastern bloc countries and Red China. Among these transfers, the interesting examples were Fiat's Tolyatti automobile plant in the Soviet Union (involving considerable financing by the U.S. Export-Import Bank because transferred technology was of American origin), British Imperial Chemical Industry's investment into a chemical plant in the Soviet Union, COTOS fiber plant transfer to the Soviet Union, a number of French exports involving chemical plants and equipment designated for the Soviet Union, and West German exports of electronic and chemical plants and equipment to the Soviet Union.

The Nature of Trade

The trade between free countries, in the first place, is characterized by the economic consideration and criteria. The Western countries trade on the basis of comparative advantage (comparative costs), and on the basis of international division of labor. However, neither of the two criteria, and therefore economic underlining factors, comes clearly as a motivation force in dealing with the Communist governments. The history of so-called East-West trade provided sufficient empirical evidence that the commercial relationships with the East based on purely economic considerations is simply impossible. The Communist governments refuse the trade based either on comparative costs or on international division of labor; they also refuse to make their currencies convertible; but rather they engage in the barter trade which requires fixed deals. It should be obvious that barter trade renders inoperative the principle of comparative cost in the production of goods as well as the principle of international division of labor which under-

lies trade governed by market forces. Barter transactions can only have an adverse effect on the proper functioning of the market in those areas in which the Soviets buy or sell.

FINANCING THE TRADE WITH COMMUNIST GOVERNMENTS

A. Government Financing. In order to generate the trade between East and West the Western Governments, including Japan, must finance, guarantee, and insure big contracts involving sale of capital and intermediate goods to the Soviet Union and other Communist ruled countries.

The financial terms under which the East-West trade takes place are an interesting economic curiosity. To generate exports each of the Western governments has established a financial institution analogous to the U.S. Export-Import Bank, which makes long-term loans at less than the prevailing market rate of interest. The United Kingdom has its Export Credit Guarantee Department, Japan has its Export-Import Bank, Western Germany also has a corresponding financial institution, and of course France is not without a state bank which finances its exports. The financing of the above institutions generally involves a direct authorization from the Treasury of the countries involved followed by authority of the institution itself to borrow funds on the open markets. In the case of the Export-Import Bank, the borrowings of that institution are guaranteed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government.

This is a subsidy for the lending institution since the guarantee allows borrowings at less than current market rates. In many instances, loans by private lending institutions are guaranteed against loss by the government lending institution. These guarantees are themselves subsidies to the extent that the lender is relieved of a risk which he would either take into account by setting higher interest rates, or by requiring the borrower to secure acceptable insurance to protect against such risk. In the assumption of such risks it is the taxpayer through the respective governments involved who is ultimate insurer.

By guaranteeing and insuring contracts involving transfer of capital and technology, transferring of intermediate goods, even trade in agricultural products, the governments of the involved Western nations assume upon themselves the risks of default on the part of the Communist governments. It goes without emphasizing that whatever risk is assumed by the involved government, automatically the same risk becomes a liability of the citizens of that country.

B. Private financing. Western banks that have been scrambling to establish themselves in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe by offering cut-rate loans, have been criticized by Gabriel Hauge, Chairman of Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company, who last week assailed such efforts as "dubious banking". As an example, I would like to mention the Banca Commerciale Italiana, which contracted to lend the Soviet Union \$300 million only $\frac{1}{2}\%$ above the floating Eurodollar loan rate.

Another bank involved in lending to the Soviet Union is the Chase Manhattan Bank, practiced in lending based on the "erosion of margins." In other words, the Chase Manhattan Bank has offered rate concessions to the Soviet Union and other East bloc countries to finance exports. According to S. Yasukovich, managing director of White, Weld's London based investment banking affiliate, such deals "apparently gave the Russians the idea that they could obtain a large syndicated loan at these rates."

The most recent inquiries with Chase Manhattan Bank failed to produce any information on the nature of most recent lendings to the Soviet Union of \$86 million to help finance construction of the world's largest truck foundry, to be located on the Kama River.

The Soviets and other East bloc countries

can make good deals in the Eurodollar market. In the short-term market, they can borrow at virtually the London interbank rate (currently 8.7% for 6 months money). "Banks over here are liquid, and there is a temptation to try to make a loan anywhere," says George Yurchyshny of the London office of the First Bank of Boston.

Consequently, the East Europe countries can still negotiate attractive rates for long-term loans. Poland, for example, has been at the Eurodollar well seven times already this year for a total of \$230 million. The First National Bank of Boston recently participated in one such deal—a \$30 million, 7-year loan to Poland's Bank Handlowy Warszawie. The rate: just $\frac{1}{2}\%$ above the Eurodollar floating rate.

Financial sources in London said that the Soviets have already borrowed as much as \$1 billion in the last year in unannounced loans from individual banks. Moscow needs about another \$1 billion to finance the grain buying for 1972-73.

The Soviets are said to be negotiating simultaneously with several banks in Europe and the United States for various loans in amounts up to \$200 million or \$300 million each. But, according to informed financial sources, Moscow would prefer a single loan of \$1 billion from a consortium of Western banks.

The London Reports said that some banks have declined to participate because of the low interest rates. But banks trying to get into Soviet trade finance or to open offices in Moscow are said to be more amenable.

Consequently, the narrow margins are likely to continue as long as the Western banks remain anxious to get into the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Yurchyshny explains First Boston's rationale: "It was more a marketing gesture than anything. We do want to develop a business in Poland. We cannot pack up our tents and go home for two years hoping that the market will get better."

SOVIET CREDIT WORTHINESS

An interesting argument of the advocates of East-West trade in general, and those who favor credits to the Soviet Union and other communist governments in particular, is, for them, the "intriguing" phenomenon that the Soviet Union "never" defaulted on its financial obligations. If we scrutinize the existing situation in regard to the Soviet credit worthiness, it is imperative to discover the actual situation which is far from being that which the advocates of East-West trade maintain.

At present, there is a long-term outstanding debt, on the part of the Soviet government, of \$385 million of principal and interest dating back to the early 1910s. It is worth noting that despite the fact that a United States government agency, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, has officially reported that the U.S.S.R. owes United States nationals (on unpaid awards) over \$120 million, which the U.S.S.R. does not even acknowledge. Additionally, the U.S.S.R. owes United States investors the principal and interest on the dollar-bond debt, as well as the U.S. Government, the Kerensky government debt, which was on the order of \$100 million, plus interest since 1918.

The dollar-bond debt of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes has been acknowledged by the successor-Yugoslav communist government, which has been paying interest on those dollar-bonds for many years; more recently, the FBPC negotiated with the present communist government of Poland and the latter have agreed to certain reduced interest payments on the dollar-bonds issued by its predecessor, the Republic of Poland, and have further agreed to negotiate a complete settlement of that old dollar-bond debt within the next 18 months. Both the communist Hungarian government and the communist Rumanian government have promised in writing (to the U.S. State Depart-

ment) to negotiate settlements of their dollar-bond obligations as soon as they are able to do so.

The Government of the Peoples Republic of China has just settled a debt with the Canadian Government incurred by private businesses of Nationalist China prior to 1948.

Lend-lease exports to the Soviet Union during World War II totaled over \$11 billion in 1941-1945. The terms of lend-lease agreements require the recipient countries to pay for material accepted after hostilities officially ended. In 1952, the United States asked the U.S.S.R. for \$800 million in settlement. In 1972, at the time Secretary of Commerce Peter Petersen, announced the agreement between Soviet representatives and representatives of the United States' government of the lend-lease settlement in an amount of \$722 million, to be paid by the year ending July 1, 2001.

The agreement allows the Soviet Union to take up to four deferments. However, in the agreement, between U.S. government and the Government of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics requiring settlement of lend-lease, reciprocal aid and claims, signed on October 18, 1972, by Secretary of State, William P. Rogers and Soviet Minister of Foreign Trade, N. Patolichov, the Soviets were successful to linking receiving of the Most Favored Nation status with payment of lend-lease debt. In other words, if the Congress refuses to grant the Soviet Union the MFN status they will not pay any part of the World War II lend-lease debt. Mr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt, one of our chief negotiators in Moscow, and at present Under Secretary of the Treasury, in his recent testimony, before the Senate Finance Committee, has confirmed this.

Between 1822 and 1914, Russia borrowed an estimated \$4.8 billion from private investors in Europe on 114 issues of bonds, most of them payable in non-Russian money, especially in French francs and British sterling. Most of the loans had gold clauses. Seventy-nine of the bond issues were to raise money for the Russian state railroads or to finance nationalization of private Russian railroads. Forty-three railroad systems and eight city governments participated in the borrowing. The cities were Astrakhan, Baku, Kiev, Moscow, Nicolaev, Perm, St. Petersburg and Saratov. These external debts were defaulted.

The Soviet government repudiated all obligations of the predecessor Czarist State by a retroactive decree issued February 8, 1918. A further default occurred when in 1940 the Soviet government dishonored its own external obligations by discontinuing interest payments on British sterling notes issued by the Soviets in 1932 and 1934 to dispossess the owners of Lena Gold Fields, Ltd., a Siberian enterprise, and owners of Tetiuhue Mining Corporation. Spokesmen for Soviet Russia, including its founder, Lenin, repeatedly expressed a willingness to honor the external debt of the predecessor regime providing payment on the old debt could be arranged within the Soviets' capacity to pay, and provided further, that long-term credits were made to the Soviet Union from abroad. This official attitude was renewed at international conferences at Geneva and The Hague in 1922, and in negotiations with the French government from 1924 to 1927, and again in 1933. In 1956, new negotiations of like kind broke down.

A further analysis of Soviet credit and debt handling discloses that the credits obtained and debts incurred during the past decade manifests a more sophisticated pattern in Soviet strategy in quest for credit. The first criteria for incurring indebtedness, analogous to the previous patterns, was that it had to be long-term credits (that is, commercial credits ranging from 8 to 15 years). Their second criteria was to obtain an interest rate considerably below the on-going market interest rate. It goes without saying that this type of arrangement equals subsidy on the

part of credit-providing sources (the Western governments).

Third, using various kinds of pressures, they were able to compel creditors to accept raw materials in the form of payments.

Fourth, and last but not least, using governmental power, threats and insinuations about defaulting on existing obligations, they were always able to coerce the creditors to re-extend, again on long terms, the existing long-term indebtedness. The European bankers and their governments, afraid of losing face before their public and business community, were willing to oblige the Soviets in order to save face.

A will-o-the-wisp record shows that the sellers are hit by endless consolations, arbitrary rejections of products, outrageous downward contract price adjustments, and outright repudiations of terms. Moreover, despite the 10-, 12- and 15-year payment provisions, creditors have had to suffer losses from current obligations of the Soviet government or its agencies.

That is what is happening to the West Germans. West Germany graciously exported to the Soviet Union and the Communist controlled countries of Eastern Europe more than \$1 billion in goods and capital during 1970. The collection problem has now reached a crisis. In fact, it was a significant factor in the financial problems of the giant Krupp enterprises.

The MontiEdison Industrial conglomerate of Italy is the largest single enterprise of that country. It is controlled by the Italian Government because the majority of its stock is owned by the Government, although private investors also own stock in that enterprise. As early as 1967 MontiEdison entered into a joint venture with the Soviet Government to begin the production of electrical machinery in the Soviet Union. Capital equipment was exported from Italy to the Soviet Union and financed by MontiEdison for the purpose of carrying out the joint venture. It is not known the amount of credits that were extended but it is known that the Soviet Government defaulted on payments of the loan. Today, MontiEdison would be incapable of continuing operations except for heavy subsidy financing by the Italian Government. This crisis was brought about because of the failure of the Soviet Government to complete its part of the joint venture and make payments as contracted.

We are all familiar with the construction by Fiat of an automobile factory in the Soviet Union. The plant is known as the Soviet Tolati automobile plant and involves a \$1 billion loan commitment from various sources, including a \$80 million loan from the U.S. Export-Import Bank. The automobile plant has not been as successful as contemplated. The Soviets had agreed as part of their commitment to the plant to supply certain parts to be used in the assembly of the completed automobiles. The Soviets failed to meet the commitment. Whether the failures were due to a lack of Soviet technology or mismanagement is not important to our discussion. What is important is that the failure did occur and as a result, Fiat was compelled to borrow an additional \$162 million in order to fabricate components in its Italian plant to be shipped to Russia for the assembly of completed Tolati automobiles. The solvency of Fiat can well be endangered if the Soviets are unable or unwilling to make good their original commitment. Again, the important consideration is the fact of the failure of the Soviet Government to meet a contractual obligation.

One of the first West German companies to feel the pain of joining in with the Soviet Government in industrial enterprises was the giant Krupp enterprises. This firm, having been one of the oldest and largest steel manufacturers in the world prior to and after World Wars I and II, began entering into a series of joint ventures with the Soviet Union and Poland in the late 1950s.

The ventures called for the construction by Krupp of steel and diesel engine manufacturing facilities within the Soviet Union. Krupp was to be paid by the receipt of a portion of the goods produced with the thought that Krupp could recoup its investment and make a profit by the sale in western markets of the goods received by them. Soviet deliveries of goods were never on schedule, never in the quantities anticipated by Krupp, and of dismal quality with the result that they were not marketable in western markets. Not only was Krupp disappointed in the quality and quantity of its share of the goods produced, but financing extended to the Soviets by Krupp as part of the overall transactions was never paid on time. The combination of these failures in the joint ventures today finds Krupp Enterprises near collapse. This is hardly an encouraging recommendation for American businessmen who are today being led to believe that joint ventures with the Soviet Government have great hope for financial reward.

The examples above of disappointments by Western nations and Western firms in dealing with the Soviet Union should not be treated as isolated incidents unrelated to the American experience. To come more close to home and more recent in date, a reference to the Soviet grain purchase last year is appropriate.

THE COSTS OF THE SOVIET GRAIN "DEAL"

The huge grain sales to the Soviet Union resulted in a wide variety of costs which can be classified into the following categories:

1. Costs to the Consumers.
2. Costs to the Taxpayers.
3. Costs to the Economy as a Whole.
4. Political Costs to the United States.
5. Costs to the Free Economies.

COSTS TO THE CONSUMERS

According to the figures supplied by the Comptroller General, Elmer B. Staats, the massive grain sales to the Soviet Union raised domestic prices of wheat from about \$1.63 per bushel in July of 1972, to \$2.49 a bushel in September of the same year. CBS News has computed the total cost to the American consumers for the 9-month period starting July 1972, and according to these figures, the total costs to the consumer for the purchase of bread and other flour-based products as a result of the Soviet wheat deal, will be at least \$300 million, and that is a conservative estimate. As far as beef and pork (and beef and pork-based products) are concerned, the additional costs the American consumers will have to absorb during the same 9-month period is \$1.2 billion in order to eat the amount of meat that he has been consuming. However, the actual increase in food prices imperatively adds an additional 12 per cent to the combined figure of \$1.5 billion.

The cost of feed grain plays a large role in determining the price of poultry, eggs, and dairy products. The increase in those prices vary from 12 to 25 per cent, and that adds for the 9-month period—an additional cost to the consumer of about \$800 million.

COSTS TO THE TAXPAYERS

The direct subsidy for the Soviet grain deal, at the expense of the American taxpayers, exceeded \$300 million. The subsidy for the transportation of grain, so far, has amounted to over \$400 million. This figure coincides with that estimated by CBS News.

COSTS TO THE ECONOMY AS A WHOLE

These are the most difficult to estimate because they reflect a variety of costs and factors which are extremely intricate in nature. Some of them, such as market distortions, transportation tie-ups, and loss of good will with established customers for agricultural products (for instance, Japan) are almost impossible to measure.

The grain deal has been financed with a credit of \$750 million by the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) at 6 1/2% interest, repayable in three years. The interest rate is lower than what it cost the U.S. Treasury

to borrow in the market place. By contrast, the Treasury is paying 6 1/2% and 6 3/4% on recent market borrowings.

The freight rates on the railroads increased by about 10% and, in addition, the economy experienced the most acute railroad car shortage in the history of the American railroads. This shortage in the Midwest resulted in the shortage of some rail carried products, such as fuel oil. The overburdening of the transportation system with transportation of grain for the Soviet Union, resulted in delayed deliveries of numerous industrial products from steel and machinery to various component parts for a variety of industrial commodities.

Another cost to the economy resulting from the Soviet grain deal is the increased price of agricultural machinery. The increase has been reported to be about 10 per cent.

National and independent bakers are complaining because wheat shipments to the Soviet Union have resulted in a price surge at home. The price surge at home resulted in the increase of the price of flour the bakers buy. This resulted in a large number of bankruptcies among the independent bakers which, so far, have cost ten thousand people their jobs. For example, the added annual cost of one particular enterprise—American bakeries—is estimated at \$9.2 million over the 12-month period starting August 1972.

For the farmers, the cost of the Soviet grain "deal" was at least \$120 million by September 1972—both because they sold wheat too early (spring of 1972 which is usual) to benefit from higher prices and more importantly, because the higher prices cut the subsidy available to many Southwestern farmers.

If we sum up the cost of the Soviet grain deal to the American public, then we reach a sum which for the 9-month period exceeds \$32 billion.

POLITICAL COSTS TO THE UNITED STATES

The lack of any political trade-offs in regard to the Soviet Union could be clearly defined as a political cost.

The fight against inflation failed primarily because of increases in food prices which are directly associated with the Soviet grain deal. While the increase in the Consumer Price Index was at the annual rate of about 5%, the increase in food averaged (for the same period) some 25%. This is a clear indication that the fight against inflation might have been completely successful had it not been for the Soviet grain deal. The increase in food prices is primarily responsible for the present inflation hysteria around the Congress and the country as a whole. The consequences of it for the welfare of the United States and its economy are not difficult to foresee; distorted markets; large

economy fluctuations; and all this due to irrational behavior on both the supply and demand side.

COSTS TO THE FREE ECONOMIES

The cost to the free economies primarily take the form of distortion effects on the market forces, both within the financial market and markets for agricultural products. In financial markets the market interest rate is suppressed by Soviet absolute demand monopoly and ability to use political power for the purpose of coercion. In agricultural markets, strongly fluctuating and suddenly exaggerated demands for the grain stuff, and playing competitors on the supply side against each other, resulted in tremendous distortions on prices and supply. And both elements, distortions in financial and agricultural markets, are responsible for highly negative influence on the World economy.

MAJOR WESTERN CREDITS OBTAINED BY USSR SINCE 1964

For the past eight years Western companies have been trading with the USSR on the basis of credits advanced by Western banks or governments in order to finance the deals. Unfortunately, no complete list of such credit operations has yet become available, but some of the major deals which are known to have taken place already are outlined below; others are still in the pipeline, but not yet firm.

Years	Company or country	Amount	Repayment period (years)	Interest rate (percent)
1964-69	Great Britain	234 billion rubles	10-15	1 NA
1964-69	Italy	379 million rubles	10-14	2 1/2
1964-69	France	463 million rubles	10-12	3 1/2
1966	Fiat, Italy	330 million rubles	14	4 1/2
1964-69	Austria	88 million rubles	10	4 NA
1969	ENI-IRI, Italy	\$280 million	5	6
1969	Thyssen, Mannesmann, Germany	1.2 billion DM	10	6
1972	Swindell-Dressler, U.S.A.	\$20 million	Not applicable	7 1/2
1972	Caterpillar Tractor, U.S.A.	\$68 million	do	8 1/2
1972	Korff, Salzgitter, Lurgi	450 million DM	do	8 1/2
1972	International Harvester, U.S.A.	\$46 million	do	10 1/2
1972	Great Britain	£200 million	2	5
1972	Continental Cargill and others, U.S.A.	£750 million	3	6
1972	Bison Werke, Teamwood International and Salzgitter, A.G., Germany	£50 million	5	6
1972	French-American Bank, N.Y. and other U.S. banks	\$100 million	10	11 1/2
1972	Alliance Tool & Die, Atlas Fabricators, U.S.A.	\$35 million	10	11 1/2
1972	Simon-Carves, Redman, Heenan, H. H. Robertson, United Kingdom	£6 million	8 1/2	6
1972	Export-Import Bank, U.S.A.	\$100 million	Not applicable	10 1/2
1973	Consortium of European Banks	\$1 billion	do	11 NA
1973	U.S. Export-Import Bank	\$202.4 million	12	10 1/2
1973	Exim Bank	\$350 million	12	10 1/2
1973	El Paso, Bechtel, Occidental, U.S.A.	\$7 billion	5	11 1/2

¹ Vneshnyaya Torgovlya, May 1970.

² Politique Hebdo, Oct. 8, 1970.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Vneshnyaya Torgovlya, May 1970.

⁶ Financial Times, Dec. 11, 1969.

⁷ Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 20, 1972.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Die Welt, Oct. 14, 1972.

¹⁰ UPI, Aug. 16, 1972.

¹¹ Reuter, July 20, 1972, Economist, Aug. 5, 1972.

¹² Muenchner Merkur, July 10, 1972, Washington Post, Nov. 10, 1972.

¹³ Financial Times, July 7, 1972.

¹⁴ Financial Times, Nov. 10, 1972.

¹⁵ Reuter, June 19, 1972, Journal of Commerce, Aug. 21, 1972.

¹⁶ Financial Times, July 21, 1972.

¹⁷ UPI, Oct. 30, 1972.

¹⁸ Washington Post, May 10, 1973.

¹⁹ Wall Street Journal, Mar. 9, 1973.

²⁰ Wall Street Journal, May 31, 1973.

²¹ Financial Times, Nov. 4, 1972.

THE POSSIBLE IMPACT OF U.S.-U.S.S.R. TRADE ON THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS OF THE U.S.

Our studies on Soviet-American trade prospects over the next ten years strongly suggests the following conjectures on the impact of this trade on the balance of payments:

a. The Soviets are unresponsive to most market criteria—but are not unresponsive to balance of payments troubles. They cannot run into large deficits with the U.S.—except in the case of barter agreements.

b. Accordingly they will try to control imports and push certain exports here—like diamonds, non-ferrous materials, furs, (oil and gas will come into consideration only after the mid 1980's).

c. The Soviets may use more aggressive methods than before to push their products in Western Europe, Japan and other currency convertible areas including the U.S. They may use American consultants, set up enterprises based on co-participation for producing for U.S. markets, etc.

Eventually, U.S. purchases of Soviet goods may reach a quarter to half a million dollars annually (before large imports of Soviet oil).

U.S. exports. Only U.S. credits could encourage Soviet imports other than sporadic grain purchases. Such credits would be needed for: (A) entire production facilities ("turnkey" projects); (B) long-term licensing agreements; (C) direct investments in the U.S.S.R. (e.g., for the exploration and exportation of oil and gas).

Since credits and insurance for such projects involve periods longer than five years, no private firm would be ready to engage in these operations without a U.S. government guarantee. (The guarantee against uncertainties would reduce the interest rates paid by the Soviets, but would imply a U.S. Government subsidy equivalent to a government to government aid, since all Soviet firms are state-owned).

According to our estimates, the Soviet Union could increase its imports to rough-

ly 1.5 to 2 billion dollars per year during the second half of the 1970's—with possible repayments starting in the middle in the form of oil and gas shipments.

Impact on the U.S. balance of payments. It is our feeling that such exports would have an unfavorable impact on our balance of payments—which now runs a deficit likely to grow unless the energy problem is dealt with imaginatively. Adding higher inconvertible long-term promissory bonds from the U.S.S.R. for the bilateral export surplus would further weaken the U.S. international reserves and payments position since U.S. exports are diverted from earning convertible currency.

One may finally note that:

a. The volatility of the Soviet market and of its demand patterns would further affect adversely our general trade;

b. Pressures from Western European countries that the U.S.S.R. straighten out its balance of payments problems with them (i.e., increase Soviet imports from these countries

rather than from the U.S.) are likely to increase;

c. The danger of sharp Soviet reversals will increase: 20 or 40 year agreements are easily talked about by the Soviets, but are just as easily broken by them (let us not forget their "unbreakable eternal friendship" with China, Yugoslavia, etc.). The indebtedness of a big country to another does not always guarantee political peace.

If the Soviets honor the proposed peace-time lend-lease which is now under consideration with the same degree of obligation that they honor their World War II lend-lease obligations, the picture is indeed a dismal one for the American businessman, the American consumer, and the American taxpayer.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Careful scrutiny of Soviet internal and external policies clearly suggests that there were no significant changes in Soviet long established practices. The Soviet Union is still a police state and its long-term objective is to establish the Soviet Union as the unparallel world power. In fact, the Brezhnev strategy is designed to use Moscow's new relationship with America as a double-edged sword toward that end.

The Kremlin needs and wants the help of American know-how in solving Soviet problems of industrial backwardness and its lag in technological advance. The Soviets are anxious for assurance that they will be able to get American grain when their abysmally inefficient agricultural system failed again. Politically, they would like to have the U.S. support in neutralizing their Communist adversary, Red China, and in stabilizing East Europe.

On one side the Soviet leaders see in the aura of good feeling the best opportunity so far to solving the Soviet's tremendous domestic problems and perhaps eventually achieving economic stature equal to that of America—just as the Soviets have reached a balance of nuclear power with the United States.

With the other of his two cutting edges, Brezhnev probably reasons that in an atmosphere of warmth and cooperation there is a chance of gradually tilting the political balance among U.S. allies toward the Soviet Union.

Domestically, despite its assurance to the contrary, the Soviet Union is suppressing the rights of its people in spite of some paragraphs in the Soviet Constitution which suggest that certain rights of its citizens are guaranteed. For instance, the persecution of Soviet Jews, who wish to immigrate to Israel is the most flagrant example of violation of basic human rights. For years the Soviet Union has been practicing a trade with human beings charging the Israel government \$10 thousand per head of each Jew immigrating to Israel. Today we witness a series of trials in the Soviet Union involving Jews who want to immigrate. In addition to it, many Jews are subjected to house arrest, loss of jobs, denial of medical care, and slow starvation.

The dissidents of various kinds including intellectuals, the clergy, and those who practice their religious beliefs, are sent either to concentration camps or locked into lunatic asylums.

Soviet acceptance of international copyright convention is just another method to control internal dissent, only in a more subtle way.

The Soviet propaganda against the Democratic Societies in the United States in particular is still one of the pillars of their public education.

In the international arena, we see the continuation of Soviet promotion of unrest and instability in non-Communist parts of the world. British intelligence, for instance, has established Soviet involvement in IRA and Civil War among the Irish factions. The

presence of Soviet arms, money and agents in that struggle is a fact. Furthermore, the Soviet Union is the chief supporter of North Viet Nam in spite of the fact that the Communist government of North Viet Nam is continually and flagrantly violating the peace agreement. The Soviet Union continues to finance Cuba at a rate of \$2 million a day. The pro-Communist government of Chile has received, in 1972, \$250 million in Soviet aid. Soviet support of revolutionary elements in the Middle East as well as their support of aggressive Arabic Governments is a matter of record.

During the past several years the Soviets have done everything to surpass the United States in the area of military power. The presence of Soviet fleets in the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean with its implications for the security of the free world is of paramount concern to the non-Communist countries in bordering areas. It goes without saying that the strategic consequences for the United States is obvious.

Soviet emphasis on rapid development of the SS-17, their edition to our MIRVs, and developing of sophisticated weapon systems based on laser power, clearly signifies their military and strategic objectives.

In the area of international economic relations, the Soviet Union bases its present strategy on three objectives. Namely; to obtain from the United States and developed nations of the West, advanced technology, industrial know-how and massive credits.

At the same time, its own policy with regard to its gold reserves is based on Lenin's formula; "We must save the gold in the U.S.S.R., sell it at the highest price, buy goods with it at the lowest price. When you live among wolves, you must howl like a wolf, while as for exterminating all the wolves, as should be done in a rational human society, we shall act up to the wise Russian proverb: Boast not before but after the battle.

This formula adequately explains a strange paradox being presented to the world and the American people. A country rich in gold reserves, the Soviet Union, is seeking loans from a country, the United States, whose currency is under sustained attack and whose gold reserves are woefully inadequate. The authoritative studies about the Soviet gold reserves set the latter at \$7 to \$8 billion. Inasmuch as there are no rubles outstanding which can be presented for conversion to gold, it is fair to say that the Soviet gold reserves are free and clear. It is estimated that approximately \$80 billion (U.S. dollars) are floating in the Eurodollar and other financial markets. What possible logic can be urged to support the concept that the gold-rich nation should be financed and subsidized by the nation which is experiencing a currency crisis and serious problems arising out of its inequilibrium in the balance of payments?

Mr. Brezhnev is coming to the United States to negotiate, among other things, that which is promising to turn into a breakthrough in large-scale development deals. Dr. Armand Hammer, Chairman of Occidental Petroleum, which has signed an agreement with the Soviet Government about production of fertilizers and related chemicals in the Soviet Union, was kind enough to make public that the most important of the deals involves \$7 billion project to tap natural-gas deposits and possibly other resources in Siberia.

THE BASIC SOVIET TROUBLES

The heart of the Soviet troubles today, Western experts agree, is domestic. Not internal politics or foreign-policy failures, but basic economics.

No-where are Soviet shortcomings made more apparent than when Russia is compared with the United States.

Soviet authorities themselves claim an overall economic growth of only 4 per cent last year. By U.S. standards of measurements,

the figure is closer to 0 per cent. By either reckoning, America—with a 6.4% real growth in production of goods and services—is expanding faster than the Soviet Union. U.S. gross national product for 1972 totalled \$1.2 trillion, while the Soviet gross national product was about \$300 billion.

In no other element of the economy are Soviet problems more acute than in agriculture. Soviet grain production—targeted at 195 million tons in 1972—fell, according to official Soviet figures, 27 million tons below that goal—to 168 million tons. From U.S. officials we find that even this figure may be exaggerated by as much as 33 million tons.

To forestall bread shortages and the danger of worker protests, Soviet authorities have purchased 30 million tons of grain in the West, at a cost of \$2 billion. That is equivalent to the total amount spent on manchurian imports in the past Five-Year Plan.

Other kinds of crops fared almost as badly. The vegetable harvest dropped 8% from the year before. The harvest of potatoes, a staple, plunged from 92 million tons in 1971 to 77 million tons last year. The pig population dropped drastically reflecting shortages in feed grain.

According to reports in *Pravda* and the *New York Times* during the week of March 12, 1973, numerous Soviet provinces reported shortages in bread supply. The cities of Novosibirsk, Volgograd, and Corki were among those cities that experienced the shortage of bread, and were forced to establish sales quotas of bread per household. *Pravda* also reported the shortage of bread in the Tanbow region and Bashkir Republic. During the month of March, the Soviet press was continuing numerous letters from the people in rural areas, who were complaining about the bread shortage.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The past has demonstrated that there can be changes in Moscow's tactics, manners and theatrics. But, the goal—that of attaining pre-eminent world power—never changes.

Therefore, in order to insure a defacto detente and a "generation of peace" we would like the United States Congress to consider the following recommendations. Because we believe that only by following these ideas can we be instrumental in liberalizing the Soviet society. And it goes without saying, that without liberalization of the Soviet Union there is no guarantee for our children and grandchildren that they will enjoy the "generation of peace."

We suggest that:

a. Before any long-term credits can be extended to the Soviet Union, by, or with participation of, our government, the Soviet State, as a successor government, should first be required to make settlement in full of debt claims awarded to: a.) U.S. private investors; and b.) U.S. businesses to whom awards were certified by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission in 1958-59.

b. The Soviet Government should be required to permit American corporations to invest in the Soviet economy and operate its enterprises in accordance with well-established international business criteria.

c. American financial institutions should be permitted to establish their branches in the Soviet Union and operate on its territory in accordance with long-established international financial and commercial practices.

d. Every dollar of U.S. government credits and/or U.S. government credit guarantees involving tax monies or funds raised by the Federal Government or its agencies in financial markets for the financing of commercial transactions with the Soviet Union and/or investment in joint ventures with Soviet state business enterprises must be matched by an equal amount of U.S. dollars provided by the Soviet Government.

The purpose of this provision is twofold.

First, to ascertain that the Soviets are not going to divert their resources from civilian into military areas, or to divert their resources for promotion of conflicts and subversion around the world. Second we believe that if we demand from our local governments and communities to match every federal dollar invested into their area with a local dollar, that it is only fair to apply the same criteria to the Soviet Union.

e. No transfer of American technology, relevant for the development of sophisticated weapons systems, is to be allowed, directly or indirectly, to the Soviet Union.

I believe that only with establishment of American presence on the territory of the Soviet Union and by application of sound economic and business practices, can we assure the liberalization of the Soviet system, which is the only guarantee for a meaningful detente and better world for our children.

PRESIDENT NIXON SHOULD ORDER IMMEDIATE 60-DAY EMBARGO ON THE EXPORT OF FEED GRAINS, LUMBER, SCRAP STEEL, AND OTHER CRITICAL COMMODITIES

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

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's 60-day freeze on prices is only a temporary answer to the Nation's out-of-control inflation. What the President has tried to do is simply buy us a little time to find real answers in the economic debate which has to date provided much talk and little action. At the present time I see little evidence that we will use this time wisely.

Stabilizing our economy will require curbing the wild growth of the money supply that Arthur Burn's Federal Reserve has permitted to continue unchecked for far too long. It will require the Congress and especially the President to stop spending at rates far beyond Federal tax revenues. It will necessitate that we demand the opening of foreign markets now barring our exports and the rescinding by foreign governments of illegal and anticompetitive practices designed to flood our economy with imports. None of these necessary steps will be taken or implemented soon or ever if we follow the pattern of the last 4 years.

However, I believe immediate action can be taken by the administration to reduce the price of food, housing, and automobiles.

President Nixon should at once order, concurrent with the freeze, a 60-day embargo on the export of feed grains, lumber, scrap steel and other commodities of critical importance to the consumer. Most importantly, such authority is already available to the President under existing law, namely the Export Control Act.

Mr. Speaker, we should not underestimate the power of such an embargo to reduce high prices.

By placing an embargo on feed grain exports, we could rightfully expect the retail prices of meat, bread, milk, eggs, and butter, to name a few, to be reduced as grain prices dropped. By keeping more of our lumber supply at home we would lower the price of housing and thereby increase the number of housing starts,

incidentally creating more jobs at the same time.

As for scrap steel, I have long argued that by limiting the export of this precious commodity we could make more of this valuable raw material available and lower the price of the specialty and other steel products whose increased prices have pushed up the costs of automobiles and other consumer durable goods.

This morning I discussed these policy moves with Mr. Herbert Stein, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. He indicated reluctance to advise an export embargo on these items, not because they lacked desirability, but because he felt the current language of the Export Control Act was insufficiently broad to permit this action.

Mr. Speaker, I have carefully reviewed this language in the law, and am at a loss as to why Mr. Stein would believe the President to be so restricted. Moreover, President Johnson, on more than one occasion, used this same language to control exports in his administration.

I, therefore, believe that the President would be thoroughly justified and completely within the law to embargo the export of these commodities during the period of the price freeze. In this way we can avoid the kind of inflationary pressures that built up under last year's phase 2 and were so unwise released in the abortive and bumbling phase 3 just ended.

MORE ON "WATERGATE AND ME"

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

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 9 of this year I submitted some thoughts of mine on the developing investigation into the Watergate affair under the title of "Watergate and Me."

On May 23, following the release the day before by the White House of the President's lengthy and detailed statement about Watergate, I entered some further comments of mine in the Record together with a promise to have more to say, in time, about the ramifications of that statement.

Those further comments—which I shall insert in a moment—were delivered by me on two separate occasions in my congressional district last weekend. It is, perhaps, worthy of note that they drew one front-page headline in one of our local, daily newspapers—the headline reading: "Robison Says Watergate National Disaster."

I am discovering—perhaps we are all discovering—that it is difficult to say anything at all about Watergate without making headlines. This may be one of those rare times when we—at least, we Republicans—would prefer not to make headlines. And yet, perchance, Watergate is of such substance that it has to be addressed by all of us in public office; preferably in accordance with the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln thus expressed—as the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) has recently reminded us:

Let the people know the facts and the country will be saved.

The "facts" of Watergate are being displayed to the people of America—though in a rather curious fashion. Let us go, now, overseas to the editorial comment of a recent issue of the Times of London:

The President of the United States is in the unenviable position of being tried by his fellow countrymen in three different forums, each of which has its own particular deficiencies and two of which have the power to offer freedom from prosecution to those whose evidence may accuse him.

The three forums the Times of London had in mind were the Ervin committee, in the Senate; Special Prosecutor Cox's grand jury and, of course, the American news media, including—as the Times noted: the New York Times and the Washington Post. One wonders, a bit, why our editorial friends across the Atlantic thus confined themselves to these two members of the media. But an explanation is offered, about halfway through the editorial to which I have had reference, where those two are referred to as "the most important national newspapers of the United States."

Well, in any event, the London Times does remind we Americans—as certainly someone should—that:

Senate committees are not courts; they do not have an adversary procedure; they do not have cross examination by counsel for the accused; they can take and certainly do take hearsay evidence.

This, I think, is a reminder we Americans might well endeavor to bear in mind next week when John W. Dean III, assumes his seat at the Ervin committee's witness table to present evidence which—as everyone thinks—is bound to be, at the least, sensational.

As for the media—harking back, I presume, to the headline, I myself, made—let me again quote the London Times for its constructive, further comment:

The American press, and particularly the Washington Post, deserves their full credit for forcing the Watergate affair into the open. They are however now publishing vast quantities of prejudicial matter that would be contempt under British law, which again must tend to prejudice the fair trial of any accused, or if it came to that, of the President.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to pursue this for yet a moment since, in my May 9 remarks, I suggest how heavy the burden for fairness and objectivity then lay on the American news media in attempting to bring what Abe Lincoln called the facts to the American people. The London Times had reference to what it termed the "Dean leak" to its sister New York Times, to the Post, and to Newsweek, in these words:

Here is a real piece of hanging evidence, the missing element—if it is believed—in the chain of proof. Here is a piece of wholly suspect evidence—unsworn, unverified, not cross-examined, contradicting previous evidence, subject to none of these safeguards of due process, given by a man who may be bargaining for his freedom. How can the newspapers defend themselves from the very charge that they are bringing against the President, the charge of making a fair trial impossible, if they now publish evidence so damning and so doubtful with all the weight of authority their publication gives?

Enough of this, Mr. Speaker, since by next week this time Mr. Dean will have

proven to be either a credible witness or an incredible one, and we may—or may not—be closer to the “facts” than we are at this moment.

For, right now, I would like to amplify that comment of mine—the one that drew the headline—about Watergate being a “national disaster.”

As will be noted from my remarks—set forth below—what I actually said in this regard was this: “Watergate is, by all odds, a Nixon disaster, if not a national disaster.”

Concerning the first part of that equation, Watergate is, is it not, a Nixon disaster? At least in this sense, that the President—prior to Watergate—had been perceived by his countrymen as a prudent, moderate, and responsible Chief Executive who, if he had struggled less than successfully with some of our exceedingly complex domestic problems, was well on his way toward making a historic mark in foreign policy. Focusing, as he did, so intently on the great task of promoting peace in the world—to find a way to extricate America with some semblance of honor, and in such a fashion as to rescue the prisoners of war, from our mistaken adventure in Southeast Asia; to make the bold, and courageous, break with America’s previously unrealistic policy toward mainland China; to successfully carry the strategic arms talks with Russia through to at least a preliminary agreement; to delicately balance off, one against the other, the competing interests in the Middle East so as to avoid, for a time at least, another outbreak of war there, and so on—one can begin to understand how it might be possible, if such proves to be the case, that the President was so isolated, and insulated, by his top staff people as to have let the sordid and unexplainable aspects of the Watergate affair slip by him, unnoticed.

Whatever the event, here, the personally tragic aspect of Watergate for Mr. Nixon is that, whereas future American history books might have begun the chapter on his administration by noting that he was the President who gave the world a chance at a “generation of peace,” that same chapter will probably now begin with an accounting of how his tenure was marked and marred by the Watergate scandal.

As to the latter half of my equation—the seeming fact that Watergate is also a “national disaster”—one need only note the rather obvious fact that, with Mr. Nixon’s reelection and his Vietnam settlement, it appeared that his patience and perseverance would, at last, lead us out of the agonies of the 1960’s. Surely, America had been divided long enough, as the Vietnam era drew to its close, and surely we had enough problems of our own to concentrate on and to attempt to solve—with the solutions depending so very much on our renewed capacity for working together—without being drawn back in, again, to the polarizing effects of something like Watergate with its tendency to erode, however temporarily, the President’s potential for national leadership where needed, and its resulting exacerbation of Presidential-congressional relationships.

Need I say more, Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation? I trust not. Clearly—but

without the necessity for anyone to read into the statement more than it implies—Watergate is a national disaster.

Nevertheless, I have—somehow—an abiding sense of the resiliency of the American system of government; and of its capacity for outlasting the storms of history.

And, having thus said, here are my formal remarks to which I earlier had reference:

“The time has come,” the Walrus said,
“To talk of many things:
Of shoes—and ships—and sealing-wax—
Of cabbages—and kings—
And why the sea is boiling hot—
And whether pigs have wings.”

—LEWIS CARROLL.

Under other circumstances than presently prevail in your Nation’s Capital, the time would indeed have come “to talk of many things”—of many perplexing things, such as what to do about this Nation’s still-struggling and so-uncertain economy and about whether we need, now, to go back to another 90-day “freeze,” as the U.S. Senate Democrats have just urged, or whether something like a “Phase-II-and-a-half” would be better than a “Phase III” anti-inflationary effort that has been tottering on the brink of failure ever since its inception.

Or—in consideration of the American dollar’s ever-deepening decline abroad, whether—and how—a new international monetary arrangement should be approached.

Or—in light of what appears, by all signs, to be a developing energy crisis in a nation, supposedly at peace, that has heretofore prided itself on its management techniques and its technical competence, what ought to be done about it and, alternatively, about developing an “energy-ethnic” or conservation-consciousness in the minds of the people of that nation even though, as the mere consideration of such a concept presupposes, the same might require a substantial change in our life-styles.

Or—since heretofore, and until recently, much of that same nation’s attention had been focused on the developing struggle as between President and Congress over who really, and properly, was in control of the “public-purse,” and over which of those two branches of our Federal government that ought to be cooperating and, as of yore, compromising with one another but were now headed for stalemate, was best equipped to truly determine essential national priorities, what is the situation and the prospects for settling this unfortunate quarrel, as of now.

Or—since the price of food, at least until recently, had occupied a major share of the public attention, especially of the housewifely portion of that public, and further since, given the vagaries of the weather around this globe we occupy like travellers on a “space-ship,” we could not yet put behind us the specter of worldwide famine which tragedy, if it were to be avoided, required the input of American agricultural abundance, how could one get through the American Congress some new, permanent agriculture legislation that was applicable to the decade of the ‘70’s and not a farm bill that was born, fundamentally, during the American depression and only tinkered with in meaningless ways over the past 25 or 30 years.

Or—what to do that would be constructive from the long-range standpoint of world cooperation, and world peace, about the need for a new American foreign trade program to replace the one now expired.

Or—for it is related, what to do about the former “foreign-aid” program which that same America essayed some years ago, as an experiment in avoiding further world wars by taking notice of the human deprivations which, history teaches, breed militancy

broad as well as revolution, now that such a uniquely-American effort had come largely to the end of the always-small supporting constituency it originally enjoyed here at home.

Or—in brief specifics of other possible topics, what about the question of tax-reform; or of some form of national health-insurance, with special attention, at last, on the fiscal ravages of catastrophic illnesses on even the moderately well-off American family; or of the problems and perils faced by the American educational system, whose relevance to today’s needs would seem to have to be ranked somewhere near its own fiscal necessities as being of proper concern; or what to do about the “drug-problem,” or the environment, or sub-standard housing, or poverty, or the need for a balanced, national transportation system.

And, thus, the list of possible things about which “the time has come to talk” goes on, and on, and on.

And, yet, at least in Washington, D.C., if not, so far, on every Main Street in this land of ours, the major topic for discussion, today—the chief focus of nearly every political and news-gathering eye—seems to be on only one thing: The so-called “Watergate Affair.”

I’d much prefer to speak about something other than Watergate—but I suspect that you expect I should address myself thereto.

By my lights, Watergate is a tragic episode; a situation without precedent in our history for I can find no lessons from the Andrew Johnson affair to apply to it, now.

It involves a special sort of tragedy in that, insofar as I can understand the matter, it was all so unnecessary.

For that reason, among others, it is also fair to state that I am baffled by Watergate. The thinking of the men who engineered it—and that seems now to have included nearly all of the top, former White House staff—is well-nigh incomprehensible to me.

Irving Kristol, Henry Luce Professor of Urban Values at New York University, has written a perceptive piece about this aspect of the affair. Kristol, a Nixon supporter last Fall, and one who saw in the President—even as I have—substantial qualities meriting and, absent Watergate, continuing to merit that support, suggests in his article the possibility that “... the White House staff, and perhaps even the President himself, have been living in a different world from the rest of us. Many sins,” he goes on to say, “may be tolerated in government, but not the sin of incomprehensibility. People need to feel they understand their government, even if they find some of its behavior shocking. An irrational government is the citizen’s ultimate nightmare.”

Watergate has, thus, become a “nightmare” for many of us—as I am rather sure it must be for the President, himself. I think back now to the strangely somber mood that affected the President last Fall, after his great victory at the polls. I think back, too, to that afternoon in January when I stood in the Rotunda of the Capitol—at the Lyndon Johnson memorial services—and watched what seemed to be unexpected signs of stress and strain, then, despite the gravity of the moment, on Mr. Nixon’s face. And I remember, as do you, those weeks and weeks between Election Day and January’s Inauguration when Mr. Nixon secluded himself, at Camp David or in the confines of the White House and made few public appearances and even fewer public utterances, and wonder, now, if he did not sense impending disaster.

For Watergate is, by all odds, a Nixon disaster, if not a national disaster.

Americans have a special feeling about the Presidency. As I suggested in some of my remarks on this matter earlier this year, there is—and I share it—an unspoken desire throughout our citizenry to keep anything tawdry, cynical, or unscrupulous away from our revered institution thought of, simply, as “the White House,” an attitude that

seems to have little to do with whoever is the occupant thereof.

At the same time, since perhaps the advent of Franklin Roosevelt, whose tenure began during the depths of the great depression that shook this Nation's faith in itself to the roots and carried nearly through a great World War whose ending left us with more problems even than we'd had before—problems of worldwide implications of a sort not previously experienced and not wholly welcome—we have, as a people, come to demand a great deal of our Presidents. It has been a popular conception—and, curiously enough, especially with those now most critical of the nature of the Nixon Administration—that America needed "strong" men in the Presidency. Given the scope and complexities of the problems we now know we face at home and abroad—and the reluctance of the Congress to gear and equip itself to deal in a positive fashion with those problems—this is understandable enough and, in varying degrees, the men we have elected to the Presidency since Roosevelt have been regarded as "strong" men.

I don't think there can be much doubt that we have expected, at the same time, far more of these same Presidents than they could reasonably be expected, in turn, to deliver. Accordingly, we have tended to forget—as I have also noted before—that our Presidents are, after all, only men possessed of the same human failings and frailties that beset us, all.

In saying this, I do not intend to suggest that Mr. Nixon's involvement—whatever its true extent may prove to be—in the inexcusable aspects of Watergate can be explained, or shrugged, away as a mere, and temporary, human aberration. The ramifications of the possible Nixon involvement are far more serious than that.

At the same time, I have said—as I now say again—that even the President of the United States—or, perhaps, especially the President of the United States—is entitled to the same privilege we all enjoy: That of being presumed innocent until proved guilty.

I am not yet wholly satisfied with the President's explanations so far of his role in Watergate. I doubt if anyone is, including Mr. Nixon himself who, I believe, at some future date—and perhaps not so far off—must render a further public accounting, whether voluntarily before Special Prosecutor Cox's Grand Jury or before a press conference that will, undoubtedly, be the best-attended one in our history.

Such an ordeal will be most difficult for him—since it will involve a further humbling of a man who, whatever else you may think of him, is an extremely sensitive individual. Yet, I feel he will eventually have to undergo it if he is to restore his own credibility—something vitally necessary if the current vacuum of national leadership is to be filled since, at least at the moment, I do not feel Mr. Nixon will either resign, as some demand, or be impeached, as others would now require on a basis, evidently, of willingness to presume Mr. Nixon guilty until proved innocent.

What Mr. Nixon seems to need most to provide us with is a *plausible* reason for that part of Watergate—the earlier part having a relationship of sorts to considerations of national security—of which he has now admitted knowledge and approval. The lengthy statement he released on May 22nd sought to do this, and it is a helpful—if, in many ways, also a question-provoking—document that, in my judgment, should have been submitted to the public much earlier than it was.

Depending, again, on your attitude toward Mr. Nixon, that statement answered nothing and represented merely a further, and contemptible, attempt by the President to draw the cloak of "national security" over the whole, sordid Watergate affair—or, else, depending on your willingness to give him the

benefit of the doubt, it was the long-awaited beginning of a Presidential attempt to give a plausible explanation to that part of Watergate he knew about.

I will not here go into the details of that statement—which I do hope you have all read thoroughly for you should not make up what part of your mind you wish to now until you have done so—but I would say I, personally, find its contents an acceptable beginning. It was, at the least, an attempt to separate—as they must be—the legitimate acts related to national security from the illegal and reprehensible political aspects of Watergate, with their obvious ugly overtones.

I'll have more to say as to the former in a moment, but as to the latter let us note this statement in the May 22nd Nixon statement: "To the extent that I may in any way have contributed to the climate in which they (the illegal political activities) took place, I did not intend to; to the extent that I failed to prevent them, I should have been more vigilant."

In any event, as to those illegal political activities, there can be no excuse for them. Those responsible therefor must be found out, and properly punished and—unless the activities of the Ervin Committee which have replaced the "Edge of Night" as the most popular daytime TV serial inadvertently make that punishment impossible under our judicial system—I am sure they eventually will be.

As to the Ervin Hearings, I believe Prosecutor Cox has a point when he complained, this week, that "... the continuation of the hearings at this time would create a grave danger that the full facts about the Watergate case and related matters will never come to light and that many of those who are guilty of serious wrongdoing will never be brought to justice." I say this, as a one-time lawyer aware of how easy it is to prejudice a case ahead of trial. I am sure, however, that Senator Ervin is aware of the same problem, but he and his colleagues will have to walk a thin line if the cases Cox wishes to make are not to be prejudiced. Interestingly, here, some of the same Senators who demanded a Special Prosecutor—and then withheld approval of the Elliot Richardson appointment as Attorney General until Cox had been assured of a "free hand" are now in the forefront of those insisting the Ervin Hearings must go on, and the Cox plea ignored.

For what it is worth, one can say, I think, that in a sense the "impeachment trial" of the President has already opened—in those same hearings—for the key question they appear to be addressing is that of the actual degree of involvement of Mr. Nixon in Watergate's political side and its ensuing cover-up. It may well be, on this point, that the hearings will get as far up as former aides Erlichman and Haldeman who will accept the blame and corroborate the President's denial of involvement, thus leaving a situation which many people will find unacceptable—hence, my belief that Mr. Nixon must yet do more, at the proper time, to reassert and establish the plausibility of his non-involvement.

On this point, unless you are prepared to believe Mr. Nixon guilty of anything of which charged, I think it possible that the first instinct of those of his key aides who did—whatever they were—convert the national security aspects of Watergate to an over-zealous, almost fanatical, attempt to use any means to protect the President's re-election chances, would have been to keep the President ignorant of their roles. As Stewart Alsop has written on this possibility, in their minds this could be "... rationalized on the ground of 'not worrying the President' (and) keeping the President ignorant meant keeping the press and the people ignorant, and this in turn meant resorting to all sorts of artful dodges, including the attempt to use the CIA as cover."

At this point, though, who knows?

Now, finally, as the supposed "national security" aspects of Watergate—about which

the President has spoken out—while it will be hard for many Americans to accept even such unusual, covert and, in some cases, possibly illicit activities, one does have to go back, in one's efforts to understand, to the climate at the time those activities were instituted. There were the White House and other leaks—the Pentagon Papers being an example—which were of a serious nature considering the delicate negotiations in which the President, in the broader context of his search for peace, was so deeply involved. His successful balancing act of Russia against China—and vice versa—which was truly a masterful job, conceivably hung, at least in his mind, in the balance. At the same time, there were other Americans—some sincerely motivated, but with others, like the "Weathermen" of clear revolutionary bent—who, like Daniel Ellsberg, were deliberately breaking laws in protest of governmental policies. There were threats of bombings and actual bombings—one in the Capitol, itself, even—plus marches on and demonstrations in Washington, physical charges on both the Pentagon and the White House, disorders on college campuses with blood spilled, munitions trains halted and, even, an alleged plot to kidnap Henry Kissinger.

To say that a government—even one possibly following a "wrong" policy—should not move to protect itself in such a situation would, I think, possibly be involving a dangerous precedent. But, clearly, it is now appropriate to ask: At what point does the defense of the "system" corrupt that system? Just as clearly once both the President and the men around him begin to bend the law for "good" means, it became easier for some of those around him to justify also bending it for "bad" ends. We are evidently on the verge of a national debate over where the dividing point should lie—and, if we can learn something from it, that would be one of the few useful things that might come out of Watergate.

As the President, himself, has noted, "... what one saw in terms of public responsibility, another saw in terms of political opportunity." That the opportunists, in the end, seemed to outnumber the responsible ones is the kind of blame for which the President has already accepted partial fault.

Where we go from here, I do not know—nor do I wish to speculate.

But I do believe it is important—nay, essential—to try to save the Presidency. Not, that is, to save Richard Nixon—those two are not quite the same things. But, still, towards that first and quite-appropriate end—though some of you will disagree—I think Mr. Nixon is gradually moving.

As Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has recently written: "The answer to the runaway Presidency is not the messenger-boy Presidency. . . . The great powers of the American government are *shared* powers. They reside, as Hamilton wrote in the 75th Federalist of the treaty-making power, in an area of 'joint possession.' They call not for antagonism between Congress and the Presidency but *collaboration*. They therefore require a sense of comity and self-restraint on both sides. . . . Or, to put it more succinctly, we need a strong President as much as ever—but a strong President *within the Constitution*."

The Nixonian ridding of himself—not matter how reluctantly he began it—of those close to him who apparently over-stepped the bounds of judgment and responsibility, was a beginning. The re-birth, now, of the Cabinet; the ending of the brief trial of "supra-crats"; the new overtures towards Congress, and the beginnings of a new spirit of willingness to consider and work with Congress—as marked by the return of Mel Laird to a top-level domestic-policy position in the new White House staff—all these are wholesome signs. I hope—and anticipate—there will be more such moves; and, if there are, we can make our system work.

able once again as, given our challenges, we must desperately try to do.

In the meantime, as to Mr. Nixon, himself, I think it is incumbent on all Americans who can do so to be patient, and settle themselves in for a protracted period of suspended judgment. This will not be easy, for a lot of public opinion is not "suspended" now. Some citizens, literally, want to "hang" Mr. Nixon now without waiting for the "judge." Others say, as vehemently, that the whole inquiry ought to cease—that no good can come of it—and that we are only hurting ourselves by tearing the President down.

Perhaps Richard Nixon cannot lead this Nation during the next three and a half years. Perhaps he cannot repair the horrible gaps in his credibility. But I suggest we ought to give him a chance at trying. He may not succeed, but the governance of our Nation *has* to go on.

I think—though I am not sure—that Congress is, generally, willing to accept this necessity; to be patient, and to suspend judgment along with you, but it would help if some more of you would urge Congress to adopt that attitude. At the moment, we know full well what the viewpoints are on Watergate from what might be considered the polar-points, but we are uncertain—perhaps because it, too, remains uncertain—about the viewpoint of the great middle-ground of American public opinion which, though prejudices and passions are always seeking to divide it, remains the major element which unites this Nation.

Let me now conclude by re-stating what I said a few weeks ago:

"We are, obviously, nowhere near the end of the 'Watergate Affair,' and where our efforts to untangle this dreadful mess will eventually lead us no man can say. But I have supreme confidence in several things—in the basic goodness and stability of this Nation and its people; in the fairness and sensibility of our citizens; and in the ultimate triumph of justice under the system we have established for the protection of our individual and collective rights and freedoms."

Thank you for having let me share these thoughts with you.

BALTIC STATES FREEDOM DAY

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, this week marks yet another anniversary of the cruel occupation of the Baltic States by the Russian Army. The tiny states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were overrun by a country which agreed to respect the sovereignty of the Baltic people by signing several nonaggression pacts in 1919 and 1920.

The people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia finally regained their freedom after World War I, and each of these states then took steps to insure to their people all of the rights and liberties found in democratic countries.

Subsequently, however, the Russian Government on June 15, 1940, took over these republics by force, and on June 14 to 16, 1941, the Kremlin supervised the cruel and inhuman mass deportation of over 60,000 Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to Siberian labor camps.

Soviet domination of these Baltic States is both unfortunate and tragic, as the Baltic people are unable to enjoy the human rights which those of us in the free world take for granted.

To its credit, the U.S. Government refuses to acknowledge the Soviet occupation of the Baltic States. But beyond this, the United States must continue to call attention to the issue of Baltic independence in every available forum. We must strive to influence other democratic nations to exert pressure on the Soviet Union to give the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians the fundamental rights they deserve.

The Baltic people deserve our respect for their staunch struggle against a nation which seems totally unsympathetic toward their concerns and needs. They deserve the support we can give by acknowledging the difficulty of living under such conditions and rallying behind them in their courageous battle against tyranny. The Baltic people are deeply concerned about regaining their freedom, and as Americans, we can take the lead by showing our deep concern over the domestic problems faced by these tiny states.

Last year, two events took place in which the cruel repression of the Soviet government was brought to the attention of the world. In March, over 17,000 signatures were sent to Kurt Waldheim, Secretary General of the United Nations, in order to protest the treatment of Lithuanian Roman Catholics. Finally in May, several demonstrations took place in the City of Kaunas due to religious persecution on the part of the Soviet Union. The demonstrations turned into riots and one young man burned himself to death in order to draw world attention to the repressive treatment of the Baltic people by the Soviet Union.

During my tenure in the Congress, I have urged the President to impress on the Soviet Union the need to ease its strict control over the lives of the Baltic people. I was honored to sponsor the bill—House Concurrent Resolution 416—which calls for freedom from Soviet domination of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The objectives of this bill, which passed both the House and Senate unanimously, can be furthered considerably if the President would add to his agenda of topics for discussion with Soviet Communist Party Leader Leonid Brezhnev in their talks next week the subject of Baltic States occupation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that I may live to see the day that the Baltic people will be able to enjoy the freedom and privileges that the citizens of our own Nation have known for almost 200 years.

I join with all Baltic Americans in their commemoration of this solemn occasion and hope that their determination will one day result in the independence of the Baltic States.

PROPOSAL ENCOURAGING THE PRESIDENT TO NEGOTIATE TOWARD A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today, together with 30 other Members of the House, I am introducing a resolution

proposing that President Nixon begin negotiations with the Soviet Union to suspend all further underground testing of nuclear devices and draft a comprehensive test ban treaty for all nations to sign.

Such a treaty would represent fulfillment of the promise contained in the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963 to "achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time." It would be a valuable first step in seeking peace throughout the world, in moving away from reliance on technological superiority to insure national security and towards negotiations among the major powers.

It is appropriate that this proposal be introduced now, on the eve of Mr. Brezhnev's visit to Washington. Negotiations leading toward a comprehensive test ban treaty should properly form a major part of the rapprochement we hope to effect with the Soviet Union.

A report prepared by Senator HART's office for Members of Congress for Peace through Law clearly demonstrates that there is no longer any military benefit to be gained from technological advances in nuclear weapons. The United States and the Soviet Union have achieved nuclear parity, at the level of mutual assured destruction. Any technological advance made by one side is swiftly matched by the other, resulting in a stalemate, while more and more resources are poured into unproductive research. There appears to be nothing that either side could develop which would radically alter the balance of power. It is time to stop this waste of financial and natural resources; now it can be done without threatening national security, and it should be done.

Under present treaty obligations, particularly the SALT I accords, the United States and Russia are permitted stronger offensive arsenals than defensive ones; the nations are committed to a policy of mutual vulnerability. At the same time, defense technology is not as advanced as offensive technology. It is impossible to reach a level of development which will seriously alter the fact that either nation can destroy the other, but neither can protect itself from destruction. It is obvious that the time has come to cease the escalation of supplies of weaponry, and to cease further experimentation which has reached the point of futility.

It must be emphasized that the parity level at which the two great powers have arrived far exceeds that of any other nation, including the People's Republic of China. At the present level, both nations would remain far ahead of the other nuclear nations in technology; even a tremendous burst in developmental achievement on the part of China would not upset the status quo. Russia and the United States together have sufficient superiority in technology that the risks from other nuclear nations are minimal.

Negotiations for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty would also encourage acceptance by non-nuclear nations of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Additional testing by the major powers will only encourage less advanced nations to begin testing of their own, which might be a key factor in

upsetting the present balance of power. To preserve national security at its present level, then, demands not more research and testing, but the end of such research. The suspension of testing of nuclear devices will testify to our commitment to nonproliferation and to the preservation of world order.

The development of nuclear weapons is no longer a useful or efficient way to guarantee national security. The primary stumbling block to the conclusion of a test ban treaty up to this point has been the problem of verification. Mutual suspicion, although somewhat alleviated by 10 years of observance of the Limited Test Ban Treaty, is still a problem in Soviet-American relations.

However, modern methods of verification can insure observance of the treaty, without the necessity of on-site inspection, which has been a major point of contention in the negotiation of past treaties. The United States has customarily asked for on-site inspection, regarding it as a necessary tool for enforcement of the treaty; the Russians have customarily denied permission for on-site inspection, citing their sovereignty rights. However, new detection technology has obviated the need for any debate on the subject; on-site inspection is no longer necessary, given today's sophisticated detection technology. If the United States drops its antiquated demand for the right to on-site inspection, the major problem that has historically plagued negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty will have been settled. It is time for the United States to make such a move, in the interest of international detente.

Given the feasibility of refraining from tests of nuclear weapons and of making sure that cosigners of the treaty do the same, the only remaining question about the test-ban treaty is its effect on the peacetime users of nuclear technology. This has not been a very fruitful area of research; neither the technical efficiency nor the international acceptability of nuclear technology for peacetime use has been fully established. The uses that have been made of nuclear technology have been found to be less economical and more questionable environmentally than alternative conventional methods. The problem of incidental radiation has not yet been solved. In addition, the war-like uses to which advances in peacetime technology might be put encourage the suspension of all types of testing. In short, nuclear technology has been found wanting for peaceful uses, and it provides additional difficulties for the enforcement of a treaty banning the development of weapons.

Since there is little efficient peaceful use that can be made of nuclear technology, and since the United States and the Soviet Union are at a stable level of parity in weaponry of this sort, it is clear that now is the time to begin negotiations on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It would be a strong first step toward the development of worldwide peace, indicating the sincerity of the United States in its commitment to peace

and its rejection of the use of arms to solve differences among nations.

The Congress can now make it clear to the President that we favor his negotiating with the Soviet Union on these matters, and that we urge him to do so at the earliest possible time. We have a commitment to follow through on the promises made by the nuclear arms treaties in 1963, 1967, 1968, and 1972. We have already limited the use of these weapons; it is now time for us to negotiate toward an end to development of more and more deadly weapons which do nothing but drain the economy and swell the military budget. A pledge that we will refrain from further development of nuclear weapons in cooperation with other nations is the strongest contribution that can be made now toward a more secure future.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the text of the resolution:

CALLING ON THE PRESIDENT TO PROMOTE NEGOTIATIONS FOR A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

Whereas the United States is committed in the Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963 and the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons Treaty of 1968 to negotiate a comprehensive test ban treaty;

Whereas the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty will reinforce the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons Treaty, and will fulfill our pledge in the Partial Test Ban Treaty;

Whereas there has been significant progress in the detection and identification of underground nuclear tests by seismological and other means; and

Whereas the SALT accords of 1972 have placed quantitative limitations on offensive and defensive strategic weapons and have established important precedents for arms control verification procedures; and

Whereas early achievement of total nuclear test cessation would have many beneficial consequences: creating a more favorable international arms control climate; imposing further finite limits on the nuclear arms race; releasing resources for domestic needs; protecting our environment from growing testing dangers; making more stable existing arms limitations agreements; and complementing the ongoing strategic arms limitation talks: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President of the United States (1) should propose an immediate suspension of underground nuclear testing to remain in effect so long as the Soviet Union abstains from underground testing, and (2) should set forth promptly a new proposal to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other nations for a permanent treaty to ban all nuclear tests.

SAVE STUYVESANT TOWN RENTS

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 18, I will submit to the committee on housing of the New York City Council a statement concerning Stuyvesant Town and the need to control the rents in that very large community. It is of vital importance particularly since the President omitted rents from his order freezing prices. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. KOCH

Members of the Committee on Housing: I strongly urge the City Council's favorable consideration of a resolution currently before this Committee which could have a decisive impact on the lives of approximately 25,000 people residing in my Congressional District. I speak of the resolution which calls on the State legislature to enact legislation authorizing the City of New York to grant the owners of Stuyvesant Town, The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, an additional 25 year tax exemption. As you undoubtedly know, the tax abatement covering Stuyvesant Town is scheduled to expire in June 1974 and when this happens it could bring great hardship to the residents of Stuyvesant Town.

It is my understanding that the City has the right to extend tax exemptions to housing projects acquired by mutual development companies if substantial increases in carrying charges would occur after the period of tax exemption ended unless relief were provided. There is surely no question that once tax exemption were to expire, the rentals in Stuyvesant Town would substantially increase no matter who owned the complex. And as far as can be determined, there would be absolutely no limitation on the new rentals. I believe it is the City's responsibility to protect these residents from possible exorbitant rent increases.

Stuyvesant Town is a unique middle income development which houses some 25,000 people, many of whom live on fixed incomes and are elderly. The residents have developed a strong sense of community and have actively participated in making Stuyvesant Town one of the most desirable middle income areas in which to live in New York City.

The residents have paid their fair share of rent increases over the years. Rents have gone up steadily since the project opened in 1949 from an initial \$14.00 per month per room to the present \$56.00 per month per room. The most recent increase was granted in June 1972, retroactive to November 1971, in spite of the opposition of the Board of Estimate. This 15% increase was greater, in fact, than that charged tenants who reside in Rent Stabilized buildings for renewal leases. Additionally, the tenants in Stuyvesant Town pay for their own improvements, such as the security system for which they pay a monthly surcharge of \$2.65.

Should Stuyvesant Town lose its current tax status in June 1974, then in my judgment it is incumbent upon the City to provide relief and to establish a definition as to the future rental structure of that complex. The City Council would have to specifically provide, should the contractual agreement between New York City and Metropolitan Life be terminated, that the complex would immediately be placed under Rent Stabilization. Another proposal considered by some would be the possibility of co-oping. While I don't think this is desirable, if the plan were put forth it would have to be within the reasonable financial capability of the tenants. In addition, I feel that co-oping should have the support of 51% of the current tenants before it is accepted. Currently the law only requires that 35% of the tenants indicate their willingness to co-op, but efforts have been made for some time—efforts which I support—to change the required 35% to 51%.

The City cannot shirk its responsibility to these middle income residents. Inaction could bring great hardship to the residents of Stuyvesant Town and the result would be that many residents of that community, the taxpayers who support many civic and religious organizations, would be forced to flee the City to find housing they could afford. Along with you who sit in judgment on the application, I have voiced my concern about

the exodus of the middle class on many occasions—if we do nothing to insure that Stuyvesant Town residents are protected a year from now—we will surely witness the departure of many of our most active citizens. I urge the members of this Committee to support this legislation which represents a first but important step in commencing the legislative process needed to provide the necessary tax abatement, and to take action as well as to provide legislation which would place Stuyvesant Town under Rent Stabilization if all else fails.

COMMUNITY ATTITUDE SURVEY

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, two grade school teachers, Mrs. Zennie Herring and Miss Wilmus O'Neil, and 36 of their fifth-grade students in Collinsville, Ill., have conducted a "Community Attitude Survey" on specific ecological

beliefs of adults in a part of their city. The survey shows strong community concern for environmental problems ranging from air and noise pollution to weed control and sidewalk conditions. We should be encouraged by the efforts of these students since the solutions to our environmental problems can only be expedited by the energy and enthusiasm of youth.

The results of the survey are as follows:

ATTITUDE SURVEY ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS—292 REplies

	Yes		No		No opinion
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
I. Air pollution—Leaf burning:					
1. I burned leaves before the Environmental Protection Association banned leaf burning.	203	71.2	82	69.5	7
2. I favor repealing this ruling, even though it will increase air pollution.	91	-----	172	-----	23
3. I would be willing to either (check one):					
(a) Pay a nominal fee for leaf removal to reduce air pollution, or (59)		26.1		20.2	
(b) Take my own leaves to the landfill at no extra charge to me (167)		73.9		57.2	
No opinion (69).		23.6		23.6	
4. I would favor having the City Street Department remove bagged leaves during the month of November.	224	83.0	46	76.7	22
II. Disposable and throw-away materials:					
1. I now return returnable bottles.	258	92.8	20	88.4	14
2. I now return disposable containers to be recycled.	79	30.1	183	27.1	30
3. I would recycle disposable containers if facilities were established at convenient locations.	233	87.6	33	79.8	26
4. I prefer (check one):					
(a) All returnable containers (94)		32.2		-----	
(b) A combination of returnable, disposable, and throw-away containers as currently used (100)		34.2		-----	
(c) No preference (78)		26.7		-----	
No opinion (20).		6.8		-----	
5. I now recycle newspapers and magazines.	115	42.1	158	39.4	19
6. I would be willing to separate disposable and throw-away materials so that the city could recycle them after they are picked up at my home.	241	86.4	38	82.5	13
7. I would be willing to segregate all my old newspapers and magazines when I use the landfill—where such would be loaded by the landfill operator into pickup bins for transportation to recycling center.	226	8.50	40	77.4	26
III. Motor vehicles:					
1. I approve of stronger auto pollution emission controls even though there is increased cost.	164	63.6	94	56.2	34
2. I approve regulating use of high pollution emitting vehicles (autos and trucks) to specified hours to reduce pollution.	132	48.4	130	41.8	40
3. I would use fast, convenient, public transportation to help reduce pollution.	159	60.0	106	54.5	27
4. I would favor having city policemen issue warning tickets to owners of all cars and trucks causing heavy pollution because of improper care and repair.	220	83.7	43	75.3	29
5. I would favor fines for second offenders of item 4 above.	200	80.0	50	68.5	42
6. I think all motorbikes and motorcycles should have mufflers to stop noise pollution.	242	88.0	30	82.9	420
7. I think we need total schoolbusing, in the city and without, to eliminate cars that create pollution and heavy traffic.	142	54.6	118	48.6	32
IV. City services:					
1. I prefer the city to use its revenue sharing funds for (check one):					
(a) Increasing and improving existing city services such as police service, fire protection, and making permanent streets (62)		21.2		24.7	
(b) Improving environmental conditions of the city through pollution abatement programs, beautification programs, and recreational programs (42)		50.3		58.6	
(c) Reducing property taxes and/or reducing the 125 percent sewer service charges (147)		14.0		-----	
(d) No opinion (41).					
2. I think the city should give credit for beautification of property by lowering increased taxes on all property improvements.	224	87.2	33	76.7	35
V. General:					
1. I think the cost of controlling pollution should be borne by (check one):					
(a) Governmental agencies (Local, State, Federal) (92)		31.5		34.7	
(b) The offending groups (63)		21.6		23.8	
(c) Shared by all (110)		37.7		41.5	
(d) No opinion (27).		9.2		-----	
2. I would be willing to place a brick in my toilet tank(s) in order to save a quart of water with each use (about) 5 or 6 gallons a day for a family of 4.	197	77.3	58	67.5	37
3. I approve using the coal strip mine areas for sanitary landfill operations.	206	82.7	43	70.5	43
4. I approve the cutting away of Collinsville's scenic bluffs for dirtfill and other purposes.	44	16.5	223	15.1	25
5. I favor an annual citywide celebration of Earth Week and Arbor Day.	198	82.5	42	67.8	52
6. I approve strict enforcement of litter laws.	251	95.1	43	36.0	23
7. I think the city should require owners to repair or remove dilapidated buildings.	257	93.1	19	88.0	26
8. I approve strict enforcement of weed control laws and sizable penalties for violations.	210	80.5	51	71.9	31
9. I am concerned about the following environmental problems.					

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE JAMES O. MONROE, JR.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on June 7 the Honorable James O. Monroe, Jr., Circuit Judge, Third Judicial Circuit of Illinois, was killed in an automobile accident. The tragic and untimely death of this distinguished jurist is a grievous loss to the people of Illinois. Few men who have served on the bench have infused the Illinois judiciary with the intellectual verve and vision that Judge Monroe possessed.

Judge Monroe was a friend of mine. His death is a personal loss to me. I have known his family since I entered public life. His father, the Honorable James O. Monroe, Sr., was a leader in the Illinois legislature. His brothers, Thomas, now

deceased, and Karl have been leading journalists whose outstanding newspaper, The Collinsville Herald, has won numerous major journalism awards. In sum, Judge Monroe's family has been devoted to the public good and has striven for excellence in every endeavor they have undertaken.

So that my colleagues may share in the appreciation of this magnificent human being, I include in the RECORD the June 7 article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the June 11 editorial in The Collinsville Herald on Judge Monroe's career and contributions to the people he served.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, June 7, 1973]

JUDGE MONROE IS KILLED WHEN AUTO OVERTURNS

Circuit Judge James O. Monroe Jr. of Collinsville, both controversial and colorful in his 15 years on the bench, was killed this

morning in an automobile accident one mile south of Edwardsville.

The judge, 55 years old, was alone in his automobile, southbound on Illinois Route 159. Madison County sheriff's deputies said the car overturned in a small ravine near Glen Carbon Road and righted itself in an adjacent restaurant parking lot. Residents heard the crash about 4 a.m., and called authorities.

He was pronounced dead at the scene by Madison County Deputy Coroner Edward Rodney of head and neck injuries.

It was not unusual for Judge Monroe to work unusual and long hours. He was oblivious of both people and of time when he had a decision or opinion to prepare.

Termed eccentric by some, he was often seen walking and jogging the eight miles from the Madison County Courthouse to his home along the same route on which he was killed. He still wore narrow ties, with a Phi Beta Kappa tie clasp, symbol of academic excellence at the University of Illinois from which he graduated with a law degree in 1942.

"I never earned a football letter, so I had to leave college with something," he said.

Even in his college days, he was involved in controversy. He quit as editorial editor of the Daily Illini, the University's newspaper in 1939, "because of fundamental differences in policy" concerning a vice investigation in Champaign.

His father owned the Collinsville Herald and served in the Illinois Legislature for 10 years. Judge Monroe was a part owner of the newspaper, which is operated by his brother Karl.

Judge Monroe periodically wrote book reviews for the Post-Dispatch, and many articles appeared under his name in law and journalism reviews and magazines.

Politics, public affairs and history interested him. He said he acquired an interest in public affairs from his father. He studied and wrote on the life and times of Abraham Lincoln.

In 1952, he published a pamphlet "Everybody Loses," a short study of ethics, politics and gambling in Madison County. The foreword was written by Adlai E. Stevenson, then Governor of Illinois, and later the Democratic presidential nominee.

Judge Monroe and Stevenson were close friends. The Judge was the composer of "The Man with the Hole in His Shoe," a song inspired by a widely publicized photograph of Stevenson taken in the 1952 campaign showing him on a speaker's platform with a hole in his shoe.

Judge Monroe labeled himself an independent Democrat. Although he had expressed no interest in public office years before, he was easily elected a judge in the Third Judicial Circuit, embracing Madison and Bond Counties, in 1967 and had been retained in office since then.

He had served briefly on the United States Treasury legal staff in Washington after graduation from college. Then he entered the Army, where he moved from private through captain on two World War II tours of duty in the Far East. He was a staff judge advocate for the Fourteenth Air Force, and later a judge advocate general under Gen. Archer Lerch, military governor of Korea. He served on the U.S. War Crimes Commission in Shanghai.

Surviving are his wife, Gertrude, an Edwardsville school teacher, and two children. Funeral arrangements are incomplete.

[From the Collinsville (Ill.) Herald, June 11, 1973]

A STRIVING FOR EXCELLENCE—IN MANY DIVERSE WAYS, JUDGE JAMES O. MONROE, JR. GAVE TALENT, ENERGY AND HARD WORK TO THE PUBLIC GOOD

Zest. Energetic, methodical application of thorough, scholarly method. Devotion to duty, the law and the common good. A striving for excellence in widely divergent fields, fueled by diverse talents capable of the heavy demands he made on himself.

A conviction that the task in hand deserved maximum effort.

These characteristics, plus the warm, flavorful humanity made Judge James O. Monroe, Jr. an unforgettable figure on the Collinsville and Madison County scene for a quarter of a century.

His accomplishments were considerable. He was an architect of the 3rd Judicial Circuit in its formative stages and battled, often with success, to smooth its procedures. He carried a conviction that legal procedure at all levels could be improved and his counsel was sought on state and national levels among those seeking better rules for the courts. He never backed off from a hard duty.

He came as close as anybody in our midst these days to being the universal man. His interests were wide and his talents diverse. Music, literature, law, cross-country running, politics all commanded his attention and ap-

plication of great bursts of energy. In pursuing them, he showed a fine disdain for convention.

He was a one-time editorial editor of the Daily Illini and never lost his affinity for journalism, with which he grew up as a member of The Herald family. He was secretary of The Collinsville Herald, Inc. and a director until he resigned both posts in respect to his position as Judge.

But he was always interested in The Herald, available for shrewd estimates of the handling of the news or editorial policy. His presence hovered over us even when he was not here; always we sensed his pressure toward excellence. He wanted The Herald to be a successful paper, but more than that, he wanted it to be a good paper, with a conscience, doing what good papers do to make their communities better.

He respected the law, and lawyers respected him. Some of them on occasions might have preferred a less independent judge or one who tolerated more shoddiness, but they recognized that he ruled impartially. His opinions were respected not only for their scholarship but for the clarity and simplicity of style that he carried over from his newspaper background.

In his untimely death the Herald has suffered a blow made the more heavy because it follows all too soon the deaths of his father, publisher James O. Monroe, Sr. and his brother, general manager Thomas W. Monroe. We hope we may carry on the principles they valued in a way they would admire.

In his death, the court system of Madison County and the community in a broader sense, have lost an engine for good.

Those who will miss him may take comfort from knowledge that he packed into his 56 years much that was memorable. He strove mightily and reached many goals. He was loved and respected. No man can ask more of life.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was 33 years ago that the government of the Soviet Union occupied and purported to annex the Baltic Nation of Lithuania. Since that time the Lithuanian people have endured that harsh dominion while resisting, with arms as well as with minds, the power which has stripped them of their sovereignty.

And so it is that while other nations proudly commemorate their births, Lithuania and the other Baltic States can but bitterly mark the cheerless anniversary of their subjugation. Today, as we celebrate our Flag Day, a foreign flag flies over Lithuania. In the 1970s, when colonialism is everywhere on the wane, it is anomalous to the point of international disgrace that the Baltic peoples should be deprived of the right of self-determination which so vigorously flourishes elsewhere.

The Lithuanians have battled valiantly to free themselves of foreign domination, and even succeeded in overthrowing the Soviet regime for a short period in 1941. But fearlessness and love of liberty may not be enough when a small nation defies the armed might of a much larger one. Other powerful nations, concerned with the self-determination of small nations as well as the preservation of their own, must vocalize their support of the struggle.

It is our responsibility, then, to bring this violation of human liberty to the attention of the world. As we honor the flag which for us represents independence and freedom, let us pause to remember those who are deprived of these basic rights. In this, what some have called "The Year of Europe," the status of Lithuania cannot be ignored. If the Lithuanian people and the Lithuanian-Americans who share their distress are ever to celebrate a day of independence, the collective indignation of free peoples must be asserted against those who perpetuate their affront to human rights.

PUBLIC SCHOOL PRAYER

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, in 1962 and 1963 the U.S. Supreme Court handed down a series of decisions which have subsequently become known as the school prayer cases. At that time the Supreme Court interpreted the so-called establishment clause of the first amendment to the Constitution as prohibiting the previously commonplace practice of holding brief voluntary non-denominational devotional exercises in the Nation's public schools. Even though the tradition of public school prayer could be traced back to the earliest days of our Republic, the Court held that a simple brief voluntary group recognition of a Supreme Deity by students in tax-supported schools constituted an unconstitutional establishment of religion.

I am quite sure that all of my distinguished colleagues can remember the public outcry against this strained judicial reasoning. As a result, numerous legislative efforts have been mounted to secure the passage of a constitutional amendment to restore the right of voluntary prayer in tax-supported classrooms.

The Congress has addressed this issue on several occasions and a Prayer amendment was adopted by the Senate, as a floor amendment to the equal rights for women amendment, but it died for lack of further action at the close of the 91st Congress. In the 92d Congress, I had the privilege of bringing the prayer amendment up for a vote in the House by a discharge petition. Unfortunately, it narrowly failed to achieve the necessary two-thirds vote.

The American people are still asking why a prayer amendment has not been passed. Enthusiasm and heartfelt support for this proposal has not diminished even though there have been disappointing setbacks. Various dedicated ad hoc citizen groups are still actively promoting this effort and the organization, Operation Prayer 1973, has proclaimed this coming Sunday, June 17, as National Rededication Day 1973. The date is, indeed, significant since it commemorates the 10th anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in *Murray v. Curlett* 374 U.S. 203 (1963) which held that Bible reading without comment and/or the use of the Lord's Prayer in tax-supported schools constitutes an establish-

ment of religion in violation of the first amendment to the Constitution. You may recall that this is the case which was brought by Madalyn Murray O'Hair who has also objected to the recitation of prayer by the astronauts in space and who recently brought suit to prohibit prayer services in the White House. This case when combined with the holding in *Engel v. Vitale* 370 U.S. 421 (1962) has for practical purposes resulted in the removal of voluntary religious exercises from the public classroom.

The Reverend Robert G. Howes, the national coordinator of Operation Prayer, and one of the real leaders to assure the right to pray in public schools, has prepared some timely thoughts on this subject which I include at this point in the RECORD for the further information of the Members:

NATIONAL REDEDICATION DAY 1973

JUNE 17, 1973.

It is now ten years since the Supreme Court, in a second decision, finally banned voluntary prayer and the spiritual reading of the Bible from our public schools. With wonderful appropriateness the tenth anniversary of this tragedy falls on the Lord's Day. We now propose that in every way possible and with a maximum of publicity June 17, 1973 be celebrated as a day of national penance for what the Court so mistakenly did but even more as a day of national redefinition linked primarily to the restoration of freedom of religion in the public classroom.

There has been indeed, in these past bittersweet ten years, much cause for sorrow but also much cause for joy and hope. On the one hand the incredible error of the Court has been compounded by the culpable silence of that vast majority of Americans who dissent from this error and by the sheer inability of the democratic process to carry through the Congress a prayer amendment bill for reference to the conscience of the nation in its fifty states. On the other hand hundreds of dedicated citizens on the Hill in Washington and across the nation have continued to fight and, whenever they have been polled in the matter, the American people have responded in overwhelming majorities in favor of a prayer amendment. Consider these further evidences of good and bad in the decade now behind us:

1. Rounding the moon at Christmas, 1968, the astronauts read from the Book of Genesis. They did this in a public machine, on a public mission, while on the public payroll. Quite logically, since what they did was not essentially dissimilar from voluntary school prayer, they were attacked by Mrs. Madalyn Murray O'Hair, the self-proclaimed atheist who was prominent in the proponents of the 1963 prayer ban.

2. Repeatedly, the President has proclaimed national days of prayer. Prayer breakfasts have been held again and again on the Hill in Washington, D.C., and these have involved legislators of varying political affiliation and different religious persuasions.

3. Thousands of prayers have been uttered by chaplains in the United States Senate and House, in state legislatures, in local city and town councils, and in the armed services.

4. In Utah, in 1972, a stone tablet with the Ten Commandments engraved on it was ordered removed from in front of the Court House by a judge relying on the same illogic which had written the majority decision on June 17, 1963. (Salt Lake City)

5. In Netcong, New Jersey, in 1972 public school students were denied the right freely to read at the start of their school day the exact prayers which had been said in Con-

gress previously and which were officially recorded in "The Congressional Record."

6. Kindergarten children have been denied the right freely to speak a simple prayer of thanks to God for the food they shared.

7. Public school children have been forbidden the right to sing prayerfully certain verses of "America."

8. In Brockton, Massachusetts, an Italo-American was subjected to legal harassment for her request that her daughter be granted freedom of religion in a public school.

9. In Leyden, Massachusetts, and Fair Chance, Pennsylvania, public school students were denied the right freely to pray before the formal start of their school day.

10. Prayer amendment proposals have met with ambiguity and sometimes with bitter opposition from some so-called "religious leaders" many of whom are in fact *generals without armies* who do not have the support of even their own congregations.

11. Returning POW's from the North Vietnam in the Spring of 1973 testified again and again to the power of prayer in their confinement. Said Colonel Robinson Risner, with words echoed by many of his confreres:

"We found by talking about patriotism and talking about God that we were only revealing our true feelings. So we learned to do these things. Our faith in God, our faith in our country were two of the things that brought us out alive and brought us out sound of mind and body.

What remarkable incongruity! These POW's are public persons, publicly paid, brought home on public transportation, publicly fed and housed. Yet had they been children in public schools instead of captives in Red prison camps, they would not have been permitted to utter one syllable of prayer together much less reading the Bible side by side for spiritual comfort!

12. Dr. Billy Graham, a consistent supporter of freedom of religion in the public classroom, has called for Court reinterpretation of the First Amendment to repeal the 1962 and 1963 prayer-ban decisions. In May 1972 "Christianity Today" cites Dr. Graham as adding:

"But if no court relief is forthcoming, he (Dr. Graham) said, he would assume his original stance (i.e., for a prayer amendment) and might even lead a march on Washington—the largest of such marches' to restore prayer in public schools."

13. A national poll conducted in January and February 1971 by Opinion Research Inc. (Princeton, New Jersey) for THE ADVOCATES asked this question: "Would you favor or oppose a Constitutional amendment to permit the use of prayers in public schools?" The response:

	[In percent]				
	Total	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish	No religion
Favor.....	80	84	82	50	46
Oppose.....	12	9	10	38	42
Undecided.....	4	3	5	6	4
Don't know.....	4	4	3	6	8

14. Three states have officially voted on the voluntary school prayer issue. Maryland, on November 3, 1970, voted 73% in favor. Florida, on March 14, 1972, voted 79% in favor. Massachusetts, on November 7, 1972, voted 82+ % in favor. These states differ both in geographical location and ideological complexion:

15. Speaking in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, on July 10, 1969, our National Coordinator said:

"America today is in deep and big trouble. I need not stress the suffering and angry poor, the anarchy, the lawlessness, the tragic syndrome of escape from responsibility through drugs, the filth in some of our theaters and

on some of our stages. Nor do I come here to suggest that returning the civil right of free prayer to our school children will at once change everything. I do suggest that the fight for renewal of this important civil right can become a great rallying point for those who, like us, stand outraged before the rot which spreads through the nation. There is given to men now and then some relatively simple moment or symbol or place in which a number of complex things gather and in which a comprehensive remedy for multiple wrongs is clarified. Such a symbol was the penny on the pound of tea in Boston two hundred years ago. Such a moment came at Valley Forge. Such places are Thermopylae and, perhaps, Stalingrad, certainly at the Concord Bridge in '75. There are in these times and things the symbolism and the power to move whole peoples. This kind of moment is now possible here. . . Anyone who says that this moment, this cause and this place are meaningless, whatever his other credentials is blind."

From all this, and from its peculiarly simple and yet peculiarly comprehensive situation in America today, there can be no doubt whatsoever that *what is at stake in the drive to restore voluntary school prayer is very much more than the morning moment alone, important as this is, in our public schools*. If and as we do celebrate June 17, 1973 as a National Day of Rededication, we do so around the issue of voluntary school prayer but we do so in a cause much bigger than this. We do penance not only for what the Court so wrongly decided and for our own lethargy and silence in repealing this wrong but also we do penance for the general withering away of public reverence in our midst and for the secular humanism which in so many ways eats at the vitals of this republic. Our purpose likewise is not alone to make amends for an inadequate decade but also to discover and place a new dedication to a future in which God will again be constitutionally welcome in all our activities together as a people. It is to this kind of cause that we now invite all Americans of good will.

Current facts. A large number of prayer amendment bills have been introduced in both Senate and House this term. Key bills are, on the Senate side, SJ Res #84 co-sponsored by Senators Richard Schweiker (Pa), Hugh Scott (Pa), Howard Baker (Tenn), Howard Cannon (Nev), James Eastland (Miss), John Pastore (RI); on the House side, HJ Res #333, introduced by Rep. Chalmers Wylie (Ohio). All bills now remain inactive in Congressional committees—on the Senate side, in the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee (chairman, Senator Birch Bayh); on the House side in the Judiciary Committee (Chairman, Rep. Peter Rodino). *It is of maximum importance that a major portion of the sweat involved in National Rededication Day '73 be devoted precisely to contact with these Senators and Representatives.*

Since there is no full-time national staff, no committed mimeo machines, no unilateral organization, and no monies at our disposal, *we must mainly rely on the ingenuity and the prayerful effort of Americans everywhere. One or two suggestions, however, may be in order:*

1. June 17, 1973, should be publicized in every way possible and repeatedly in all news media and in all publications (church and secular).

2. Local pastors should be urged to preach sermons on Sunday, June 17, 1973, remembering and rededicating. We will be happy to provide material.

3. If possible, articles should be submitted to local press, radio and TV stations. Letters to the editor and talk shows should be thoroughly covered. For want of other material, this memorandum can be duplicated and transmitted.

4. A massive and noisy approach must be

made to all Senators and Congressmen again and again in the days before and immediately after June 17, 1973. It should be constantly recalled that all current bills remain blocked in committee.

5. Local church and secular organizations (e.g., PTA) should be contacted at once and resolutions supporting freedom of religion in the public classroom pressed to adoption. Such resolutions must be communicated to Congress.

6. State legislatures, city and town councils, county commissioners and other governing bodies should be asked to pass resolutions and petitions demanding of Congress immediate action to repeal the prayer-ban decisions through the proposition of a carefully worded prayer amendment to the nation.

7. Wherever possible, ecumenical prayer services and vigils should be organized on or near June 17, 1973 to invite God's guidance in our national rededication and to draw prayerful attention to the occasion and the tragedy it commemorates.

8. In every possible way, it must be clarified to all Americans on this rededication day that much more is involved in this fight than school prayer alone, that so long as freedom of religion is denied in one place its survival in all other public places is threatened. A cancer, in short, has been placed in the bloodstream of the nation. Only a radical removal of this cancer can restore us to national sanity and health.

As we now gird up for this important event, it is well to recall certain comments which can help us better sense the immensity of what we are doing:

"We believe that thus (i.e., through voluntary prayer) the school will fulfill its high function of implementing the training of the home, ever intensifying in the child that love for God, for parents and for home which is the mark of true character-training and the sure guarantee of a country's welfare." New York Board of Regents, enabling voluntary school prayer, 1951.

"The corollary in both law and logic of the Supreme Court's recent interdiction (i.e., in the prayer-ban decision) is inescapable, prohibition of the affirmative recognition and collaboration by government at all levels with all organs of religion in all relationships and circumstances. A consistent application of such a policy would involve a revolution in the Nation's habitual practice in the matter of religion." Henry P. Van Dusen, former Dean of Union Theological Seminary, New York, shortly after the first decision.

"The Supreme Court has stated that 'religion must be a private matter for the individual, the family and the institutions of private choice.' Religion is indeed a private matter, but it is far more than that. Since the founding of the Republic, it has been deemed in an important sense, a very public matter. The separation of church and state is a wise policy. The separation of religion from public life is dangerous folly. We Americans have always known that religious liberty demands, by its very nature, that it be exercised publicly." United States Catholic Conference, Statement on "Parental Rights and the Free Exercise of Religion," November 15, 1971.

"Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion . . . Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles." George Washington, Farewell Address.

SUPERPORTS

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

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 20, and 21, 1973, Public Works Committee's Subcommittee on Energy will hold hearings on H.R. 2020, and related bills. I feel that both the purpose and the contents of this bill are straightforward. Nonetheless, I would like to take this opportunity to clarify its provisions for the record.

Let me point out that this legislation takes neither a positive nor a negative stance on superports. The necessity for superports will be determined, I would hope in the near future, by joint planning between the Federal Government and the energy industries, under the supervision of Congress. It is a policy decision whether or not this country is to feed its oil addiction by foreign or domestic supplies, whether it is to sanction great importation of oil or to encourage domestic development and increased research and development. Although these are important issues, which will be considered by this subcommittee as well as others, they are essentially irrelevant to the enactment of H.R. 2020.

In essence H.R. 2020 gives to States directly or indirectly affected by the construction of offshore bulk cargo transhipment facilities a veto power over Federal approval of such projects. However, this veto power is by no means unlimited. In order for a State to be directly affected, within the terms of the bill, the affected State must have passed a law which explicitly prevents the construction of such offshore facilities, within its jurisdiction—seaward 3 miles from its low waterline.

Furthermore, a State indirectly affected by the construction of such an offshore facility of what would be considered the coast of another State can also prevent Federal approval of such a project upon the fulfillment of two requirements: First, the indirectly affected State must have a law which specifically prevents the construction of such offshore facilities under its State jurisdiction, so that it cannot block a port for another State while legally maintaining the right to approve one itself; and second, it must be established that it would in fact be vulnerable to adverse conditions by virtue of the construction of such a facility at the suggested location.

This bill, with its purpose beginning "to prohibit," may be taken by some as unnecessarily negative, the culmination of "it may be good—but put it in someone else's backyard." Yet, there can be no doubt that even in matters of national interest a State should have a determinative say in what is or is not constructed literally in its backyard.

Furthermore, I feel that this legislation in effect benefits those interested in the development of offshore cargo projects. It provides a mechanism in advance for knowing where such a project is not desired, and I think in the long run eliminate painstaking negotiations and perhaps court suits.

Who is to say that the immense delay involved in the Alaskan pipeline could not have been greatly abated had the people of Alaska, through referendum or State legislation, been able to say

whether they did or did not want the oil from the North Slope transported by pipeline through Alaska. Surely, environmentalists would have less persuasive power if the people of Alaska, through majority voice or its legislative process, had approved the Alaskan route, and conversely, the energy interests would certainly have explored the Canadian alternative far sooner had the people of Alaska expressed a negative interest in the proposal.

It is often alleged that environmentalists do not speak for the majority—the majority upon which democratic government is based. If this is true, or even if it is believed to be true, we must find a way to ascertain the true will of the majority in a given location as to a specific project. This is the course which H.R. 2020 advocates.

"NEW DIRECTIONS" AT ANTIOCH

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, time was when young Americans whose parents were unable to foot the bill for their college education were eager and anxious to work their way through school, without demanding that the Federal Government pay their way. Unfortunately, we today have some young men and women who feel that the government owes them a college education and they are prepared to demonstrate—violently—to back up their demands.

In that connection, McNaught Syndicate columnist Andrew Tully has carefully analyzed the student strike at Antioch College and has come up with a conclusion which I share—that "a College can do what it pleases with its own money, but, the college has no vested right to expect financial support from the Federal Government for its courses in 'creative conflict.'" As Tully says:

The citizen in Lubbock, Tex., or Reading, Pa., who gets it up for the income tax man every year might well suggest other uses for his dough.

The Tully column, which appeared June 13 in the Alexandria, Va. Gazette and other papers, is as follows:

"NEW DIRECTIONS" AT ANTIOCH

(By Andrew Tully)

WASHINGTON.—To understand the mentality of the student minority which closed down Antioch College in Yellow Springs, Ohio, for six violent weeks, one must ponder the statement of a student named Barbara Israel.

Testifying in a suit brought by four brave students for an injunction against the strikers, Miss Israel told the judge she expected to receive full course credit in Revolution and Spanish 1 for striking. The judge was incredulous. He should not have been. Even a cursory examination of the daily newspapers would have told him that there are still too many nuts running our so-called institutions of higher learning.

Antioch is foremost among these institutions, operating on what might be called the free-lunch theory. In 1970, the college instituted its New Directions programs designed to include "a real number of working class students, black and white." As proclaimed by President James P. Dixon, the idea was to

foment "creative conflict" and thus provide the student body with "a learning experience."

Well, there was conflict, all right, and about 250 strikers profited from the "learning experience" by demanding violently that the college guarantee low-income students financial support through graduation, at up to 4,000 clams a year. There was no talk about keeping grades up, of course. The college said it couldn't guarantee any dough beyond two years because of the uncertainty of Federal assistance. So, a strike, naturally.

Although nearly 2,000 students wanted to continue their studies, Dixon did nothing to reopen the school until his hand was forced by the four litigants seeking an injunction. Even when the injunction was granted, the college appealed the judge's decision on "principle"; Dixon's stand was that the court had interfered by ordering the college to do something it was already trying to do!

In the meantime, the college buildings were vandalized, professors were assaulted—one by a thrown ashcan—and nonstrikers were forced to organize classes off campus. Somehow, the "working class" strikers—most of them black—managed to find the money to obtain and erect barricades to keep everybody out of the classrooms.

Dixon was not idle; he was making statements. "People came to claim the social justice that was their due," he said. "A great deal of the energy for change comes from dissent," he said. He argued that to rule without agreement on campus makes the administration a "tyrant," a role he found "unacceptable." Agreement? A whopping majority of the student body was howling for its right to an education and charging, accurately, that the college had reneged on its contractual obligations.

Finally—but not until the injunction had been issued—Dixon admitted that "confusion had reached a point where it couldn't organize itself." I'm going to save that one, too. He added that he was "beginning to believe that the level of coercion is destructive of the pluralistic dissent that the campus has been willing to tolerate." Where on earth do the Dixons of this world find their rhetoric? I suppose what he meant was that the strikers were beating up too many people.

It is, of course, the James P. Dixons who are confused. In seeking to provide "social justice" for the underprivileged, some of whom are more interested in paid vacations than in learning how to spell CAT, they establish a new privileged class of students who in a community of equals are considerably more equal than their peers. Naturally, this new privileged class felt Antioch owed them guaranteed financial support. The Dixons had told them to expect it.

But there is a flaw in these "New Directions" programs. It is that while a college can do what it pleases with its own money, the college has no vested right to expect financial support from the Federal government for its courses in "creative conflict." The citizens in Lubbock, Tex., or Reading, Pa., who gets it up for the income tax man every year might well suggest other uses for his dough. Somebody always has to pay for a free lunch.

COMPROMISE TO SPEED DECISION ON ALASKAN OIL

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, last week Congressman JOHN BLATNIK, Congressman JOHN ANDERSON, and I joined nearly 60 cosponsors in the introduction of an Alaska oil compromise which offers the

Congress an opportunity to finally put this issue to rest, and do it in a way that is both reasonable and responsible. No other Alaska bill under consideration offers a final solution to the controversy; nor does any offer such assurance that construction of a pipeline could be begun any time soon. For if the Congress approves this compromise, the bulldozers can begin digging and the pipe can begin to be assembled early next year. If the Congress approves the bill presently favored by the administration and the oil industry, the most optimistic prediction is that legal battles to follow will delay the beginning of construction by at least a year, maybe two or three.

This point needs to be reemphasized because it is crucial and it is currently the subject of propaganda and misunderstanding. If the Congress adopts the President's approach on this issue, it votes to return the entire matter to the courts where the litigation, if successful, will take at least a year and probably more. If unsuccessful, the entire pipeline project will have to be scrapped and it is back to the drawing boards. If our compromise is adopted, the Congress will have decided that to settle the entire issue within six months time. There will be either a Canadian or Alaskan pipeline, and there will be no review of that decision by the courts.

Our compromise, H.R. 8561, begins with the premise that there are two large and influential segments of American society who, for different reasons, are opposed to the trans-Alaska route. First are the conservation groups who have fought this project tooth and nail, and in my opinion not without justification, since the huge oil find was made on the North Slope in 1968. Their court suits combined with the incompetent strategy of the administration and industry—which was to simply avoid public debate in the Congress—have resulted in a 5-year impasse. The most recent court decision returned the entire matter to Congress, not on the environmental or economic grounds which are really at issue, but in the sheepskin of the 53-year-old Mineral Leasing Act which restricts the width of rights-of-way over public lands to 54 feet. It is unfortunate that the Alaska oil issue has been delivered to us in such an antique and ubiquitous package because there are clear and substantial arguments for changing the law so that other pipeline work in the country can proceed according to the needs of modern technology. To hold the Alaska pipeline decision hostage to an old law that affects needed work on other, non-controversial pipelines might be an acceptable tactic on the part of the administration, but it is something other than good public policy.

The Congress really ought to deal with these issues separately. The Alaskan oil decision is important enough to stand on its own merits, and the controversy surrounding it should not be allowed to slow necessary pipeline work going on in other parts of the country.

In any event, current conservationist concern over the trans-Alaska pipeline centers on two threats:

First. Earthquakes. The nearly 800-

mile trans-Alaska route traverses one of the most active earthquake zones in the world—23 major earthquakes in the last 70 years. Even industry experts and the Interior Department's NEPA statement make no guarantees against massive oil spills, polluted streams and substantially mitigated wildlife habitats. This is America's last great wilderness.

Second. Marine oil spills. Oil spillage is unavoidable, and experts say it will average up to 140,000 barrels a year, or the equivalent of 14 Santa Barbaras. This, of course, will occur over the vast area tankers will travel, from Valdez down the west coast into new American ports, and thus the unsightliness and marine danger will, according to one's perspective, be either less intense than Santa Barbara or more pervasive.

Frequently these conservationist opponents are portrayed as a group of selfish woodsmen who want the Alaska wilderness to themselves while the country grinds to a halt for lack of petroleum. But the facts say something different. The environmental damage being contemplated is substantial and irrevocable, and the pipeline will come at no small cost to this and future generations. It's a price we may well have to pay, but to the conservationist's view, not before a good faith effort has been made to sort out the alternatives.

A second and growing opponent of the trans-Alaska pipeline is the oil-thirsty American Midwest. The argument here is made not on environmental grounds, but rather on the basis of need, national security and economics. By 1985 the U.S. east of the Rockies is expected to be over 50 percent dependent on non-Canadian foreign oil, most from the Mideast. Without the addition of costly transmission facilities, the trans-Alaska pipeline could not reduce this dependence in the Midwest, while creating an oil surplus on the west coast. On the other hand, a trans-Canadian line, assuming it were possible, would in one stroke deliver relatively cheap oil to the area of the country needing it most and improve our national security posture with regard to the unstable Mideast.

Here again these opponents of the trans-Alaska route have been cast as a self-seeking interest group grinding a regional ax. Notwithstanding their right to grind just such an ax, it is important to understand that there is a legitimate national interest in the reduction of Mideast imports and the most equitable distribution of limited domestic oil reserves.

So the compromise legislation we have introduced begins with the premise that there are two dissenting groups, involving the interests of millions of Americans, who believe the administration's trans-Alaska decision to have been mistaken, and who further believe the Canadian alternative has never been given a hard, independent look. They will not sit still until it is, and on environmental and possibly antitrust grounds they have enough legal ammunition to tie up in the courts a trans-Alaska pipeline for many months and perhaps years to come.

Mr. Speaker, a second major factor in our decision to seek compromise legis-

lation is timing. Can the country really afford to wait indefinitely to find out whether there will or will not be a pipeline? While Alaska oil is not the answer to today's shortages, although a clever industry PR effort has left a different impression, the country will increasingly need that huge Alaska oil resource as time goes on. We are talking about oil for the end of this decade and the beginning of the next—if we move now. The only way to move now is for Congress to act, to take into account in its own study the responsibilities of NEPA, and to make a final, ultimate decision on the Canadian or Alaskan route. In order to make an informed decision, a new study is necessary. The administration is incapable of such a study because on this issue it has no credibility with the dissenting groups and is already committed by word and deed to the Alaska route.

We have therefore proposed a 6-month study by the National Academy of Sciences, coordinated by the Comptroller General, which on a crash basis compares the two routes and reports its findings and recommendations to Congress. At the same time, the Interior and State Departments are directed to enter into serious negotiations with the Canadian Government determining once and for all that country's position with regard to a pipeline through the Mackenzie Valley. It is a fish or cut bait proposition.

In short, the crash study would achieve two needed objectives:

It would clear the air and remove the pall of doubt and suspicion that has clouded this issue for 5 long years by granting the dissenting groups the Canadian study they have sought.

It would allow the Congress to insulate its decision from criticism by calling on the best minds to take a last, hard look at the alternatives and to arrive at conclusions based on the best evidence available.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to make a few comments on the Canadian alternative. I am not necessarily an advocate of that pipeline route, but I am sufficiently convinced of its attractiveness and viability to be convinced that it deserves a second look.

Two weeks ago, I attended an inter-parliamentary meeting in Ottawa where with the other members of the U.S. delegation I had an opportunity to meet with Minister MacDonald and other key Canadian Government and business leaders. I came away from those discussions with the following impressions:

First. It is false to suggest, as the Nixon administration does, that the Canadians are simply uninterested in cooperating with us on both: a gas and oil pipeline from the northwest. The fact is the Canadians have been told in so many words not to interfere with an "internal" U.S. decision and have almost concluded as a result that this country will not seriously explore with them the possibility of a Canadian line.

Second. Being thus discouraged, the Canadian Government, remaining in power by the narrowest of margins, has not been inclined to pursue the tough policy decisions within its own country which might make an accommodation

possible. The Canadians would encounter objections on environmental grounds; they would have to settle political problems with regard to ownership and financing of the pipeline; they would have to lay the groundwork for a settlement of their native claims. Many Canadian officials believe all these things to be possible, but why undertake such an effort if the United States is not seriously interested?

Third. While it may take a little longer to build a Canadian pipeline, the Arctic oil by itself will be a relatively small portion of the U.S. need and, in any event, will be pumped out in a period of 15 to 25 years. If there are major advantages going for the Canadian route a delay of oil delivery from 1976-77 to 1979-80 will not be all that significant.

Fourth. The Canadians are not demanding ownership of 51 percent of the pipeline, as claimed by advocates of the trans-Alaska route. The pipeline, no matter who holds the equity, would be at least 80 percent debt financed. Other major utility projects in Canada are supported in large measure by foreign capital.

Fifth. The cost of a trans-Canada pipeline would be competitive with a trans-Alaska project, when the costs of the latter's extensive tanker and port system are taken into account.

Mr. Speaker, the administration and industry are currently opposed to the compromise I have described. The \$64 question is, Why? They are sincerely convinced that the trans-Alaska route would prevail in any serious study of the alternatives. If they are right, the independent study will simply confirm their convictions and they can begin to lay pipe early next year. There would be no further delay, no court battles, no congressional hearings.

If they are wrong, and the study finds the Canadian alternative to be preferable and viable, then the Congress will have averted a major policymaking error with which many generations would have to live. No such recommendation could be made unless the Canadian Government appears ready to commit itself to the project.

Mr. Speaker, I call on industry, the administration, the conservation groups, and Members of Congress from the Midwest and East to accept this compromise. For in a democracy the way a decision is made is frequently as important as the decision itself, and that theme has never been better dramatized than in the saga of the trans-Alaska pipeline.

THE CASE FOR REDUCED U.S. OVERSEAS TROOP LEVELS

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, during the June Democratic Caucus I will offer a resolution calling for reduction in U.S. forces stationed abroad, with such reduction to be accomplished over the next fiscal year.

This resolution is similar to one passed this March by the Senate Democratic

Caucus; the Senate resolution called for the President to reduce "substantially" the size of U.S. military presence in Europe and Asia by mid-1974.

In order that my colleagues be well informed on the issue of overseas force levels, I now wish to insert into the RECORD a series of statements and studies some very current, others made within the past 2 years—on this topic. I urge that my colleagues study these documents before the caucus meeting.

The materials follow:

I—TESTIMONY BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE JUNE 5, 1973 ON THE FISCAL YEAR 1974 DEFENSE PROGRAM AND BUDGET MILITARY MANPOWER REQUESTS IN THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

(By Edward L. King, executive director, Coalition on National Priorities and Military policy)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and discuss the military manpower requests contained in Title III, Section 301, of H.R. 6722.

Mr. Chairman, I continue to strongly support an adequate program of national defense. But I am also convinced that it is possible to adequately defend our national security at less cost and with fewer active duty military personnel.

I believe this is possible if a more accurate assessment is made of the true military extent of our overseas commitments, and the current scope of foreign "threats" that justify the forward deployment of over 600,000 personnel of our armed forces.

Recognizing the importance of manpower in the defense system and the increasing costs of obtaining this resource, Congress incorporated into the Armed Forces Authorization Act for Fiscal 1971, the provisions of Public Law 92-436, which require the Department of Defense to submit an annual report recommending active duty force levels, a justification for these levels, an explanation of the relationship between these recommendations and U.S. national security policies. Last year Congress requested this additional specific information:

"Such justification and explanation shall specify in detail for all forces including each land force division, carrier and other major combatant vessel, air wing, and other comparable unit:

- a) the unit mission
- b) the strategy which the unit supports
- c) the area of deployment and illustrative areas of potential deployment, including a description of any United States commitment to defend such areas. Such justification and explanation shall include a detailed discussion of the manpower required for support and overhead functions within the Armed Services."

In the Fiscal Year 1974 Military Manpower Requirements Report the Department of Defense has responded to the Congressional request. According to the Department, two basic national security objectives provide the rationale for U.S. force levels and overseas deployments of military manpower. These objectives are stated as: 1) preserving the U.S. as a free and independent nation, to safeguard its fundamental institutions and values, and protect its people. 2) contributing to the security of other nations with whom we have treaties or whose security significantly impacts on our security.

In accomplishing the second of these objectives the Department of Defense cites "U.S. commitments under primary applicable treaties" as the justification for a large part of the military manpower requests being made in FY 1974—and being acted on by this Committee in H.R. 6722.

The Department of Defense indicates that

the "primary applicable treaties" are the NATO and SEATO treaties. Yet no specific manpower requirements or obligations are set forth in either of these treaties. The NATO Treaty does not specify any level of U.S. military force. Indeed it does not even require members to take military action to meet a common threat. The size and composition of U.S. military forces assigned to NATO is determined by the Executive Branch of the U.S. Government—not by substantive treaty "commitments."

The most binding language in the NATO Treaty in regard to military commitments is contained in Articles 3, 4, and 5, which read:

ARTICLE 3

"The parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack." [Under this article the U.S. has felt compelled to assume a costly 25-year obligation of a massive military assistance program to NATO members.]

ARTICLE 4

"The members agree to consult whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the parties is threatened."

ARTICLE 5

"The members agree to consider an armed attack against one . . . an attack against them all." But each signer agrees only to "assist the party or parties so attacked by taking . . . such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force." (Italic added)

Article 11 states that the provisions of the NATO Treaty shall be carried out by the member states "in accordance with their respective constitutional processes." Neither the United States Congress nor the President is committed—by treaty—to any particular military course of action or level of military manpower in Europe. Thus I seriously question the legitimacy of the Department of Defense contention (as stated in the FY 1974 Military Manpower Requirements Report) that the "NATO Treaty" is a sufficient justification for about 500,000 military personnel on active duty to meet a U.S. "commitment" to an initial defense of NATO. This force justified under P.L. 92-436 on the basis of the "NATO Treaty" commitment consists of 8 active Army and Marine division, 6 aircraft carriers, over 80 surface warships and attack submarines, plus 21 air squadrons. This "commitment" is the result of voluntary Executive Branch consultative agreements—not specific treaty agreements entered into by the Congress.

Much the same process has been repeated under SEATO. The Department of Defense lists the "commitment" contained in the SEATO treaties as the justification for requesting over 150,000 military personnel for deployment to Asia. This force includes 3½ Army and Marine active divisions, 9 aircraft carriers, over 80 surface warships and attack submarines, and 11 air squadrons. But the articles of the SEATO treaties do not specify any military force levels, or any form of required military action by the signatory parties. Again, the level of military forces provided is the result of voluntary consultative agreements entered into by the Executive Branch—not articles of treaty commitments entered into with the agreement of the Congress.

At a time when military threats in Europe and Asia no longer resemble those projected in the 1950's, and when urgently needed domestic programs are being drastically reduced or eliminated, the Department of Defense should be required to more fully comply with the requirements of P.L. 92-436. The Congress should be furnished more accurate and precise justification for military manpower requests than vaguely

worded treaties, which are in fact discretionary and do not call for the standing commitment of any prescribed level of U.S. military manpower. Such specious justifications for military manpower, which will be the basis for about 1 million active duty personnel and cost the American taxpayer in excess of \$30 billion in FY 1974 do not beneficially serve U.S. domestic priorities or national security objectives in the world of the 1970's.

In FY 1973 the Department of Defense deployed over 600,000 military personnel overseas in support of Executive Branch agreements. These so-called "forward deployments" cost the taxpayer billions. The Defense Department says that in determining the location and size of overseas deployments it considers:

- a) the threat
- b) the military requirements of the area
- c) costs and political aspects

The final decision regarding forward deployments is made by the President, the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Congress has not always played a role.

Close analysis of present forward deployments of military manpower and those planned for FY 1974, raises questions about whether the Department of Defense has given adequate consideration to determining the location and size of overseas forces. Two examples are the U.S. forces deployed in Europe and Korea:

EUROPE
The threat

The Soviet "threat" in Europe which is used as a basis for the deployment of 319,000 military personnel to Europe (this is more than the 311,600 we had there before the Berlin Crisis of 1962) is stated as follows in the FY 1974 Department of Defense Report:

"While we do not consider aggression by the USSR likely in the present political climate, the fact remains that the Soviets have a vital interest in preserving the status quo in Central Europe and in retaining their hold on Eastern Europe. A crisis that could lead to conflict could arise if the political situation substantially changed in a way that threatened the USSR or its hegemony over Eastern Europe, or if a Soviet government saw opportunities for other ways to apply critical pressures on the cohesion of the Alliance. Such a crisis could escalate to hostilities."

Despite a Berlin Agreement, detente between East and West, a SALT agreement, and growing trade exchanges over the past four fiscal years, the Department of Defense has stated the Soviet "threat" in exactly these same words each year. The vague supposition contained in the threat has not changed, but the manpower deployments required to meet it have increased by at least 20,000 and the cost has increased by about \$4 billion over the four years.

The military requirements of the area

Over the past twenty years there has been no report by the Department of Defense of any substantial change in the military requirements in Central Europe. These requirements have always been reported as remaining constant and requiring continued expense and effort on the part of the American people. Yet the manpower required to meet these constant military requirements has fluctuated from around 280,000 in 1968 during the Vietnam War to a high of about 411,000 in 1963. Based on these facts of the past 20 years of our presence in Europe, it is difficult indeed to believe that it is military requirements that legitimately determine U.S. military manpower levels required. A more accurate assessment would tend to indicate that it is our unduly sensitive concern over European political considerations and requirements, which more nearly determine

that 300,000 or more American military personnel must continue to be stationed in Europe. This is the result of hiding for years an essentially political problem in the wrapping of specious military justifications.

If valid military requirements were truly the overriding considerations of our European force deployment, the Defense Department should probably have long ago improved the ratio of combat-to-support personnel assigned in Europe. At present there are 198,600 Army troops deployed in Central Europe. The Department of Defense has reported that in FY 1974 a total of 116,000 of those troops will be serving in combat units. Two questions immediately come to mind: what units are being classified as "combat" and are all the personnel assigned in a "combat unit" actually involved in combat against an enemy?

The answer can be found in the Army's statistics on personnel assigned to combat skill jobs (i.e. individuals whose primary duty is to fire on the enemy). Army statistics show that 24% of the requested FY 1974 force will be assigned to combat skill jobs. Using this percentage as a basis of computation, 43,600 of the 198,600 total will be personnel actually assigned to combat duties and 155,000 will be personnel assigned to support duties.

Costs and political aspects

In FY 1974 the cost of U.S. forces based in Europe and those based in the U.S. with European missions has been estimated at about \$17 billion. Balance of payments loss in Europe as a result of military accounts have been stated as approximately \$1.8 billion in FY 1973. These high costs have been justified as necessary to provide U.S. combat manpower to make a "flexible response" to any form of Soviet aggression in Central Europe, and to assure our European allies of our resolve to defend them. For years the theory has been advanced that any reduction in the number of U.S. troops in Europe would be interpreted by our European allies as a signal of a lessening of U.S. resolve to help defend them and mark the beginning of Soviet dominance. This theory has been advanced as much by our State and Defense Departments as by our allies. On close examination it proves to have little validity. Since 1964, well over 100,000 U.S. troops have been removed from our European-based forces. British and Canadian troops have been withdrawn. France withdrew 10 divisions. Yet there was no psychological collapse on the part of the European allies. There was no rush to reach an accommodation with the Soviets. What has happened is an increased interest on the part of our European allies to strengthen the Alliance, and a transfer by the Soviets of a few Eastern Europe-based units to the Sino-Soviet border.

There are those who argue that there can be no reduction in the amount of U.S. military manpower stationed in Western Germany because this would weaken the political position of Mr. Brandt and damage his *ostpolitik*. This is of course supposition. What is not, is that West Germany under the Soviet Democrats, devotes more of its GNP to domestic social programs than does the United States. It has a lower unemployment rate than the United States. While we can find no money available for child day care centers, West Germany has one of the most advanced day care programs. Is it not a significant political aspect that the presence of large numbers of U.S. military manpower in West Germany which releases West German manpower and money is in effect subsidizing West German social development programs at the expense of fund-starved American domestic programs?

And does the deployment of 319,000 military personnel to Europe provide a conventional "flexible response" to the very unlike-

ly possibility of Soviet aggression? Rather than flexibility, present U.S. military manpower levels there tend to lock the U.S. into early, first use of tactical nuclear weapons, which would in all probability escalate to massive nuclear exchange. It is not apparent that the relationship of the serious military or political aspects of this problem have been fully examined.

KOREA

The threat

"Both North Korea and the People's Republic of China maintain large, well equipped, well trained forces capable of attacking the Republic of Korea at short notice. Additionally the USSR represents a potential threat to the U.S. and Japanese maritime interests in the region. However, in the present political climate we believe these nations would see aggression as contrary to their interests. The opening of talks between the two Korean governments has given both sides an incentive to avoid hostilities . . . Nevertheless, North Korea and the People's Republic of China could pose a serious threat to South Korea should this situation deteriorate in the future."

This threat statement for FY 1974 is almost identical with the one given by the Department of Defense for FY 1973. And it is very similar to the threat statements for Korea in FY 1971 and 1972. On the basis of meeting this highly conjectural threat analysis the U.S. has continued to deploy nearly 40,000 military personnel in South Korea.

The military requirements of the area

The stated Department of Defense mission for the 40,000 man U.S. force (which contains 18 generals/admirals) is "to provide ground combat and security forces for South Korea." The bilateral treaty between the U.S. and the Republic of Korea does not contain language requiring a U.S. force commitment, and the Department of Defense does not consider North Korean or Chinese aggression likely. Why is it necessary then for the U.S. to provide "combat and security" forces to South Korea?

The South Korean ground combat forces presently number around 600,000 men backed by a large trained reserve. A large portion of these troops are Vietnam combat veterans. Department of Defense reports place the North Korean ground combat force at 360,000 men. And this force has not been in sustained combat since 1953. There are no Soviet or Chinese combat units stationed in North Korea.

The principal combat element of the U.S. force is the Army's 2nd Infantry division. This division is not at wartime strength of 16,200, but contains only 13,000 U.S. soldiers. The Army divisional ratio of combat-to-support personnel establishes that only about 7,000 of these soldiers are assigned to combat related duties. This understrength division is backed up by about 18,000 additional soldiers serving in noncombat administration and support jobs. Tactical air support for the division is provided by 54 F-4 aircraft manned by 8,300 Air Force personnel. The 1,113 man Eighth Army Headquarters is in overall command of U.S. forces in South Korea. This headquarters—which contains a dozen generals—is a U.S. field army. Under U.S. Army tactical doctrine a field army headquarters is authorized only to command *four or more* U.S. combat divisions grouped under corps headquarters which in turn command two divisions each. In South Korea the Eighth U.S. Army headquarters commands a corps headquarters, which controls the one understrength infantry division. Why does it require such a large command overhead to command and control one infantry division?

A close reading of Department of Defense reports reveals that at present South Korean armed forces are superior to North Korea in

every category except fighter aircraft. Under a recently agreed on \$1.5 billion five year military assistance program, the U.S. is providing sufficient numbers of new F-5E fighters to establish South Korean superiority in this area.

If, as it appears, South Korean forces do not need ground combat support, then what is the security mission of U.S. ground forces in Korea? One of the principal purposes of the U.S. forces is to provide tactical nuclear weapons fire in support of the South Korean armed forces. How valid is this purpose? During the Korean War—when the U.S. had an absolute atomic supremacy—we did not use atomic weapons in Korea. Why would the U.S. choose to use tactical nuclear weapons (which are of the same essential yield range as our 1950 atomic weapons) in any future conflict in South Korea? And more importantly, is first-use of nuclear weapons in Asia in any way compatible with the Nixon Doctrine? And if there is no serious intent to use tactical nuclear weapons in Korea, then why continue to maintain an infantry division there to provide security for the stored weapons?

Costs and political aspects

In fiscal year 1972, the pay, upkeep, and operating costs for U.S. forces in Korea was \$584 million. In addition South Korea received \$192 million in U.S. economic assistance and \$155 million in military assistance. Balance-of-payments costs ran near \$300 million. Thus the cost to the taxpayer in FY 1972 for our presence in Korea was nearly \$1 billion.

The Secretary of Defense stated in March 1973 that U.S. forces in Korea were needed to provide political stability to the area. Certainly the present South Korean government has given evidence of "stability". It has continued in power for several years despite constitutional limitations to the contrary. There is nothing to indicate a lack of stability in the present situation in South Korea. Why is it not possible to now withdraw this U.S. military force which landed in Korea in Sept. 1945 and has continued its presence since that time? And what are the political aspects for the U.S. of continuing to provide military personnel and money, to support a South Korean government which denies constitutional guaranteed liberties to its own people?

MILITARY MANPOWER PLANNING IN THE FY 1974 DEFENSE DEPARTMENT BUDGET REQUEST

The Department of Defense Authorization Bill (H.R. 6722) which the Committee is considering, contains what I believe to be excessive end-strength authorizations for each of the military departments. These end-strengths are based on the type of embellished commitment and threat evaluation that I have discussed, but they are also based on wasteful and low combat productive doctrines and management techniques.

The FY 1974 budget outlays for military manpower will exceed \$30 billion. What amount of combat defense will the American taxpayer receive for his money? Let us examine the specifics of how some of this costly military manpower will be used during FY 1974:

According to a press statement of the former Comptroller of the Department of Defense, about 77.5% of the fiscal 1974 active military force of 2.2 million men and women will be serving as officers or non-commissioned officers. A ratio of about 3 supervisors or health care specialists for each private, seaman and airman.

In the 2.2 million active duty force being proposed for authorization in FY 1974 only the following percentage of each military department will be serving in combat skill jobs that directly fire on an armed enemy of the U.S.:

Army, 24% of a requested end-strength of 803,806.

Navy 12% of a requested end-strength of 566,320.

Marines, 28% of a requested end-strength of 176,219.

Air Force, 8% of a requested end-strength of 666,357.

Despite the end of most short tours to Vietnam and a smaller planned force, Department of Defense manpower projected for non-productive transient status will number 89,000 (3.7% of the total force) in FY 1974. This represents an increase of 7,000 military personnel over the number of transients required in FY 1973. And the 89,000 non-productive man-spaces represents enough personnel to man 5½ combat divisions. The cost of FY 1973 transient manpower was \$1.5 billion. In FY 1974 the Department of Defense is projecting 2,269,000 Permanent Change of Station (PCS) moves among its total 2,200,000 active military force, more than one PCS move per military individual.

Military "grade creep" continues unchecked in the FY 1974 force. In a peacetime environment there will continue to be over 200,000 officers serving on active duty in higher "temporary" wartime rank (no program has reverted officers to permanent peacetime rank since the end of World War II). Despite the implied and intended restrictions contained in the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and the Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954, to maintain a balanced officer corps, the 2.2 million FY 1974 force will contain more 4- and 3-star officers (182) than were required on active duty in 1945 (139) to command over 12 million. In the FY 1974 armed force there is one general/admiral to command each 1,800 other military personnel. On June 30, 1945, at the peak of World War II there was one general/admiral to command each 5,000 other personnel, and we won that war. On that same date in 1945 there were 14,898 colonels/Navy captains on active duty; on June 30, 1973, there will be 16,739 colonels/Navy captains on active duty in a 2.3 million force. There are also more Lt. colonels/commanders in the FY 1973 force than there were in the 2.6 million FY 1964 force.

A comparison of FY 1964 and FY 1973 officer strengths shows 18,698 fewer captains, lieutenants and warrant officers in the smaller FY 1973 force, but an increase of 6,907 in the number of general/flag and field grade officers. It is difficult to relate these figures to a recent Army announcement which stated that the Army would involuntarily release approximately 4,900 reserve officers in the grade of major and below from active duty by October 1, 1973. It would appear that again token forced reduction is going to take place at the bottom rather than the bloated top of the officer corps. And it should be remembered that in terms of combat productivity, about 80% of active duty U.S. field grade officers are assigned to noncombat duties.

The Defense Authorization bill contains an end-strength request for an active Army manpower level of 803,806 personnel. But less than 220,000 of those soldiers will be serving in the 13 combat divisions the Army will field in FY 1974 to fight in defense of our national security. And within each 16,000-man division over two-thirds of the personnel will be serving as officers or non-commissioned officers—only one-third as privates.

In FY 1973 there are nearly 70,000 U.S. military personnel scattered about in 46 countries that include the following: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Bermuda, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Great Britain, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Liberia, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Nigeria, Portugal, Paraguay, Pakistan, Spain, Saudi Arabia, Taiwan, Turkey, Tunisia, and Zaire. The FY 1974 Department of Defense requests give no indication of any lessening of this scattered U.S. military manpower deployment. It is difficult to under-

stand how the security of these countries significantly impacts on our own security to a degree to justify stationing this number of our costly military manpower there.

In FY 1974 the Department of Defense will train more administrative specialists and clerks (311,100) than they will infantry, guncrew, and seamanship specialists (215,700). The Department of Defense will also pay for 24,845 career officers to attend graduate education courses during FY 1974. And it is interesting to note that in FY 1974 the Air Force (with a requested end-strength of 660,357) will need to send 3,589 more officers to obtain graduate degrees in business management than the Army (which will have a requested end-strength of 803,806). Why does the Air Force need twice as many officers with graduate degrees in business management to manage 143,449 fewer personnel?

Mr. Chairman, I believe that if there is serious interest in reducing defense manpower costs and still adequately defending our national security then some hard decisions still remain to be made.

Foreign "threats" must be more realistically perceived and evaluated on intent rather than "worst case" analysis. Overseas commitments must be more carefully weighed against actual treaty obligations and the priorities and best interests of this country, and troop deployments and overseas bases curtailed to more effectively relate to U.S. national security objectives. We must cease scattering our military manpower about the globe with combat missions they often cannot reasonably hope to accomplish. And in this regard we should face up to the fact that it is virtually impossible to make needed reductions in defense spending without first making substantial reductions in our over-commanded and over-supported forces stationed in Central Europe.

Present costly and unnecessarily lavish armed forces combat and support doctrines can no longer be tolerated. Our defense leadership and the Joint Chiefs of Staff must be more strongly encouraged to stop parochial log-rolling, and be required to streamline force structures by austere revising current Tables of Organization and Equipment (TO&E) and Tables of Distribution (TD).

I believe now is the time to return to a traditional peacetime permanent officer rank structure, to reduce the excessive number of permanent change of station moves and unnecessary unit rotations that waste our manpower. It is time to eliminate duplicate rank-justifying headquarters and lavish support commands, and return to time-tested principles of armed forces planning and support doctrines within the parameters of new national priorities and austere common-sense combat requirements.

When these steps are taken, America can be even more adequately defended by more efficient armed forces and at far less cost in men and money.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the committee for your time and consideration. I would be glad to respond to any questions.

II—KNOW YOUR ARMED FORCES: THE U.S. ARMY

(By the Friends Committee
on National Legislation)

"The uniform of the Armed Forces . . . has been severely tarnished" . . . partly because media coverage of the Vietnam war "brought home to the American people the true nature of warfare. . . . The truly tragic nature of warfare was so dramatically demonstrated . . . that it had an immense, though immeasurable, demoralizing effect. . . ."—Special House Subcommittee on Recruiting and retention of Military Personnel, May 11, 1972.

The Army is "not a war machine. It's a machine prepared to wage war in order to keep the peace. Now, that's not just semantics; that's vital if we're going to get these young people in the Army. . . . I'm idealistic and sensitive and I don't want to be in charge of an organization whose mission is to go out and kill somebody."—Secretary of the Army Robert F. Froehlke.¹

"The Army as an institution has an extraordinary ability to take young men and make them selfless in . . . a peer group situation and get them to do things that nobody in his right mind would do—you know, go out and get shot at. But that ability depends on a sustained belief in the value of what they're doing—and that . . . belief doesn't exist now. . . . I do think the situation is recoverable. . . . I would just reject as nonsense the idea that there is this permanent sapping of the national will to fight in glorious causes. . . ."—Former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower Alfred B. Fitt.²

The phrase, "the American Army", conjures up many pictures—tattered remnants at Valley Forge, Jackson standing like a stonewall, Patton slashing across Europe in World War II, and on and on to the blur of Vietnam.

What is today's Army? What kind of Army do Americans want in the year 2000? Or, even more basically, do Americans need an Army at all in the post-Vietnam era? Is it time to channel peacemaking and peacekeeping activities into a multinational framework?

Such questions will be up for debate in 1973 as Congress discusses U.S. foreign policy and examines the size of the armed forces, military pay scales and retirement benefits. Each Congressman will have several opportunities to record his position. The first vote will probably be on force levels since a ceiling on the number of men and women who can serve in each branch of the armed forces is included in the annual Military Authorization bill. Funds to pay personnel are provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill.

It is hoped that the data in the accompanying paper will be of assistance to constituents and Congressmen engaged in this most important discussion.

SOME TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS

On our shrinking planet, the American Army is an anachronism, like all other national war-making machinery. The interdependence and interrelationship of the world's people have become so great that they cry out for multinational mechanisms of mediation, conciliation, negotiation and policing.

The U.S. government has not yet come to grips with this need. It has tried to cope with the growing interrelatedness by tightening alliances and giving U.S. military personnel responsibilities around the world. U.S. military carry on joint maneuvers with allies, participate in joint research and exchange staff. The Army, Navy and Air Force have more advisors assigned to foreign capitals than our government as a whole has assigned to agencies of the United Nations. Expenditures in support of NATO alone far exceed U.S. contributions to programs of the United Nations. The U.S. armed forces spend more money on one exercise testing U.S. capability to reinforce Europe-based battalions than the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency spends in one year.

But no national institution is capable of supervising and coordinating the world's peacekeeping operations, especially if that institution's ultimate responsibility is the waging of war.³

¹ Johnson, Haynes and Wilson, George C., *Army in Anguish*.

² Ibid.

³ Readers are reminded that this paper deals with only one branch of the Armed Forces—the Army. The Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps play equally important roles.

The U.S. Army's frantic effort to carry out its assignment of being prepared to wage war anywhere and everywhere has led it to build a vast, worldwide bureaucracy, to move people endlessly, and to assemble an incredible array of complicated, expensive, "gold-plated" weaponry.

The Army has become a state within a state, a "welfare" state—providing its far-flung employees and their dependents with everything from housing and health care to an education. Its supplemental allowances and retirement benefits have reached alarming proportions.

But the Army is not only a drain on U.S. resources and an uneconomical and inefficient way of trying to resolve international disputes. As an institution, it is less and less acceptable to those people whose support it needs to survive—the young. Fewer and fewer Americans go into the Army because they want to go into the Army. They join because they are looking for help in getting an education or for training in a technical skill. The "glorious causes" referred to by former Assistant Secretary Fitt, above, are being defended and advanced in other ways.

In our own self-interest, the United States must begin to provide leadership in the movement toward world order. As a first step, Congress should reduce the size of the Army, eliminate overseas military commitments, disband the entire Selective Service System, and start putting as much energy into helping create a multinational judicial system as we are currently expending on coordinating and strengthening joint military operations.

WHAT IS THE MISSION OF TODAY'S ARMY?

It's Mission Is To Provide A "Forward Defense" As Far As Possible From the North American Continent.

"Forward defense" is also as a "responsibility to protect" allies. According to Government spokesmen, U.S. troop levels are largely determined by the commitment to defend Europe from Soviet attack, plus the need to help defend Asia from the Chinese, as well as cope with a "minor contingency" in the Middle East, Africa or Latin America.

This seemingly unlimited responsibility has resulted in:

Stationing of one or more American soldiers in more than 80 countries;

Budgeting of millions of dollars annually for training exercises to "make certain that we have the expertise to reinforce anywhere in the world"—Brigadier General L. R. Sears, Jr., March 10, 1972;

The expenditure of millions on questionable overseas rotation of personnel;

A determination that the American soldier should "be able to perform his tasks to survive and win in any environment on the face of this earth"—Major General William A. Burke, November 8, 1971;

Extensive research, running into the millions of dollars annually, on malaria, schistosomiasis, African sleeping sickness, and other tropical diseases "that are problems in military operations in tropical and subtropical regions, especially the Middle East . . . Additionally, many new virus diseases of potential military significance are being discovered as new areas of the world are developed"—Army submission to Senate Appropriations Committee, 1972;

The very expensive demand that army equipment should possess the "inherent capability to operate efficiently from the jungle to the Arctic"—Major General Burke, November 8, 1971;

The control, through base rights and leases, of thousands of acres overseas;

The payment of land use taxes and maneuver damage claims in West Germany;

The employment of foreign nationals in over 40 countries;

The nurturing of foreign military establishments.

The Army maintains a School of the Americas in Panama that trained nearly 2000

soldiers from 17 Latin American countries in the year ended June 30, 1972. It has advisory missions in over 40 countries, including Taiwan, Turkey, Ethiopia and Saudi Arabia. Mission activities frequently include helping the ally to decide on what kind of army to have and how to arm it. A U.S. Army briefer in Athens told a House Armed Services Subcommittee in 1972 that: "We have nine officers, four NCO's [sergeants] and 10 civilians assigned who are in virtually daily contact with our [Greek] counterparts. Our advisors make frequent visits to units throughout Greece, so we can evaluate performance and determine needs of the Hellenic Army. Our programmers, both in the materiel and training areas, formulate requirements for the Hellenic Army and administer grant-aid dollars to meet these needs. We also work with our [Greek] counterparts in developing force goals . . . and planning foreign military sales."—Colonel James E. Campbell, January 12, 1972.

IS ALL THIS "FORWARD DEFENSE" NECESSARY?

That's what the American people must decide. A decision is especially important now, since the Army says it needs to move toward a "readiness oriented budget" and step up its training program to compensate for the loss of "the Vietnam war as a major training base under combat conditions for the combat soldiers."—Brigadier General Sears, March 10, 1972. "During the past several years," said Major General George M. Bush, on March 10, 1972, "the Army's procurement budgets have been essentially replenishment budgets. The Fiscal Year 1973 budget shifts more to a readiness oriented budget." But full readiness will not be achieved at least until the FY 1976 budget.

For those who ask, "Ready for what?" the answer is for anything and everything. The threat, as the military sees it, is equal to the prospective enemy's estimated capability. His intentions are almost irrelevant. This view was expressed most succinctly last year by Admiral Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when he told a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that in reviewing the overall military balance, . . . "I will again maintain an attitude of strict objectivity, emphasizing the military capabilities of our opponents rather than their intentions." This type of he-can-kill-me-therefore-he-will "objectivity" has frightened Congress and the public instead of informing them. When combined with extensive military secrecy, it tends to foreclose thoughtful analysis of U.S. foreign policy actions and goals.

WHAT KIND OF INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK HAS THE ARMY DEVELOPED TO MANAGE ITS WORLD-WIDE RESPONSIBILITIES?

The Army might be described as an industrial conglomerate. It employs about 1.8 million soldiers and civilians. Its holdings as of June 1972 were valued at \$49 billion, including: \$1.7 billion of excess or potentially excess supplies and equipment, \$5 billion of industrial and other plant equipment, and 1.2 million acres of industrial land.

The Army produces some munitions and equipment itself. It contracts out the operation of 19 ammunition plants to private producers and holds 5 inactive plants plus equipment in an industrial preparedness reserve. It is currently engaged in a 12-year, \$8 billion program to modernize ammunition facilities to a "level capable of meeting mobilization requirements."

To coordinate its 35,000-man, \$2 billion research and development program, the Army maintains "what is essentially a corporate headquarters . . . It is like a major company, General Motors, a corporate headquarters which oversees Chevrolet, Cadillac, Pontiac, Buick and Oldsmobile. That is exactly what we do. The same comparison."—Major General George Sammet, Jr., May 2, 1972.

ARMY PERSONNEL, ESTIMATED END-STRENGTH

	June 30, 1973	June 30, 1974
Active Army	824,791	803,806
Reserve	275,876	291,421
National Guard	376,704	392,455
Subtotal	1,477,371	1,487,682
Civilians	344,000	346,000
Total	1,821,371	1,833,682

Note: This total does not include foreign nationals hired under contract. These personnel numbered 77,709 at the end of December 1972.

Source: The Budget of the U.S. Government—Fiscal year 1974, appendix, pps. 267, 270, 1003, and the Department of Defense.

ARMY BUDGET

[In millions]

	Fiscal year 1973 (appropriated)	Fiscal year 1974 (requested)
Military personnel	\$8,550	\$8,283
Military and civilian pay increase	(0)	869
Military retirement	1,592	1,676
Operation and maintenance	7,279	7,127
Procurement	2,744	2,867
Research, development, test and evaluation	1,829	2,109
Military construction and housing	615	952
Total	22,609	23,883

¹ Congress is being asked to appropriate another \$285 million to cover the cost of the Jan. 1, 1973, pay raise through the end of the fiscal year.

² Additional millions are being requested for bonuses to encourage voluntary enlistments and for revision of the retirement system. The exact amount of these requests is not yet public. It could total \$110 million.

IS THE ARMY EFFICIENT?

No. It is geared to a heavy turnover in personnel. It doesn't want to overload the promotion structure by (a) retaining too many young soldiers, or (b) retaining too many officers for more than 25 years. Its peacetime goal is an outflow turnover of 25%. During the peak of the Vietnam war, the inflow and outflow exceeded 100%. Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower Roger T. Kelley has compared the chaos of that era to the situation that might exist if a business firm had "a production force that turned over every six months, foremen who turned over every three months, and superintendents who turned over every six months."

Soldiers are moved so frequently (about once a year on the average) that extra manpower spaces have to be set aside for transients. (The Army assumes that it will move an average of 39,000 men a day in FY 1973.)

The Army is topheavy. It has "too many chiefs and too few Indians," according to a Special House Subcommittee on the Utilization of Manpower in the Military. The structure of the officer corps has been likened to a "balloon." It has more sergeants than recruits, more lieutenant colonels than second lieutenants, more three star generals in 1972 than in 1945, when the Army was ten times larger.

The House Subcommittee on Utilization of Manpower says that there are too many administrators and too few fighters in the Army. No more than 24% to 57% of the total force is combat related, depending on how the combat role is defined. Most officers are serving in administrative or "support" positions. Less than 20% of the colonels and majors are in combat units; fewer than 10%

of the captains are assigned to command positions. "Neither the Army nor the American public can afford" this "ever-decreasing ratio of combat to support troops," says the House Subcommittee quoted before.

HOW DOES THE ARMY GET ITS MANPOWER?

The desire for a high turnover of first term personnel is one ingredient in the Army's manpower problems. Others center on the Army's difficulty in getting and keeping the personnel it wants. "American youth," says Secretary of the Army Froehlke, "has rated the Army the lowest in potential for job satisfaction and the least likely to provide interesting and challenging work."

Many soldiers, officers included, became disillusioned with the Army as a result of the war in Vietnam. That conflict, said Lt. General Walter T. Kerwin, Jr., on March 9, 1972, "extracted a price in morale, discipline and leadership throughout the Army."

As a consequence, the Army has been trying to change its image. It has developed a variety of bonuses to entice the reenlistments of specialized personnel.

It is engaged in a gigantic selling program to attract the 15- to 20,000 first term enlistees it says it needs each month. Before, in the words of Secretary Froehlke, "we had . . . the luxury of the draft. We did not have to worry." But now "it is primarily a matter of salesmanship which includes identifying the market to which you are going."

As part of this salesmanship, the Army has added 12 new enlistment options since January 1971, expanded its recruiting force, extended proficiency pay to recruiters, upped its written advertisement budget to over \$30 million in Fiscal Year 1973 and urged the majority of radio and TV stations to provide prime time for Army advertising as a public service.

A typical Army recruitment advertisement reads as follows:

"Today's Army values athletes . . . we have every sport imaginable . . . Today's athlete will like other things about the Army. The opportunity to learn a skill. A starting salary of \$288 a month. All meals, housing, clothing, medical and dental care free. And 30 days' paid vacation a year."

Salaries for military personnel have been increased dramatically, especially at the lower grades, to compensate for an earlier policy of deliberately keeping wages of enlistees low. During the 13 years from 1952 to 1964, there were no increases in basic pay for personnel with less than two years of service. Basic pay for all grades has been increased at least 50% since July 1967; ranging from a 50% increase for a full general to 70% for first lieutenants through lieutenant general, to 86% for second lieutenants, 192% to 241% for privates, and 240% for recruits.

Military pay, says Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman John C. Stennis (D, Miss.) "has reached . . . enormous levels in certain categories."

In addition, the public is carrying a heavy burden in military retirement payments—\$1.7 billion for army personnel in fiscal year 1974. Any soldier may retire, at taxpayers' expense, at 50% of his current salary, after only 20 years of service.

The cost of these benefits is rising so rapidly that the Administration is recommending some reforms. "There is no other system in the United States, public or private," which encourages its staff to retire at such an early age. Those who retire at 39 or 40 "may receive more in retirement pay than they ever received in basic pay while they were on active duty."—Lt. General Leo E. Benade, December 7, 1972.

These basic personnel costs plus manpower related expenditures and benefits, such as housing, consume more than 60% of the army budget.

U.S. MILITARY COMPENSATION: ANNUAL RATES—1973

Rank	Basic pay		
	Actual	Percent increase ²	RMC ³
O-10 general	\$36,000	49.9	\$43,001
O-9 lieutenant general	35,939	69.6	42,933
O-8 major general	32,404	69.6	39,084
O-7 brigadier general	28,174	69.5	34,490
O-6 colonel	24,750	69.5	30,210
O-5 lieutenant colonel	19,508	69.6	24,224
O-4 major	15,746	69.6	19,909
O-3 captain	12,438	69.6	16,130
O-2 1st lieutenant	8,550	69.5	11,769
O-1 2d lieutenant	6,793	86.3	9,120
W-4 chief warrant officer	15,617	69.5	19,654
W-3 chief warrant officer	12,326	69.6	15,950
W-2 chief warrant officer	10,386	69.6	13,587
W-1 warrant officer	8,550	69.5	11,536
E-9 sergeant major	12,197	69.7	15,730
E-8 1st sergeant	10,159	69.6	13,355
E-7 sergeant, 1st class	8,842	69.6	11,870
E-6 staff sergeant	7,524	69.6	10,375
E-5 sergeant	5,497	69.7	8,188
E-4 corporal	4,687	84.7	6,662
E-3 private, 1st class	4,270	192.1	6,093
E-2 private	4,108	240.6	5,799
E-1 recruit	3,686	239.7	5,317

¹ A person's pay will vary with the number of his dependents and his years in service. This table is based on the assumptions of the Department of Defense and the House Appropriations Committee concerning these variables.

The sums given do not include special pays such as hostile fire pay, incentives for hazardous duty, proficiency pay, reenlistment bonuses, clothing, or overseas allowances. Nor do they include any estimation of the value of medical care, commissary privileges, the value (for career personnel) of Government-paid retirement, and so on. These latter benefits may equal as much as 50 percent of RMC for top-ranking personnel.

² Since July of 1967.

³ RMC, or regular military compensation, includes basic monetary pay, basic allowances for housing and food, plus the tax advantage that accrues because quarters and subsistence allowances are not subject to Federal income tax.

Sources: Department of Defense, "1973 Monthly Basic Pay Scale," Department of Defense, "The Economics of Defense Spending: A Look at the Realities," p. 132. Department of Defense, "Tax Equivalent and Tax Advantage of Military Pay and Allowances," Jan. 1, 1973, basic pay scale.

WHAT MOTIVATES ENLISTEES?

The 3- to 6-year enlistee is usually a high school graduate from a low income environment. He is driven, according to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, by the desire for opportunities or escape: "(1) to obtain a better opportunity for advanced educational training, (2) to acquire a skill or trade valuable in civilian life, (3) to exercise a choice of the military service in which to serve instead of being drafted . . . (6) to be of service to the country, (7) to avoid some personal problem . . ."—Special House Subcommittee on Recruitment and Retention of Military Personnel.

"Most of our recruits," says former Chief of Staff General William C. Westmoreland, come in "because we have made the commitment, that we will allow them to attend a school: communications school, cook school, computer school—we have a variety of school programs."

Some enlistees realize their goals; many do not. A large number are bored or offended by the lack of meaningful activity in the Army. They may turn to drugs, alcohol or crime, or they may desert.

Apprehension of deserters, absentees and escaped military prisoners is expected to cost the Army nearly \$4 million in FY 1973;

More than \$40 million has been budgeted in FY 1973 for Army research and control of alcoholism and drug abuse;

Last year the Senate Appropriations Committee justified the expenditure of more than \$23 million to make Americans TV programs available to more of the troops and dependents in Europe as one way "to relieve troop boredom during off duty hours, thereby reducing crime, racial tensions, and dependence on drugs."

U.S. combat units stationed in Germany have been torn by fights between gangs trying to control the hashish traffic, and robberies among servicemen. Making the bar-

racks safe for the soldier has become a major preoccupation of U.S. officials. "We will," said Secretary Froehlke in February 1972, "do anything to make his place safe, even if it means marching soldiers up and down the street 24 hours a day."

"Drug abuse, to include alcohol," says Lt. Gen. Kerwin, "continues to be one of the Army's most serious social and human problems." Almost one-third of U.S. servicemen in Europe use hashish at least once a week. Alcoholism is a continuing problem, encouraged by the fact that Army operated clubs in the United States sell cheap alcoholic drinks. The Army also has a chain of cheap liquor stores at overseas bases.

WHO WANTS TO DIE FOR HIS COUNTRY?

No one wants to die, unless he or she is mentally ill. "Traditionally," says Secretary Froehlke, "it has been hardest to attract the young man to the combat arms: infantry, armor, artillery . . . when we had the draft, we got almost exclusively all of our combat forces from the draft . . . Now as we look forward to a volunteer arm, we recognize that perhaps our greatest challenge is to get people to volunteer for the combat arms."

Whenever death is mentioned, army officials emphasize that the rate has fallen as weaponry increases in potency and medical science perfects more sophisticated techniques for saving the wounded. They cite statistics showing that in the Civil War, 43 soldiers per thousand in the services died on the battlefield; 9.2 per thousand in World War II, and 3.6 in Vietnam. These data understate recent casualties by ignoring the drop in the percentage of the troops in combat related positions. The death rate in Vietnam rises to 16 per thousand when men in administrative and support positions are excluded from the computation.

But, whatever the validity of the statistics the servicemen who die tend to be lower-ranking enlistees and draftees, and, in Army parlance, the hapless — that the Department of Defense required the Army to accept during the peak of the Vietnam war, 1966 through 1971. More than 60,000 of these marginal men were taken into the Army in 1969 alone. Many were thrown into combat. "Any man who comes in and doesn't make a specific choice or can't meet the mental standards for a hard skill . . . will probably be placed within the combat arms . . ."—Lt. Gen. Kerwin.

Another group who may have been dying are boys with a police record. According to Gen. Westmoreland, the Army was forced to expand so rapidly during the Vietnam war, that "We had to take in a number of men with lower standards. [This includes the — mentioned above.] During this process, a criminal element came into the Army. There were waivers on police records and there were some judges and justices of the peace around this country who dropped criminal charges if a man would join the Army . . . Thousands have been given administrative discharges and many have been court-martialed."

The Special House Subcommittee on Utilization of Manpower in the Military has reported that, "Of those killed in Vietnam, over two-thirds had served in the Armed Forces for less than two years. The only conclusion which can logically be reached is that career personnel received the promotions, while the less-than-two-year servicemen were the victims who died while engaging the enemy."

Combat arms are not only unpopular because no one wants to die. They are also unpopular because the training does not fit the soldier for a productive civilian life. In 1972, a Department of Defense official told a Congressional committee that, "It is important to note that the unemployment rate

for those men having a civilian related Army job runs 4- to 5-per cent below that of the excombat soldier."—Brig. Gen. Sears.

A number of inducements to join the combat ranks have been authorized—the payment of an enlistment bonus, allowing the enlistee to sign up for a particular unit and "pick a section of the world in which they want to serve, Europe being the most attractive."—Secretary Froehlke. Variable reenlistment bonuses are also being paid to selected military occupational specialists in the combat arms.

WHAT ELSE DOES THE ARMY DO?

It is heavily engaged in training and educational activities—partly because of its excessive turnover, partly as an enticement to attract and hold personnel, and partly because it has to find ways to keep soldiers busy. A large percentage of the Army seems to be in training much of the time, either as recruits, as specialists, at the Military Assistance Institute (for counterinsurgency), the Jungle Warfare School, Arctic Warfare School, Career Command schools, or in various civilian institutions obtaining advanced scientific, engineering, medical or managerial degrees. The civil program is under expansion.

The U.S. Army might be called the world's largest "university." More than 400,000 military personnel are engaged in formal, on-duty education. There are more than 38 military schools and literally thousands of classrooms scattered throughout the country.

This great educational program covers a whole range of subjects from the three R's to those required for a Ph.D. degree. If you want additional education, you can get it in the Army, no matter what the subject may be excepted from Army brochure—"The Secret of Getting Ahead."

A soldier can earn a high school diploma while on active duty.

A three-year recruit who signs for a high skill job may be trained for as much as 40 weeks. More than 30,000 manpower slots were set aside this year for soldiers undergoing specialized training.

An enlisted man can work toward a B.A. while in the service. The Army will assist with tuition charges for night school or off duty courses during the first three years and send him to school full time, with pay and allowances, in the senior year; the student pays all school expenses during the senior year.

Career officers frequently obtain an M.A. and, in some instances, a Ph.D. at taxpayers' expense. If "ordered" to an institution of higher learning, the Army pays dependent moving costs, all educational costs and continues the officer's salary and allowances. In some cases, officers have been assigned to graduate school shortly before retirement.

In March of 1972, 344 Army officers were working for their M.A.'s in Business Administration at 70 universities, including Harvard, where the average tuition charge was \$3000 per year. Another 20 officers were attending short term "Advanced Management Courses". According to Rep. Charles E. Bennett (D, Fla.), "... a good, hard look should be given to this educational thing, which really seems to me . . . to be a morale factor for certain high ranking military brass to get an education which they can use after they leave . . . It doesn't really seem to me to be something the taxpayer should be spending a lot of money for."

In FY 1973, the Army asked Congress for half a million dollars to send certain civilians in its research and development branch to college for six or more months to update their technical or managerial knowhow. Cost to the taxpayer for a similar program carried on in fiscal 1972 ranged from less than \$1000 per student to as high as \$41,000.

The Army provides a variety of financial assistance to students in medical, veterinary

or nursing schools. Aid in these fields will be expanded as a result of the passage of the Uniformed Services Health Professions Revitalization Act of 1972. This Act authorizes the Department of Defense to establish a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, to graduate not less than 100 medical students annually.

The Act also sets up a comprehensive scholarship program under which the Armed Forces will cover the full costs of training a doctor or dentist or allied health expert at a civilian institution. Each student would receive reserve officer pay and allowances of about \$5000 per year.

Under its *officers training program*, the Army maintains an academy at West Point for some 4100 cadets. Each cadet's education, pay and allowances cost the American taxpayer about \$16,000 annually—more than five times the price of a private education and two thousand dollars a year more than it costs to train a medical student.

The Army's *training program for reserve officers* covers more than 50,000 college students and 100,000 high school cadets. Approximately 11,000 of the college students receive \$100 per month for subsistence for up to 10 months, plus some clothing allowance. Those who attend summer camp receive about \$9 per day in pay, plus travel and subsistence. An additional 6,500 students are on 2- to 4-year full scholarships at the university of their choice, costing the taxpayers well over \$8 million in FY 1973. Scholarship students also receive the \$100 per month subsistence.

Certain duty obligations are attached to these educational benefits: officers attending graduate school are required to serve a minimum of three years following completion of a one year course and four years for all courses over one year. West Point graduates are expected to serve in the Active Army for five years after graduation. ROTC scholarship recipients have a four year active obligation, with two years in the reserve; non-scholarship students have a two year active duty obligation, followed by four years in the reserve.

Recipients of medical scholarships will be obligated to at least one year of service for each year of free study.

The Army is responsible for managing the educational program (kindergarten through grade 12) for more than 100,000 dependents of U.S. military and civilian personnel in the European area. This activity involves the employment of 6000 civilians and costs over \$100 million per year.

WHO GUIDES THE ARMY?

Any large bureaucracy has its own momentum which is controlled in large part by the careerists in that bureaucracy. This is true of the Army as well.

The two top men in the Army are the Secretary and the Chief of Staff. The Secretary of the Army is a civilian. He is nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to serve as long as the President wishes. Many secretaries have been drawn from industry and have served less than two years. The Army Chief of Staff, on the other hand, is a military careerist. He, too, is nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, but for a four year term.

The current Secretary of the Army, Robert F. Froehlke, is a lawyer and a former insurance executive. He joined the Department of Defense in 1969 as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Administration; he has served as Army Secretary since July 1971. The Chief of Staff, Creighton Abrams, has been affiliated with the Army for 40 years. He graduated from West Point in 1936; was a tank battalion leader in World War II; commanded the troops in Vietnam from 1968 to 1972. Here, he was the commander of Major General John D. Lavelle who ordered some 24

unauthorized bombings and had over 200 men falsifying reports to hide the air strikes.

Military careerists like General Abrams play a large if indeterminate role in making U.S. foreign policy. Of particular importance are those assigned to NATO, to military missions around the world, and to the intelligence activities.

HOW DOES IT RELATE TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC?

The Army participates in the comparatively new Department of Defense Domestic Action Program "to assist responsible local, state and federal agencies in alleviating the social and economic problems of the nation."

Under this program, the Army is helping to provide health care in impoverished areas; lending out equipment and recreational facilities. According to Army statistics, 5,000,000 Americans have benefited from Army assistance.

Secretary Froehlke has indicated that the Army wants to do more in the way of domestic action, because the Army "kids want to feel as though they're contributing to the overall good."

Other contacts with the public are supported under an \$8 million budget for public affairs, public relations and public information activities. This covers support of a "home town news center" in Kansas City, Missouri, which collects news releases from the various commands and submits them to home town newspapers. Senior officers are sometimes sent to journalism school.

Suggested Reading:

King, Edward L., Lt. Colonel (ret), *The Death of the Army, A Pre-Mortem*. Saturday Review Press. Available from FCNL at \$5.00.

Johnson, Haynes & Wilson, George C., *Army in Anguish*. Pocket Books, \$1.25 (not available from FCNL).

JUNE 17, 1971.

III—MILITARY MANPOWER REPORT

(Prepared by Congressman Abner J. Mikva for consideration by the Military Spending Committee of Members of Congress for Peace Through Law)

One of the primary determinants of the size of the defense budget is the level of manpower which is requested. The decision regarding appropriate manpower levels affects the size of supporting and training components of the budget in addition to the type and amount of equipment needed to supply this manpower. In short, if we are maintaining more manpower than we need, then we are paying for all kinds of unnecessary items throughout the entire defense budget.

America's manpower posture at present is musclebound. Our national security could be well assured with an overall manpower level of 2.1 million men instead of the 2.5 million requested by the Department of Defense for FY 1972.

Obviously our Armed Forces should be designed to protect our national security. More specifically, three criteria should be used in determining optimal military posture: (1) what elements of the status quo are crucial to the maintenance of U.S. security; (2) what are the potential threats to these vital elements; and (3) what is the minimum military establishment necessary to deter or to repel such threats. The determination of the first criterion has largely been a function of the President and the Executive Branch. However, the remaining two formulations—which have the greatest impact on ultimate force levels—have always been under the exclusive purview of the Pentagon. This has resulted in staggering military budgets and unnecessarily high manpower levels.

The post-Vietnam foreign policy of the Nixon Administration differs little from that of previous Administrations. Foremost among our commitments is maintenance of a nu-

clear deterrent sufficient to inflict retaliatory nuclear damage on a potential aggressor so as to render nuclear attack against the United States highly irrational, and thus improbable. In addition, the United States maintains a policy of total defense in Europe and is prepared to respond to aggression against any Western European NATO state. American defense of the regime in South Korea continues, and despite the so-called Nixon Doctrine the current Administration comes perilously close to continuing our pre-Vietnam policy of open-ended commitments to the defense of Asian nations, the fatal mistake that led to the debacle in Vietnam.

It is useful to critically consider the three criteria earlier cited as they apply to Europe, Asia, and the strategic nuclear balance. In analyzing our present foreign policy—the determination of those elements of the status quo that are vital to U.S. security—few Americans would quarrel about the premise that Western Europe must be helped. Twice in this century, Americans have fought in Europe rather than succumb; it is unlikely that Americans would view aggression any differently today. However, the second and third determinations—what kind of threats are posed against Europe, and what is the optimal military force to deter those threats—are susceptible to fundamental reevaluation.¹

The paramount threat to NATO and European security is, of course, the Warsaw Pact. Two military contingencies could arise from this threat: (1) aggression in conjunction with the use of tactical nuclear weapons, or (2) aggression entailing exclusively conventional tactics without the use of nuclear weapons. It is the second contingency that presents a dilemma for force planners. Since the late 1960's, NATO has followed a policy of flexible response—guiding its action according to the degree of the initial aggression. Such a policy requires the maintenance of large numbers of standing troops to confront potential war contingencies.

Whether conventional troops are indeed necessary to deter non-nuclear aggression is a subject of considerable debate. Many observers argue that the threat of nuclear escalation is sufficient to deter any aggression, nuclear or otherwise, and that the maintenance of conventional armies is unnecessary and wasteful.

An excellent case can be made that NATO troops are not necessary to deter conventional attacks on Western Europe so long as one is prepared to use nuclear weapons in response to conventional attack. The United States is not yet prepared to limit its options this drastically—therefore, we have maintained a posture of "flexible response" which requires continued reliance on conventional ground troops.

However, even if we accept the doctrine of flexible response, a reduction in American NATO forces is desirable. An examination of the conventional military balance in Europe is of prime importance, and in such an analysis only Army troops are relevant. Most published statistics on NATO and Warsaw Pact levels include Navy and Air Force manpower, but these figures should be discounted since NATO and Pact troop levels are roughly equivalent.

It is undeniable that NATO air forces would be able to match Communist aircraft in any engagement. Alain C. Enthoven, former assistant Secretary of Defense, in the May 1969 issue of *Interplay* illustrated the rough equivalence of NATO and Pact air forces. Although NATO aircraft are slightly outnumbered, NATO has a distinct advantage in effectiveness indicators plus a greater reserve pool of aircraft.

Footnotes at end of article.

NATO AND WARSAW PACT TACTICAL AIR FORCES IN THE CENTER REGION IN MID-1968²

	NATO	Warsaw pact
Number of deployed aircraft	2,100	2,900
Percentage of total inventory (of center region countries)	20	40
Percentage of force by mission capability (center region):		
Primary interceptors	10	42
Multi-purpose fighter/attack	48	15
Primary attack	9	6
Reconnaissance	13	8
Low performance	20	29
Total	100	100
Effectiveness indicators (NATO as a percentage of pact):		
Average payload	240	
Typical loiter time	200-500	
Crew training	200	

Similarly, although the NATO tank force is only 55% of Pact strength, Mr. Enthoven argues that this factor would largely be irrelevant in a European encounter. NATO tanks are generally more sophisticated, and the 50% advantage NATO has in anti-tank weaponry would more likely be decisive, especially with NATO in a defensive posture.³

Moreover, a potential conflict in Europe would likely be of a small scale, surprise-attack nature, entailing a quick invasion and control of limited territory. The vision of a massive mobilization and all-out attack has been largely out of vogue (even with the military) since the late 1960's. As a result, any discussion of a NATO-Pact conflict must place heaviest emphasis on those troops that could be deployed within the first thirty days. Forces which could be used only in the second and, especially, third months of the conflict would be of little value.

Given these assumptions, a scenario of a Pact invasion would look something like this:⁴

STAGE 1 (M-DAY) DEPLOYED ARMY MANPOWER

NATO ⁵	Warsaw Pact ⁶
United States	200,000
West Germany	300,000
Great Britain	50,000
France	28,000
Canada	5,400
Total	583,400
	Total
	275,000

Note: Stage 1 shows a clear NATO superiority.

STAGE 2 (M-DAY +15) DEPLOYED ARMY MANPOWER

NATO ⁷	Warsaw Pact
United States	10,000
Belgium	78,000
Denmark	28,000
Netherlands	82,000
Subtotal	198,000
Stage 1	+583,400
Total	781,400
	Total
	822,000

Note: Stage 2 indicates a slight manpower edge for pact forces.

STAGE 3 (M-DAY+30) DEPLOYED ARMY MANPOWER

NATO	Warsaw Pact
Britain	50,000
Canada	6,000
Italy	100,000
France	48,000
Greece	100,000
Turkey	200,000
U.S.S.R.	290,000
Bulgaria	125,000
Rumania	170,000

	NATO	Warsaw Pact	
United States	100,000		
Subtotal	604,000	Subtotal	
	+761,000	+820,000	
Total	1,365,000	Total	1,405,000

Stage 3 shows a slight, but insignificant, Pact advantage.

In light of historical perspective, no rational military strategist would embark on an offensive campaign in the face of such strength. At no time during the scenario does Pact strength even approach the 2 to 1 or 3 to 1 advantage historically necessary to insure any reasonable chance of success in an offensive endeavor. The probability of victory is small indeed, and any conventional attack against even a substantially smaller NATO force would be clearly irrational.

At this juncture all active Pact forces have been utilized. The Soviet Union would be unable to muster any additional divisions for European combat unless they were prepared to either (1) divert troops from the Chinese border and thus expose themselves to possible attack, or (2) to upgrade substantially several divisions stationed in central Russia, a move requiring extensive time and effort. Yet the United States maintains another 8½ active divisions (over 400,000 men) at home in addition to nine reserve divisions for NATO reinforcement, a total of 17½ divisions earmarked for NATO use.

Assuming it is possible to transport all of these active divisions to Europe within the first month of a Pact attack (the programmed fleet of 69 C-5A transports makes such an airlift possible),¹⁴ the NATO force would be bolstered by these more than 400,000 American soldiers. This would bring total NATO force levels to over 1,700,000 troops by M-DAY +30 (versus 1,400,000 Pact troops) and does not even begin to tap the nine reserve divisions intended for NATO use. Clearly, we are buying more NATO "defense" than we need, or for that matter, could ever possibly utilize.

ASIA

In Asia, our foreign policy, in spite of the tragedy of Vietnam, remains essentially unaltered. We continue to maintain a division in South Korea despite Secretary Laird's conviction that "a large-scale conventional attack on South Korea is not likely in the future."¹⁵ Furthermore, even in the face of a large-scale attack by the North Koreans, the Institute for Strategic Studies has concluded that the South Korean Army is amply prepared to defeat any invasion from the North.¹⁶ In light of these considerations, last year's MCPL Military Manpower report advocated that our force level in South Korea be halved. Such a proposal continues to be desirable.

The FY 1972 proposed military budget anticipates potential military contingencies throughout Southeast Asia. Secretary Laird has stated,

"We plan for material logistics, and intelligence support, and backup tactical air and naval support. We plan for only a limited backup ground force capability for non-Chinese, non-Soviet supported contingencies. We also maintain the capability to assist our allies against a CPR (Communist Chinese) attack with conventional forces in [deleted] Asia, but not in both areas simultaneously providing we are not fighting in Europe."¹⁷

Coming on the heels of Vietnam, this is frighteningly ambiguous language. What is a non-Chinese, non-Soviet supported attack? If Communist guerrillas supplied with Russian and Chinese arms attack Thailand, does the Administration reserve the right to intervene with American troops? If Communist Chinese soldiers move into North Vietnam and thereby free NVA troops for use

elsewhere, does current foreign policy call for deployment of American troops in Asia as a response? The fact of the matter is that the FY 1972 budget maintains two Army divisions (96,000 men) for Asian contingencies in addition to three Marine Corps divisions (87,000 men). If Vietnam has taught us anything, it is that our foreign policy interests are not served by deployments of land troops in Asia. The only eventuality that could conceivably justify deployment of several divisions would be large scale overt attack by the Communist Chinese.

Such an attack is extremely unlikely for several reasons. First, geographically speaking, there are few places where a Chinese attack could be mounted. The areas of vital American interest—Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Australia—are largely impregnable islands, certainly not vulnerable to a Chinese invasion. Likewise, the jungles of Indochina make the operation and supply of large armies extremely difficult, as our experience in Vietnam has shown. The principal area where a large Chinese ground attack is possible is South Korea, where American soldiers stand ready alongside a formidable South Korean army.

In addition, considerable doubt exists as to whether the Chinese Army could launch and sustain an offensive. Although the CPR Army remains a formidable defensive force, much of it is ill-equipped. Only five of 118 divisions are armored and there is a decided shortage of field engineering, heavy self-propelled artillery, and motor transport equipment—all crucial to the success of an offensive operation.¹⁸ The justification for retaining large numbers of American troops as a counterbalance to potential Chinese aggression remains less than convincing.

American strategic nuclear policy has likewise remained largely unaltered since the early 1960's. Since that time, we have maintained three separate nuclear deterrents—nuclear bombers, land-based missiles, and sea-based missiles—each force being sufficient to inflict 'unacceptable' damage on a nuclear aggressor. The rationale for maintaining this "triad" deterrent is that each component displays different characteristics and poses different defensive problems for a potential attacker. Secretary Laird provided the rationale for each component of the "triad" in his statement before the House Armed Services Committee:

"Land-based missiles have a high alert rate, quick response capability, reliable command and control, and the capability to cover a broad range of targets. Sea-based missiles offer dispersion and concealment, pose a threat from several directions with a short time of flight, [deleted] and are capable of extending responses over a long period of time. Bombers can deliver large payloads with accuracy needed to destroy hard targets, can restrike targets as necessary, and can provide damage assessment of earlier strikes."¹⁹

While our sense of omnipotence is undoubtedly served by our knowledge that we can obliterate the Earth in any number of different ways, it is highly debatable whether this "triad" nuclear deterrent is essential to our security. Our Polaris/Poseidon fleet of submarines remains invulnerable, and no breakthroughs in anti-submarine warfare are on the horizon. We have already expended hundreds of millions of dollars on an anti-ballistic missile system in the conviction that our land-based missiles are defensible. These two components of the deterrent would seem to be capable of absorbing a nuclear first strike and still inflict sufficient retaliatory damage.

If there is a weak link in the system, it is the bomber force. Planes are extremely sus-

Footnotes at end of article.

ceptible to air defense systems, and the unique characteristics of bombers—ability to carry large payloads, restrike targets, destroy "hard" targets, and conduct reconnaissance missions—would be largely irrelevant in a massive nuclear exchange.

Moreover, the intercontinental bomber force is a redundant deterrent. It makes sense to procure only those forces necessary to deter enemies from nuclear attack. Apparently, the Soviet Union does not view a bomber force as a primary deterrent; their

intercontinental bomber force is less than a third of the SAC Command. And if the Soviets consider a "duad" nuclear force of land and sea-based missiles a sufficient deterrent, there is no reason why they would not view a U.S. "duad" in the same manner. It makes no sense to buy a weapon your enemy does not consider to be an effective deterrent.

Having reappraised our foreign policy—criteria 1 (what are the areas vital to U.S. security) and 2 (what are the threats to

those areas), criterion 3 can be analyzed (what is the optimal defense posture vis-a-vis criteria 1 and 2). Proceeding from the constraint that it is rational to procure the minimum manpower level necessary to insure American security, it soon becomes apparent that substantial reductions in manpower levels requested in FY 1972 Department of Defense budget are justified.

A comparison of FY 1972 Department of Defense requested manpower levels and our recommended reductions follows:

MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS

	Fiscal year 1972 DOD ¹ budget	Recommended budget	Reduction
Army:			
General purpose forces:			
Land forces	501,000	405,000	-96,000
Mobility forces	2,000	2,000	
Total general purpose forces	503,000	407,000	-96,000
Other mission forces:			
Intelligence and security	29,000	21,000	-8,000
Communication	13,000	13,000	
Research and development	9,000	9,000	
Support to other nations	18,000	18,000	
Total mission forces	69,000	61,000	-8,000
General support forces:			
Base and individual support	134,000	101,000	-33,000
Training	196,000	147,000	-49,000
Command	28,000	28,000	
Logistics	6,000	6,000	
Total general support forces	364,000	282,000	-82,000
Strategic forces	6,000	6,000	
Total Army ²	942,000	756,000	-186,000
Navy:			
Strategic forces:			
Land forces	19,000	19,000	
General purpose forces:			
Land forces	3,000	3,000	
Tactical air forces	61,000	49,000	-12,000
Naval forces	202,000	202,000	
Mobility forces	3,000	3,000	
Total general purpose forces	269,000	257,000	-12,000
Other mission forces:			
Intelligence and security	17,000	10,000	-7,000
Communication	11,000	11,000	
Research and development	8,000	8,000	
Support to other nations	6,000	6,000	
Total other mission forces	42,000	35,000	-7,000
General support forces:			
Base and individual support	106,000	86,000	-20,000
Training	126,000	120,000	-6,000
Command	34,000	34,000	
Logistics	9,000	9,000	
Total general support forces	275,000	249,000	-26,000
Total Navy	605,000	560,000	-45,000

¹ All figures supplied by Department of Defense.

RATIONALE FOR REDUCTIONS:

Army—186,000:

Army land force manpower should be reduced by the elimination of two active Army divisions. All other reductions flow from this decision. Currently the Army maintains 13½ active divisions, 4½ in Europe, one in Hawaii, one in Korea, and seven in the United States—of which 4½ are earmarked for NATO reinforcement. Each division is composed of three components of 16,000 men each—a combat division (DIV) plus two support divisions (an initial support increment (ISI) and a sustaining support increment (SSI)). For each combat division deployed, there are two support divisions.²⁰ One division equivalent (DFE) = (DIV+ISI+SSI) = 48,000 men. Thus, the elimination of two divisions would result in a manpower reduction of 96,000 men.

The two divisions should be taken from the 4½ divisions stationed in the United

States for NATO reinforcement. This leaves 2½ active divisions (128,000 men) for NATO contingencies. Referring back to the scenario developed earlier, you will note that only 100,000 additional United States forces were included in the final stage calculation (M+30). The proposed elimination of two state-side NATO support divisions does not impair our ability to supply 100,000 support troops within 30 days in the event of an emergency in Europe. The scenario is not affected by this manpower cut of two support divisions. Still, at no time does the Warsaw Pact advantage approach 2 to 1, much less 3 to 1. The primary deterrent to a conventional Pact attack—an inability to gain a numerical superiority significant enough to render a reasonable probability of victory—is not affected by the reduction. In the unlikely event that the conflict should extend beyond M-Day+30, the Soviet Union would have to embark on a large-scale mobilization program in which case we could draw on our nine reserve divisions for support.

The rationale for reductions in base and individual support and in training follow along two lines. First, manpower requirements in both areas are largely a function of the size of land forces. By reducing land forces by 16%, it is possible to reduce manpower in these areas by an equivalent amount. In fact with the elimination of two army divisions in the United States, it becomes practical to close at least one U.S. division headquarters.

Second, a reduction should be made corresponding to the incredible built-in allowance for inefficiency. In determining its manpower needs in the general support categories, the Army assumes an 11% "non-productive time factor".²¹ In other words to do a job which requires the services of 100 men, the Army hires 111 men. If ever there was a self-fulfilling prophecy, this is it. How can you hope to cut down inefficiency in the military if you build it into the budget as a line item? No business would tolerate this kind of inefficiency and neither should the military. The

Footnotes at end of article.

Navy is an even worse offender. It assumes a "productivity allowance" of 20%.²²

Simply by eliminating this programmed inefficiency from the Army's and the Navy's general support requests we could effect a total manpower cut of nearly 35,000 men.²³

Finally, a reduction in intelligence and security forces appears justified. With the recent furor over military surveillance of domestic activities, it has become obvious that there simply is not enough military "spy work" to go around. Hence, reductions in the intelligence requirements of all the services would appear to be in order.

Navy—45,000:

The primary reduction in naval forces is the elimination of four aircraft carriers, leaving a remaining force of nine carriers. In any conventional war involving the Russians, aircraft carriers would be extremely vulnerable for several reasons:

1. Large air-to-surface missiles with conventional warheads and terminal guidance have made it possible to launch the equivalent of the Second World War Kamikaze attacks.

2. Satellite and long-range aircraft reconnaissance has greatly reduced the ability of naval task forces to hide in the broad expanses of the oceans.

3. More sensitive submarine sonars and higher speed submarines make it easier to find and attack the carriers.

4. Developments in carrier defense have lagged behind . . . improvements in offense, such as higher-speed and lower altitude missiles.²⁴

Although it is difficult to sink an aircraft carrier, it is comparatively easy to make flight operations impossible. There is little question that in any eventuality where the Soviets could deploy submarines or anti-carrier ships, carriers would be of little use.

In addition, most of the functions an aircraft carrier performs are also achieved by land-based aircraft. And few areas in the world are inaccessible to U.S. land-based aircraft.

The primary justification for the aircraft is its role during a peacetime crisis or in a limited military engagement not involving the Soviet Union. Its presence is highly visible, and as long as contiguous waters remain free of submarines or anti-carrier craft, the carrier can wield sizable diplomatic influence. Hence a fleet of nine carriers—two support carriers are necessary for every one deployed—is valuable. The nine carriers, in effect, provide three carriers for crisis contingencies, one for use in the Atlantic-Caribbean, one for the Mediterranean, and one for the Pacific. Each carrier requires, on the average, a crew of 2,650 men plus another 1,500 men to operate and maintain the aircraft. Thus, the elimination of four carriers would achieve a reduction of approximately 12,000 men.

Other reductions include an elimination of the Navy's 20% non-productive time factor along with a small reduction in training manpower to account for the cutback of four carriers.

Marine Corps—63,000:

We recommend the elimination of one Marine Corps division of 29,000 men. This would leave two divisions for Pacific deployment, certainly sufficient for any foreseeable limited military conflict. The dissolution of this division logically precipitates the elimination of one Marine Corps air wing in that the Corps has historically maintained one wing for every Corps division. Similarly, reductions in base support and training logically flow from having one less division.

Air Force—212,000:

Air Force manpower reductions should occur in two areas: strategic forces and tactical air wings. As indicated earlier, the argument for preserving the present 521-plane SAC manned nuclear bombing force is less

than overwhelming. Undoubtedly, a "triad" nuclear deterrent adds something to our own security. The relevant question, however, is whether a "duad" force is just as sufficient to deter Soviet nuclear attack. And there is every indication that it is, especially in light of the fact that the Soviet Union itself largely maintains a "duad" force. A recommended reduction of 50,000 men of the current 77,000 man SAC force would bring our bomber force into parity with that of the Russians, and still permit limited use of the B-52 bombers as conventional weapons.

With the elimination of two Army divisions, it is possible to cut back four Air Force wings. Historically, the Air Force has maintained a 2 to 1 ratio between wings and divisions, this year requesting 50 1/2 wings to support 25 1/2 divisions. Thus, a reduction of four wings is justifiable, resulting in a direct manpower savings of 12,500 men and an indirect savings (from base operation and training manpower reductions) of about 55,000 men.

Resulting Manpower Posture:

These proposed manpower reductions would produce a military force of 11 1/2 active Army divisions and 2 active Marine Corps divisions along with nine reserve divisions (eight Army and one Corps). These divisions could be deployed in the following manner:

AREAS AND NUMBER OF DIVISIONS

Europe (NATO assigned): 4 1/3 (Army).
United States (NATO assigned): 2 2/3 (Army).

Korea: 2/3 (Army).

Okinawa/at sea: 1 (Army).

Hawaii: 1 (Army).

Pacific Fleet: 1 or 2 (Marine).

Atlantic Fleet: 1 (Marine).

United States (Minor contingency/strategic reserve): 2 1/3 (Army).

The total of divisions: 11 1/2 Army and 2 Marine.

Although this force is smaller than that requested by the Administration for FY 1972, it is, nonetheless, consistent with Administration objectives:

1. The force will mesh with the implementation of an all-volunteer Army by 1973. In fact, by eliminating two divisions, this proposal makes the all-volunteer force an earlier and more realistic possibility.

2. The force is consistent with the Administration's policy of being ever ready to fight 1 1/2 wars (down from 2 1/2 in 1963). The seven divisions committed to the defense of Europe maintains our deterrence of a conventional Pack attack. The two Army divisions and one Corps division in the Pacific are more than adequate for any minor military emergency, and in the unlikely event of an overt Chinese attack, these divisions coupled with the 2 1/3 Army divisions stationed in the U.S. for strategic reinforcement would provide a stout defense against a badly-equipped and poorly-organized Chinese army. Finally, the 2 1/3 divisions in the United States for minor contingencies also provide a force for unforeseen situations such as a crisis in the Middle East.

3. In maintaining the existing nine reserve divisions, this proposal coincides with Secretary Laird's Total Force concept, which stresses reliance on reserve forces, rather than draftees, for reinforcement.

Undoubtedly some will claim that this is an inopportune time to engage in manpower cutting, since negotiations with the Soviet Union on mutual reductions in force levels may be in the offing.

We firmly support such mutual reductions in the numbers of men under arms in Europe and elsewhere. The manpower cuts recommended in this report should serve as a guideline for such mutual reductions. Assuming that the Soviets have as much padding in their defense posture as we do, we should be thinking in terms of mutual cuts of at least 500,000 men. Such cuts would

not affect the strategic balance significantly, and would go far toward de-emphasizing armed confrontation as a means of conducting foreign policy.

The basic message of this study, however, is that even if negotiations with the Soviet Union fail to produce agreement on mutual reductions, the United States can and should proceed with substantial unilateral cuts.

The economic ramifications of these reductions are enormous. A reduction of 438,500 men would result in an immediate savings of over 4 billion dollars. When one considers the equipment eliminations contingent on these reductions, the savings could well approach 7 billion dollars. The advantage of freeing these sums of money for domestic concerns is obvious. For years, social problems in this country have cried for solution as billions of dollars have been squandered in the interests of national defense.

But even if no domestic programs were starving for funds, even if all Americans were living in a peaceful, prosperous society, it would still be foolish to continue to finance inflated and oversized defense budgets. By maintaining a musclebound defense posture, we increase the likelihood that the military will periodically flex its muscles. Our recommended manpower levels are sufficient to repel and to deter any potential attack which threatens our security. And that is all we should require our defense posture to do.

FOOTNOTES

¹ The United States' role as protector of Western Europe is being challenged in some quarters as a basis for future foreign policy. Obviously a redefinition of our role in Europe would call for additional changes in our military manpower posture. For the purpose of this analysis, continuation of our present commitments to Europe is assumed.

² Alain C. Enthoven, "Arms and Men: The Military Balance in Europe," *Interplay*, May, 1969.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Institute for Strategic Studies, London, *The Military Balance: 1969-70, and 1970-71*.

⁵ All forces stationed in West Germany.

⁶ All forces stationed in East Germany.

⁷ Troops stationed in Italy.

⁸ Troops stationed in Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

⁹ Six infantry brigades stationed in Britain.

¹⁰ One mechanized infantry brigade stationed in Canada for NATO use.

¹¹ Two armored divisions and five infantry divisions, stationed in Italy, for NATO use.

¹² Three mechanized divisions stationed in France.

¹³ Twenty-nine divisions in European U.S.S.R. Institute for Strategic Studies estimates that, under ideal conditions, these divisions could be mobilized within 30 days.

¹⁴ Each C-5A holds approximately 270 soldiers plus equipment, travelling at an approximate airspeed of 460 miles per hour. Assuming each plane makes one round trip a day, a fleet of 68 planes could transport 559,000 troops a month, enough to tap the active force, but little of the nine reserve divisions. (Information supplied by the Defense Department.)

¹⁵ Testimony of Honorable Melvin L. Laird, Secretary of Defense, before the House Armed Services Committee, March 9, 10, 11, 1971.

¹⁶ Institute of Strategic Studies, *Military Balance: 1969-70*.

¹⁷ Testimony of Laird, *op. cit.*

¹⁸ Institute for Strategic Studies, *op. cit.* 1970-71.

¹⁹ Testimony of Laird, *op. cit.*

²⁰ The ratio of two support divisions for each combat division is accepted here for purposes of discussion. However, there is considerable room for skepticism and further study as to whether substantial numbers of support troops are really required.

²¹ Department of Defense, "Defense Military Manpower Requirements for FY 1972, Appendix I," (April 22, 1971), p. 11.

²² *Ibid.*, page 27.²³ Army: 14,740; Navy: 20,000.²⁴ *Setting National Priorities, The 1972 Budget*, Brookings Institute, Special Defense Issues, The Role of the Aircraft Carrier, page 73.

IV—REPORT ON U.S. TROOPS IN EUROPE, A RESEARCH PREPARED BY CONGRESSMEN ROBERT F. DRINAN AND BILL FRENZEL

CONCLUSIONS

United States troop strength in Europe should be reduced from 300,000 to 150,000 by June 30, 1972. In addition, we should seek through consultation with our NATO allies to reduce U.S. troop strength in Europe to approximately one division by the mid-1970's.

We should not re-deploy our troops with inadequate preparation, and need not do so. In the past two years we have seen highly persuasive evidence that our government can alter its military policies and logistics abroad without giving any impression of headlong panic. What is essential is that Congress make the explicit and unreserved judgment that a quarter of a century after World War II we will not continue to spend more than \$3 billion each year to sustain 300,000 American troops in an economically revived and viable Europe, each constituent nation of which has committed proportionately less of its national wealth to defense than has the United States.

Congress will have several opportunities during the balance of this year to enact legislation to scale down our military presence in Europe. Appropriate legislative vehicles include the Foreign Assistance Act, the Military Construction Authorization, and the Defense Appropriation bill. Each of these bills deals with an important aspect of our NATO commitment and could be used to help bring about the vital change in policy.

Having announced our intention to reduce our participation in NATO ground forces, we should consult with our NATO allies with respect to the precise timing of the reduction and the means for implementing it. Force reductions need not jeopardize the unity of Western Europe, our own security, or the security of the NATO nations—they can, in fact, enhance them.

The goal on which we should concentrate is a clear one: to deter aggression or the threat of aggression without unwarranted expense of national resources. This goal can be achieved through a two-step process: first, a near-term reduction of U.S. forces within the present NATO structure, accompanied by our renewed nuclear pledge and by intensified redeployment preparations; secondly, further reductions made possible through a more tightly integrated alliance.

We should undertake the first program now. The second is a longer range plan. In both, we shall be addressing the security of Western Europe in light of what United States interests require and what would be effective for our allies.

Each arrangement responds to the important changes which have occurred within the context of NATO's operations and purposes in the two decades since its birth, and each accounts for the possible military contingencies involving the West and the Soviet bloc in Europe, namely:

(1) all-out or limited thermonuclear attack or its threat by the Soviet Union against NATO or a NATO member.

(2) all-out or probing conventional attack or its threat by the Soviet Union against NATO or a NATO member.

THE COLD WAR AND THE BIRTH OF NATO

On April 4, 1949, the United States reacted to what it then perceived as a growing, indeed an imminent threat to Western Europe by the Soviet Union and the Red Army: we joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, declaring along with our NATO allies that "an armed attack against one or

more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all."

A communist-engineered coup in Czechoslovakia in 1948 had catalyzed our NATO role. We were also much aroused by the unexplained death of the Czech foreign minister, Jan Masaryk, who had been known as a firm friend of the West.

The real intensity of our frightened reaction to the Czech crisis is reflected by the war scare within the government at that time and by, for instance, a CIA intelligence estimate sent to the President five days after Masaryk's death to reassure the President that war was "not probable within sixty days."

Not all of our government's key policy makers were completely sanguine about the likely consequences of our new European stance. George Kennan, who eventually was appointed chairman of the working group which negotiated the language of the NATO pact, was the most sceptical and also the most prophetic. He has recently written of his unsuccessful efforts in 1948 to persuade his government that the threat facing the nations of Western Europe was and would remain primarily political and economic: "...their best bet was still the struggle for economic recovery and internal political stability. Intensive rearmament represented an uneconomical and regrettable diversion of their effort—a diversion that not only threatened to proceed at the cost of economic recovery but also encouraged the impression that war was inevitable and thus distracted attention from the most important tasks.

Twenty years later, it is obvious that Western Europe is economically robust, even awesome. Politically it is stable, and well along the road toward integration. The primary threats have been effectively countered. The economic and political revitalization of Europe reinforces the criticism, now heard with increasing frequency, that this country should not, and need not, provide a military super-guarantee for Western Europe at a time when we are struggling to provide a barely minimal standard of living for millions of poor citizens and, indeed, a just and abundant life for all Americans.

The most recent outward signs of Congressional dissatisfaction with the troop levels in Europe were the May 19th vote in the United States Senate on the Mansfield amendment, which sought to limit to 150,000 the U.S. troops stationed in Europe as of December 31, 1971, and the May 26th Report of the House Armed Services Committee. The House Report pointed to the continuing presence in NATO of 300,000 U.S. troops, stated that "reexamination of the level of that contribution may be in order," and concluded:

The Committee believes, therefore, that a greater share of the burden of providing funds and personnel for NATO-committed forces must be assumed by European members of the alliance. The Committee will be prepared to examine NATO defense expenditures in more detail in the future if present trends continue.

HISTORY OF U.S. TROOP LEVELS IN EUROPE

Immediately following World War II, during the period 1946-1950, United States troop strength in Europe declined from 3.5 million men to 200,000. Then, impelled by the North Korean attack on June 25, 1950, President Truman approved and the Senate authorized the deployment of four additional divisions in Europe.

From the 1955 level of 405,000 American troops, the number declined slightly until the 1961-1962 Berlin crisis, when it reached a peak of 434,000. Today, total United States troop strength in Europe stands at 300,000 (See Table I).

During the past ten years, Soviet deployment in Europe has increased by approxi-

mately 75,000, the additional units having been introduced in connection with the 1969 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia (See Table II).

OUR CURRENT POLICY DEFINED

NATO's strategy has shifted in the past ten years from reliance on conventional ground forces to greater emphasis on strategic and tactical nuclear weapons, and back again toward the current stress on conventional capability.

In 1967, NATO adopted the position that, in view of approaching nuclear parity between East and West, total nuclear war was no longer the most likely form of conflict. A new strategy, labelled "flexible response," was designed to provide NATO members with a non-nuclear "breathing space" in the event of conventional attack. Its purpose was the avoidance of what had become known as the "red or dead" choice between surrender and immediate resort to general nuclear war.

In his most recent Foreign Policy Report, the President restated the basis for the continuing large United States contribution to NATO's "flexible response" strategy:

No token presence could serve our purpose. Our substantial contributions of U.S. forces—about 25 percent of NATO's peacetime capabilities in Central Europe—insures the viability of the strategy of flexible response. It enables us to found Alliance defense on something other than reliance on the threat of strategic nuclear war. It is the basis of our Allies' confidence in us. It links European defense to a common strategy and to the nuclear power of the United States.

Those who doubt the wisdom of this policy question not so much our basic commitment to Europe as its size and apparently open-ended nature at a time when our allies are making limited defense efforts, and our needs at home are acute. General Andrew Goodpaster, the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe (SACEUR), has stated that the conventional forces now at his disposal are the minimum feasible to employ the "flexible response" strategy in the event of non-nuclear attack.

ARGUMENTS FOR PRESENT POLICY

While those who challenge the present policy maintain that our NATO partners can and should fill the breach, others believe that even if Europe might one day be prompted to do more for its own defense, this can only occur after close consultation within NATO over some unstated period of time. They argue that any "unilateral" determination on our part would be unwise and dangerous. Thus on December 3, 1970, President Nixon told NATO that the U.S. would not reduce its troop levels in Europe "unless there is reciprocal action from our adversaries."

1. "U.S. forces in Europe protect basic American security interests there and in the Middle East."

Some believe a major reduction in United States forces would threaten current European economic stability, brought about in large part by the American military presence in Europe over the past 23 years. They argue that substantial forces, including the Sixth Fleet, are needed in Europe to counter the growing Soviet threat in the Middle East.

2. "Now is the worst possible time to begin unilateral troop reductions."

In recent weeks the Soviet leadership have expressed a willingness to discuss mutual force reductions. Some argue that these overtures, which they believe to be sincere, together with the current Berlin Talks and the SALT negotiations, would be seriously undermined if we were unilaterally to withdraw our troops without obtaining substantial concessions from the Russians in return. Our best hope, they contend, is to negotiate with the Russians from a "position of strength."

3. "Our allies are carrying an increasing share of the burdens of their own defense."

This argument goes as follows: There are approximately 300,000 United States troops in Europe. Other NATO countries collectively have more than 2,000,000 troops. The United States has recently persuaded its allies to undertake a \$1 billion multilateral European Defense Improvement Program in addition to their normal defense expenditures. The annual United States budget cost associated with the deployment of our forces in Europe is \$3 billion. The yearly cost to our allies of their men under arms is \$24 billion.

Those who are reassured by these figures maintain that a United States troop decrease would not prompt the NATO nations to undertake a larger share of their own defense.

4. "Our NATO commitments contribute only modestly to our balance of payments problem."

The gross balance of payments cost of military expenditures in Europe for 1970 was estimated at \$1.8 billion, while the total balance of payments deficit from all sources was \$10 billion. \$1.1 billion of the total outflow is incurred in Germany. Since 1962 the Germans have partially offset these deficits through payments to the U.S. of \$6.5 billion, while other NATO allies made purchases of almost \$4 billion during the same period. Further offset agreements with the Germans are possible in Fiscal Year 1972.

5. "Unilateral reductions would divide our allies at a time when efforts are being made to encourage closer economic and political bonds."

Europe at the moment is in the process of expanding the European Economic Community from 6 to 10 members with the full support of the United States. But there is nothing inevitable about this process, and some believe that a United States troop "shield" in Europe, together with our nuclear "sword" have provided a necessary shelter behind which the moves toward integration could mature. They feel that to reduce American troop strength at this time could undercut current moves toward European economic and political integration.

FALLACY OF THE CONVENTIONAL ARGUMENTS

Essentially then the defenders of the *Status quo* assert that until there are fundamental changes in the European security scene or in our assessment of our security interests and perils, the time will not be right for a substantial and unilateral troop reduction.

Yet there remains much evidence to show that whatever the realities upon which NATO was founded, these have already changed. The two major phases and occasions for this change are widely known: communism has fractionalized, and the United States has both lost its nuclear exclusivity and discovered that other nations may successfully differ with us as to what constitutes an appropriate form of government.

We have also suffered an internal combustion of long unfulfilled domestic and foreign economic and social needs. Any random comparison of the relative dimensions of our military and social commitments will yield indicating results. Two examples:

1. To aid India, the only stable parliamentary democracy in Asia, a key to our hopes for peaceful development in the Eastern hemisphere; a country where 15 of every 100 children born do not survive their first year—the United States will spend \$400 million this year.

To maintain United States troops and facilities in Europe, with emphasis on allocations in West Germany and other highly industrialized nations, the United States will spend \$3.2 billion this year.

2. In our own country during this fiscal year, the government intends to spend \$22 billion on education, \$14 billion on health, \$5 billion on urban renewal.

To maintain United States general purpose and support forces in NATO and NATO-related forces outside Europe for use in a European emergency we spend approximately \$12 billion annually.

It is against this background that we must consider again what are our "most important tasks," and this time determine to accomplish them.

FORCE REDUCTION WITHIN THE PRESENT NATO FRAMEWORK

Whenever troop reductions are proposed, one fully expects to see hauled into battle the familiar warhorses of the military establishment: "the present troops in NATO are insufficient"; "the allies will panic and go neutral"; "Germany will slide toward a new version of the Nazi-Soviet Nonaggression Pact."

In fact, what the manpower figures show is that the present conventional force alignments of Western and Eastern European nations are either in numerical balance, or, according to certain experts, substantially favor the West.

The British Institute for Strategic Studies, which is probably the most objective and authoritative observer of international military deployment, has reported that the troops in West Germany, including the United States component, total 627,000. Soviet and Eastern European troops facing them in East Germany and Czechoslovakia total 565,000.

Those who favor maintaining or even increasing our NATO troops like to portray the Alliance as being ominously outmanned by the Warsaw Pact. This is a familiar approach, but also a curious one, since if NATO is really so disadvantaged in conventional forces, why should the United States retain any but token troops in Europe?

It is true that the Pact figures are greatly increased if we include the 60 Soviet divisions which are stationed, according to the Institute for Strategic Studies, in European USSR, west of the Urals and north of the Caucasus. But a policy based on inclusion of those divisions is not coincident with a policy related to defense against limited attack. Massive reinforcement operations would be required in the former instance. Let us first, then, consider the possibilities for limited, probing conventional attacks.

Even if U.S. troop levels were reduced substantially, the remaining NATO forces in West Germany could thwart a purely conventional attack by the Soviet Union and its allies, short of a massive invasion on the scale of World War II. NATO, after all is a *defensive alliance*. It is an accepted rule of conventional warfare that the enemy needs at least a two to one advantage in forces to mount a successful offensive. The Soviet Union enjoys no such advantage by any reputable estimate.

It is misleading in any event to compare opposing forces without considering such important variables as troop morale, logistic support, and the quality of armaments.

We are considering the capability of Western Europe to resist a conventional attack, which it would defend on its own familiar ground, a key advantage. Also, as events in Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia have shown, the Soviets could not rely confidently on the contribution of their Eastern European contingents.

Warsaw Pact forces do not match NATO's qualitative strengths. This was forcefully pointed out in a recent analysis in the respected journal *Foreign Affairs*, by Alain C. Enthoven, a former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Analysis, and K. Wayne Smith, of the RAND Corporation and formerly Assistant Professor at West Point. "NATO's forces are superior to Warsaw Pact forces, they conclude, both qualitatively and quantitatively in such important areas as logistic support, ammunition, weapons, ve-

hicles, artillery and engineers." They also state that:

NATO aircraft are far better qualitatively by almost every measure of relative capability and far better suited for conventional operations than Pact aircraft. This advantage in tactical air power adds to the confidence that NATO's land forces could not be readily overwhelmed in a conventional attack.

As for the possibility of a more massive attack, the Soviet Union could increase its own forces to 840,000 and could expand this to 1,290,000 with reinforcements from Poland, Czechoslovakia and East Germany.

These mobilization advantages enjoyed by the Soviet Union are well-known and important. But do they make the case for our keeping 300,000 troops at their posts in Western Europe? No, for two reasons. First, as Enthoven clearly demonstrates, Pact advantages in terms of overall strength are not large enough to constitute a decisive force ratio. He stresses two facts in that contest: 1) worldwide, the NATO countries have 30 percent more men under arms (and even slightly more men in land forces) than the Warsaw Pact, excluding U.S. increases for Viet Nam; and 2) NATO consistently has a larger defense budget than the Pact—50 percent greater in 1968 for example—measuring both in terms of U.S. price and excluding U.S. expenditures for Viet Nam."

A second factor in the weight to be accorded the Soviet reinforcement ability is that these reinforcement operations are, in the term used by a NATO publication, "elephantine." A decision to attack massively is not made in tranquil times. Political tensions, diplomatic signals precede it. There are invariably strategic warnings; submarine contacts near NATO missile launch areas, cancelled enemy troop leaves, ponderous shifting of armored divisions into forward areas.

This type of operation would become apparent to the allies well enough in advance for them to mobilize their own reserves. NATO has established and maintains large supply depots in Europe, such as the one at Kaiserslautern in Germany, to make possible the quick transfer of whole divisions from the United States. The transfers are frequently rehearsed, and a United States declaration of intention to withdraw troops from Europe might make the rehearsals even more determined and impressive to prospective enemies than in the past.

The Czech invasion gives us a classic and quite embarrassing example of warning time. In that case, the Western press reported Warsaw Pact Maneuvers of unusual size and sophistication months before the invasion. One day after the attack, the allies consulted each other. The failure of NATO to act decisively in a crisis underscores a fact relevant to NATO's present needs: given a basic troop force, the success of an action is less a matter of quantity of troops than of timing, determination and teamwork.

We should also remember that the necessity for a potentially explosive mobilization would itself be a powerful deterrent to massive invasion.

With respect to the question of nuclear deterrence, a reduction of United States troops should be accompanied by a reaffirmation of our nuclear pledge. NATO would continue to meet any nuclear threat with its own presently awesome deterrent, which includes the Polaris missile system and 7000 nuclear warheads. Our own pledged nuclear shield is independently staggering. The approximate total of deliverable United States individual warheads is 7500, according to the Institute for Strategic Studies report, *The Military Balance, 1970-1971*. For the Soviet Union, the estimated total is 5662. Approximately 2000 of the Soviet warheads are associated with vehicles having the range to strike at the continental United States. Approximately 6000 of the American warheads

are fitted to vehicles capable of reaching Soviet territory.

Do we really need 300,000 troops to make all this megatonnage believable? The credibility of the NATO nuclear deterrent, to the extent that it depends at all upon the continued presence of American manpower, does so only symbolically. The stationing of a certain number of United States troops in Europe reassures some that we have a stake in European security. But it would seem certain that if the survival of Europe in a nuclear crisis with the Soviet Union, and surely therefore our own survival as well, could not by itself move the United States to action, then the presence of American troops in Europe would not make the difference. If, on the other hand, some American force is required as a hostage to nuclear bargaining, 50,000 or even 10,000 American lives ought to serve that purpose satisfactorily.

We have been talking so far about contingency requirements as though the present U.S. forces in NATO operate at top efficiency, with no manpower squandered. That is a highly vulnerable assumption. A recent series of articles by a former lieutenant colonel in the United States Army analyzing the organization of America's 1.4 million-man standing army demonstrates that a very substantial fraction of the \$12 billion allocated for American troops oriented to the defense of Europe finances an extraordinary large overheard of noncombatant, administrative, supervisory and support personnel. The author, Edward L. King, who has served with the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, concludes that no more than 7500 of the 16,350 troops in an Army division are actual combat troops who might be called upon to fire on the enemy. Each division also requires another 32,700 soldiers in sustaining roles. Thus, of the 49,050 soldiers required to populate and field a United States Army division, less than 25 percent could engage in combat. International political and strategic considerations aside, the management of the United States army in Europe should be much improved.

Some have conceded the urgency of the need to reduce American troop levels in Europe, but assert that we ought not to act unilaterally, without a mutual agreement with the Soviet Union. History certainly does not justify inaction based on expectations that we and the Soviet Union will suddenly be willing to negotiate smoothly and quickly questions which have been stalemated for years.

There is a further reason why in 1971 the call to "persist" in Europe so that we may "negotiate from strength" rings hollow. Advocates of that stance try to persuade us that we should not act when we might be able to use our troops to strike a bargain with the Soviet Union. But to project every issue of United States foreign or even domestic policy as primarily another element of international game theory has been the distracting, bedeviling, and futile temptation of our cold war history. Our point in urging a stand-down is precisely that we can no longer afford this game.

As we should know from experience with our military policy in Southeast Asia, there are almost as many rationalizations for the maintenance of American troops in Europe as there are parties to the *status quo*: now as a hostage for our nuclear deterrent, now as a psychologically stabilizing "presence" in the alliance, now as one more blue chip in the bargaining of the superpowers. There is every rationale, it seems, but the essential, relevant one, that Europe could not defend itself but for the presence of 300,000 American troops. We believe it could. At present there is a compelling incentive for Europe to abdicate its defense responsibilities to the United States. Our nation provides and guarantees that incentive. The precedents of other such

incentives to abandon responsibility should be highly instructive: they have often, if not invariably, become self-fulfilling prophecies.

To summarize: NATO forces including a much smaller United States component and backed by our valuable nuclear pledge will remain adequate for any conventional attack short of all-out attack. A massive invasion would compel the mounting of a reinforced army whose mobilization would give ample alarm to the West.

FORCE REDUCTIONS WITHIN A MORE FULLY INTEGRATED ALLIANCE

In considering longer range approaches to the problems on European security, we need to recall NATO's cold war origins, how the alliance arose to confront the perceived implications of Stalin's domestic policies, and the tyrannies he imposed in Eastern Europe.

The respects in which the circumstances of its birth have enthralled NATO to its institutional detriment and the detriment of its member nations are discussed at length in *The Atlantic Fantasy: The U.S., NATO, and Europe*, a recent study by David P. Calleo, Director of European Studies at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies. Professor Calleo describes America's and NATO's response to the Soviet threat as initially sound, but, he says, the "prudent policy of containment gradually was translated into a new world order. The soaring rhetoric of the Truman Doctrine committed the United States all around the world to support free people who are resisting attempted subjection of armed minorities or by outside pressures." Those who suggest the imperative for changes in NATO, Calleo shows, must confront the inertia of this history: "Nothing, it seems, paralyzes the imagination so much as an old and decaying success."

It is necessary for the United States to reduce its military presence in Europe, but for us to do only that is not enough.

To make NATO a more coherent and credible deterrent, we must begin to relocate the responsibility for European defense within the nations whose security is directly at stake. We must find ways to make the NATO membership less dependent on the United States and more meaningfully interdependent. The impetus of American troops reduction will help, but our political and diplomatic leadership will also be required.

The NATO treaty stresses consultation and interdependence, but in fact NATO has always been almost completely dominated by the United States:

(a) Two of the three principal NATO commands have always been held by an American; the third is British.

(b) Eleven of the thirteen subordinate commands have always been held by the United States and Britain.

(c) Seven United States officers in Europe hold four-star NATO jobs; no other country holds more than two.

General André Beaufre, who brought the nominal influence of France to bear on NATO's Military Standing Group, has described the Group as "a system of wheels without power revolving almost endlessly around questions of routine."

Anyone could predict the result of this arrangement: our NATO allies do not credit our insistence on burden-sharing. They fail to keep their force contributions at full strength and readiness.

Compared with its NATO allies, the United States has nearly twice as large a percentage of its population in the armed forces. The United States spends more than twice the percentage of its gross national product on defense than most of the other NATO nations: more than three times the percentage of Canada; more than twice that of West Germany, Belgium and Denmark; one-and-

a-half times that of Britain and Greece (See Table III).

Suppose our own defense and spending efforts were scaled to a level more nearly comparable to that of our allies; and suppose theirs were increased to more closely parallel our own. Enthoven and Smith made these calculations, and they found that we would reduce our annual defense spending by more than \$25 billion, and could demobilize more than a million troops. They did not endorse such a reduction, but the comparison is instructive as to what our allies are doing in the interests of their own security. Conversely, Enthoven calculated, the Germans alone "could replace half of our divisions in Europe and half of our air wings besides, and still keep expenditures under 6 percent of their GNP, less than the percentage they were spending in 1963, and still less than the percentage we are spending now."

Even in these unequal circumstances, the allies express doubts about how the United States might react to a nuclear crisis in this present era of approximate Soviet-American parity. They wonder whether we would actually put our national existence on the line for their security.

We should scarcely be surprised at their misgivings. We have known in Southeast Asia many of the same difficulties with allies whose confidence has been undermined by economic and military dependence on us. In Europe, as long as NATO countries, particularly Germany, have to mount large offset costs for United States troops, they will not pool the necessary resources to manufacture their own deterrent.

To strengthen NATO, Germany and Britain must share more equitably in its strategy and decision-making. This may be effected under circumstances in which Germany would continue to have no nuclear weapons on its territory, and the United States would continue to maintain custody of the nuclear explosives stockpiled in Western Europe.

A NATO conference on joint deterrence should be held as soon as possible to work out political arrangements which would develop the roles of Germany and Britain in the alliance. We should attempt to bring France into a closer relation with this more integrated alliance. The United States should, for example, take the initiative in preparing for the appointment of a European Supreme Commander.

Would we by these measures be risking an involvement not in our interests and initiated by events we could not influence? In fact, this is a risk we have been facing in our complex of commitments in Asia and the Middle East since World War II. We believe the risk would not be measurably increased. Often we have been mistaken in thinking we could direct events in those areas. At least in Western Europe, where we have the longest standing cultural and historical ties, with allies who have stable governments and who do not pretend to empire, we ought to be most prepared to forgo the illusions of hegemony.

A more integrated European nuclear defense would encourage further steps toward European unity to a greater and more reliable extent than the present American economic and strategic umbrella ever can, and it would do this because it would be based on shared responsibilities.

The question at issue with regard to troop reductions is not whether we need to deploy American troops to keep our European allies calm and loyal. Rather, the question is whether—in view of our limited resources—the evidence of our critical domestic needs outweighs the evidence for continuing to deploy a huge American garrison in an economically revived Europe. We believe it does.

TABLE I.—U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONNEL IN EUCOM GEOGRAPHICAL AREA, END OF CALENDAR YEAR (DEFENSE BRIEF)
[Nearest thousand, approximate]

	Civilian employees (appropriated funds)			Dependents of U.S. military and of civilian employees (appropriated funds)		Civilian employees (appropriated funds)			Dependents of U.S. military and of civilian employees (appropriated funds)
	U.S. military	United States	Foreign			U.S. military	United States	Foreign	
End—									
1950	145	(1)	(1)	(1)	1960	379	12	123	335
1951	346	(1)	(1)	(1)	1961	417	12	122	341
1952	405	(1)	(1)	(1)	1962	416	12	124	352
1953	427	9	144	(1)	1963	380	12	117	323
1954	404	10	169	182	1964	374	12	99	310
1955	405	11	161	222	1965	363	13	94	326
1956	398	12	149	281	1966	366	14	92	264
1957	393	11	146	(1)	1967	337	14	84	264
1958	380	11	129	269	1968	316	14	82	245
1959	380	11	122	300	1969	300	15	70	225

¹ No data.

NOTES

Includes both EUCOM and non-EUCOM personnel and dependents.

End of year figures unavailable for civilian employees and dependents for 1953 and 1957-59; June or September figures used instead.

Large 1966 drop of dependents caused by: (1) extraordinary military personnel turnover and (2) revised accounting procedures.

TABLE II.—CONVENTIONAL FORCES IN EUROPE: NATO AND THE WARSAW PACT¹

Country	Total Regular Armed Forces	Army	Army forces on central front ²	Total trained Reserves and paramilitary forces	Country	Total Regular Armed Forces	Army	Army forces on central front ²	Total trained Reserves and paramilitary forces
NATO COUNTRIES³									
Federal Republic of Germany	466,000	326,000	326,000	681,500	United States	3,161,000	1,363,000	520,000	1,023,500
France	506,000	328,000	434,000	505,000	Total	6,082,525	3,372,900	794,150	4,878,050
Britain	390,000	190,000	53,500	270,000	THE WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES				
Italy	413,000	295,000	None	706,000	Poland	242,000	195,000	195,000	495,000
Portugal	185,500	150,000	None	515,000	Czechoslovakia	168,000	150,000	150,000	535,000
Greece	159,000	118,000	None	223,000	Rumania	181,000	165,000	None	300,000
Turkey	447,500	390,000	None	610,000	Bulgaria	149,000	130,000	None	167,000
Netherlands	121,250	80,000	80,000	193,000	German Democratic Republic	129,000	92,000	92,000	273,500
Belgium	94,900	70,000	70,000	37,800	Hungary	101,500	90,000	90,000	160,000
Canada	93,325	35,350	3,100	22,900	Total	970,500	822,000	527,000	1,930,500
Denmark	44,500	27,000	27,000	90,000	U.S.S.R.	3,305,000	2,000,000	640,000	2,330,000
Luxembourg	550	550	550	350	Total	4,275,500	2,822,000	927,000	4,260,500
Total	2,921,525	2,009,900	594,150	3,854,550					

¹ Unless otherwise noted, this information was drawn from the military balance 1970-71, prepared and published by the Institute for Strategic Studies, London, 1970.² These include the total forces of the NATO countries, on the assumption that an attack upon them would invoke a response from all forces and not merely from those assigned formally to NATO. Likewise for the Warsaw Pact.³ The central front is taken to include West Germany, Denmark, and the Benelux countries on the NATO side, and East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary on the pact side.⁴ The military balance 1970-71 indicates that France has two mechanized divisions in Germany plus 2,000 men in West Berlin. According to the military attaché at the French Embassy in Washington, a French mechanized division normally includes 16,000 men, which suggests that France may have a total of 34,000 men stationed in Germany.⁵ There are an additional 100,000 American military personnel in Western Europe and related areas. U.S. Defense Department, Directorate of Information, Telephone conversation, Mar. 31, 1971.⁶ Military Spending Committee of Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, Report on military spending, July 9, 1970, Table I, sec. 9, pp. 4-5. According to this source, there are an additional 450,000 Soviet troops in European U.S.S.R. Figures contained in the military balance 1970-71 suggest that there are fewer than 300,000 Soviet Army forces (14 tank and 17 infantry divisions) deployed in Central and Eastern Europe. Other current sources indicate, however, that there may be as many as 520,000 Soviet "troops" stationed in Eastern Europe, but these figures probably include support and air force personnel. See Newsweek, May 31, 1971, p. 5, and the National Observer, May 24, 1971, p. 4.

TABLE III.—MILITARY BUDGET AS A PERCENTAGE OF GNP FOR EACH OF THE NATO NATIONS—DEFENSE EXPENDITURES—NATO COUNTRIES

Country	Military budget	Percent of GNP
Belgium	\$721,538,000	3.0
Canada	1,676,000,000	2.0
Denmark	365,187,000	2.5
France	4,899,000,000	3.6
Western Germany	5,990,928,000	3.2
Greece	471,000,000	5.5
Iceland	None	
Italy	2,650,841,600	3.0
Luxembourg	8,592,000	1.0
Netherlands	1,113,304,000	3.6
Norway	369,400,000	3.7
Portugal	367,117,000	6.5
Turkey	429,992,363	3.8
United Kingdom	5,471,959,200	5.0

Note: U.S. Defense expenditures are estimated at 7.4 percent of GNP in fiscal year 1971 and 6.8 percent in fiscal year 1972.

THE CASE FOR OVERSEAS TROOP REDUCTIONS—II

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, as one justification for the resolution I shall offer at the June Democratic Caucus

calling for reductions in U.S. overseas troop levels, I would like to submit for the RECORD a list of pertinent questions I have developed which deal specifically with the rationale for our servicemen in a large number of other countries.

I would remind my colleagues that these are not rhetorical questions; instead, they go right to the heart of the question of why this Nation must maintain over a half-million military personnel and families in foreign nations.

The questions follow:

THE CASE FOR OVERSEAS TROOP REDUCTIONS
SOUTH KOREA

Why is it necessary for the United States to maintain 38,000 military personnel (including one division of 13,000 U.S. soldiers) stationed in South Korea 20 years after the war there ended?

WESTERN EUROPE

Why is it necessary to maintain 319,000 U.S. military personnel in Western Europe, when prior to the Berlin Crisis of 1962 there were only 311,000 military personnel there?

THAILAND

What U.S. national defense commitment requires the presence of 43,000 U.S. military personnel stationed in Thailand after U.S. military forces have been withdrawn from South Vietnam?

RYUKYUS ISLAND

Since the Nixon Doctrine rules out the future use of U.S. ground forces in combat in Asia, why is it necessary to continue to maintain 42,000 U.S. military personnel (including most of marine division) stationed in the Ryukyus Islands?

TAIWAN

At a time when the U.S. is establishing a mission in Peking, why does it continue to be necessary to station 9,000 U.S. military personnel in Taiwan?

JAPAN

What is the purpose of the forward deployment of nearly 20,000 U.S. military personnel (including nearly 10,000 round troops) in Japan? What treaty article requires this U.S. commitment?

ITALY

Why is it necessary to continue to station 10,000 U.S. military personnel (including nearly 8,000 ground troops) in Italy? What is the specific mission of the Southern European Task Force (SETAF) and what is the treaty article that requires this U.S. forward deployment?

GERMANY

Of the 211,000 U.S. military personnel stationed in the Federal Republic of Germany, how many are assigned to combat skill jobs? What is the mission of these 211,000 personnel? What treaty article requires their pres-

ence in the Federal Republic of Germany? What are the annual direct costs for maintaining these forces? What is the total balance-of-payments benefit that accrues to the Federal Republic of Germany as a result of their presence?

ETHIOPIA

Under what treaty article does the U.S. maintain 1,000 military personnel stationed in Ethiopia? What is the mission of the U.S. Military Assistance Command in Ethiopia? Has this command provided counterinsurgency training to elements of the Ethiopian Army?

Have U.S. military advisors visited or accompanied Ethiopian Army units engaged in counterinsurgency operations? Why does it require a major general to command this 1,000 man force?

MOROCCO

What is the treaty article that requires the forward deployment of 1,000 U.S. military personnel in Morocco? How many of these personnel are assigned to combat skill jobs? What is the mission of this U.S. force deployment?

PORUGAL

What is the mission which requires the forward deployment of 1,000 U.S. military personnel to Portugal? What treaty article requires this amount of men?

SPAIN

What treaty article requires the forward deployment of 9,000 U.S. military personnel stationed in Spain? What is the current mission of the Joint U.S. Military Assistance Group/Military Assistance Advisory Group? What is the mission of the 16th Air Force? How many of the military personnel assigned to the 16th Air Force are assigned to combat skill jobs? How many combat aircraft does Headquarters 16th Air Force command? What is the annual cost to maintain the San Pablo-Morón Airbase in stand-by status? What is the annual cost to the U.S. to operate the air base at Zaragoza?

TURKEY

What treaty article stipulates a U.S. commitment which requires the stationing of 7,000 U.S. military personnel in Turkey? How many of these military personnel are assigned to combat skill jobs? How many are assigned to headquarter or support duties? What is the current mission of the Joint U.S. Military Assistance Group Turkey? How many officers and non-commissioned officers are included in the total U.S. military strength in Turkey?

ENGLAND

What treaty article requires a U.S. commitment of 21,000 military personnel stationed in the United Kingdom? How many of these personnel are assigned to combat skill jobs? How many are officers or non-commissioned officers? What is the mission of the 3rd Air Force? How many combat U.S. aircraft does this headquarters command? What is the mission of the Commander-in-Chief U.S. Navy Europe? How many U.S. combat warships and submarines does this headquarters command?

WESTERN PACIFIC

What treaty article requires a U.S. commitment of over 68,000 military personnel afloat in the Western Pacific? What treaty article requires a U.S. commitment of 24,000 military personnel afloat in the Mediterranean?

IRAN, AUSTRALIA, CYPRUS

What military agreement or treaty article obligates the forward deployment of nearly a thousand U.S. military personnel in the following countries: Iran, Australia, Cyprus?

DUE PROCESS AND WATERGATE

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, a little while ago some of my colleagues were telling Sweden and India to mind their own business and let us bomb in peace. It is amusing to observe that supporters of the administration are now forced to rely on foreign help—Philippine money, London newspaper editorials, Communist visitors. It is indeed a little pathetic to see Nixon defenders now must rely on rightwing British MP's who believe that the Senate of the United States is composed of "rabble."

The best way to defend the indefensible is to go on the attack. Nixon supporters have to say something, and evidently the only thing they can say about Watergate is to attack the Ervin committee for keeping the matter before the public and on the front page. In their eyes, this is the major crime.

A recent editorial in the Washington Post gives a clear, reasoned response to these attacks. Nixon supporters do not like the Post, and they are right not to like it. Without the Post, there would be no rumors, innuendo or hearsay about the Watergate affair—because no one would have known anything about it. And that, it is not hard to believe, would have suited our new-found defenders of due process just fine.

The operative word in this editorial is "political due process." We should remember that we are not asking whether Richard Nixon should suffer loss of liberty or property, but whether we should trust him with the most powerful position in the world. Richard Nixon does not have a private, personal right to the office of the Presidency. The public is not asking whether he should go to jail, but whether he is politically guilty of callous contempt for the American people and the American democratic process.

We might ask: Where else do Nixon supporters want him to be tried but in the court of public opinion? By the time a head of state is actually hauled into a court of law, he is in deep trouble, as Charles I and Louis XVI found out. Nixon supporters should keep them in mind.

The editorial follows:

WATERGATE: DUE PROCESS AND THE PRESIDENT

Vice President Agnew, June 11, 1973: "Getting the truth out into the open [Senator Ervin] says, is more important than just jailing people. I could not agree more. Jailing the convicted criminal is only one part of what justice is all about. Justice in its deepest meaning involves: the assurance that we live in a society where the individual is truly free; the confidence that we are ruled by a government of laws, not of men; and the demonstrated proof that innocence and guilt alike are rewarded or punished as they deserve.

"There can be no justice without public trust, and there can be no trust without a systematic and thorough airing of the whole truth about affairs that concern us all."

Had the Vice President stopped right there, with these six sentences excerpted (only moderately out of context) from his speech on Monday, we would have been pleased to see them written in stone. But Mr. Agnew, of course, proceeded to brush aside these and other sensible things he had to say in his address to the Attorneys General in St. Louis, and to join those who would close

down the Watergate hearings, silence the news media, and leave it to the courts to determine the "whole truth" about the monumental scandal and corruption that have come to be called "Watergate." "There is no escaping the fact that the hearings have a Perry Masonish impact," Mr. Agnew went on to say. "The indefatigable cameras will paint both heroes and villains in lurid and indelible colors before the public's very eyes . . ." Reciting those elements of a judicial proceeding which he finds lacking in the Senate hearings, he argued that what a court can do, "with far greater precision and fairness than any legislative committee, is to establish the central facts of individual capability—the task that now stands first on the nation's Watergate agenda."

The Vice President is far from alone in the view that the Ervin committee proceedings and the on-going investigative reporting of the multiple facets of Watergate threaten to prejudice the prosecution of those who may be guilty of crimes, while unfairly damaging the innocent. The White House has cried out against a plot to "prosecute a case against the President in the press . . . an unprecedented assault on judicial and administrative due process . . . an [effort] to destroy the President." Secretary of the Interior Morton has opposed the Ervin committee "because there's too big a tendency to try people in a forum that is not designed for that." Sen. William Proxmire, a Democrat with no record of softness for Mr. Nixon, has argued that the President is "being tried, sentenced and executed by rumor and allegation."

Now that is pretty strong stuff and we would not dismiss it out of hand; the smearing of the guiltless is always a danger when scandal almost literally envelops a government; pre-trial publicity is often something of a hindrance to the effective prosecution of criminals. But before concluding that both things are now happening to an intolerable degree it might be wise to consider how much of this hand-wringing over due process of law is pertinent, and how much of it proceeds from an excessive effort to shield the President from the due processes of a political system which also explicitly provides for a free press, for free expression and for the vigorous discharge by Congress of its constitutional responsibilities.

And it might also be wise to consider the quite extraordinary implication of this argument when it is applied on behalf of the President. For what this argument does, in effect, is to relieve the President of the United States of the responsibilities and the risks inherent in his great office. It reduces him to the ranks of an ordinary criminal suspect, for whose protection against a repressive monarch the right of due process was expressly written into the Constitution. That he has such a right as a citizen is not the point. That he should be so endangered by the charges raised against him that he should feel obliged to rely on this right represents, in our view, a retreat on his part and on the part of his defenders which is more genuinely damaging in its way than anything that has been said against him by those who, for one reason or another, wish him ill.

And yet that is the plain implication of an eloquent defense of the President in an editorial from the Times of London, which appears elsewhere on this page today. We are reprinting it, not because we agree with it but because it represents a presumably disinterested view from afar, and because it forcefully expresses the thinking of Mr. Nixon's supporters in this country—so much so that White House propagandists are circulating it approvingly.

"What the President is now receiving is a Washington variant of lynch law," the Times declares, and it rests its case very largely on the publication in this newspaper and in The New York Times of a report that Mr. John

Dean had told government prosecutors and Senate investigators that he had discussed aspects of "the Watergate coverup with President Nixon or in the President's presence on at least 35 occasions this year." The Times of London calls this "hanging evidence" of complicity in the obstruction of justice, which, if believed, could "destroy a President." But on the basis of its own reading of Mr. Dean's reliability the Times editorial goes on to argue that it is also "wholly suspect" evidence and the editorial asks: "How can the newspapers defend themselves from the very charge that they are leveling against the President, the charge of making a fair trial impossible, if they now publish evidence so damning and so doubtful with all the weight of authority that their publication gives?"

Well, there are several things to be said in response to that. One is that the American public will now apparently have a chance to see for itself how damning or doubtful Mr. Dean's testimony is, when he gives it publicly before Senator Ervin's committee; his sworn testimony will be subject to challenge by Senators and staff members and subsequent witnesses; perjury would not exactly fit the purpose of a man who is said to be desperately trying to avoid going to jail. As for the weight of newspaper reports, it is as nothing compared with the weight of an American President, capable of commanding all three television networks simultaneously in his own defense. The Times contends that British newspapers would not be allowed to publish material as prejudicial as that now appearing in the American press. But the fact is that what is now being published is no different in essence from the early investigative reporting of Watergate to which the Times graciously and glowingly gives "full credit."

Moreover, as Britain's *Guardian* has pointed out, while such a press campaign might be more difficult to mount in Britain, it would also be "less necessary." In this regard, we would put this question to the Times: For how long would a British Government remain in office, if it had lied systematically to the press, and by extension to Congress and the public, for 10 months; if it had grossly misled the public on a critical issue—the nature and extent of its own investigation of alleged corruption in its midst; if two of its principal figures and assorted lesser lights had been forced to resign; if two of its former Cabinet members had been indicted for crimes; if "illegal as well as unethical" conduct had been conceded to have occurred in the campaign that brought it to office; if it had plainly engaged in a massive effort to obstruct justice; if it had approved a broad campaign of admittedly illegal security measures in clear violation of individual rights?

Would the Times of London in such circumstances be talking earnestly about due process for the Prime Minister?

This is the heart of what is wrong about the Times' argument; we are not Britain; we have a different set of checks and balances, which grant a President a fixed, firm term of office while holding him answerable, every day, to the judgment of the people he serves. It is only in this sense that the President is "on trial" before the Ervin committee or in the press. And it is for this reason that the Watergate crisis, which is in a very real sense a crisis of confidence in government, cannot await the determination, or narrow legal grounds, of criminal guilt or innocence. As the Vice President himself acknowledged, "a judicial trial sometimes falls well short of airing all the circumstances and ramifications surrounding a crime of controversy."

It is an authentic tragedy that we should have arrived at a point where it is not easy for the Congress or the press to exercise their rights and responsibilities without the risk of prejudicial, pre-trial publicity potentially injurious to the President. But it was not the

press nor Congress which brought us to this sorry state. And we will not rise from it by suspending the due processes of the American political system for the sake of affording due process of law to the President. We are dealing here, not with specific isolated crimes, but with a whole style and manner and method of governing. We are dealing, in the end, with the President's capacity to govern, which derives, in turn, from public trust. And the Vice President is right: *There can be no trust without a systematic and thorough airing of the whole truth about affairs that concern us all.*

lic Printer to cost \$2,295, and to include extraneous matter.

All Members (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado), to revise and extend their remarks on the Findley-Conte amendment.

Mr. MCSPADEN to extend his remarks following those of Mr. ALEXANDER in the Committee of the Whole today.

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

Mr. SARASIN.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. STEELE.

Mr. ESHLEMAN.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota.

Mr. WHALEN in three instances.

Mrs. HOLT.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. COCHRAN.

Mr. KETCHUM in two instances.

Mr. HEDNUT.

Mr. ABDNOR.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. CRONIN.

Mr. FORSYTHE.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in five instances.

Mr. COUGHLIN in five instances.

Mr. BURKE of Florida in two instances.

Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. HANRAHAN.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

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

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. HOWARD in two instances.

Mr. GUNTER.

Mr. DENT.

Mr. GIBBONS.

Mr. FULTON.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. COTTER.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. CLARK in two instances.

Mr. ADAMS.

Mr. HICKS.

Mr. ROE in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. LEGGETT in two instances.

Mr. BRASCO in six instances.

Mr. FOLEY in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.

Mr. MORGAN.

SENATE BILLS AND A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. RANDALL in two instances.

Mr. PERKINS.

Mr. MICHEL, to extend his remarks in the general debate on the agriculture appropriation bill, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DELLUMS, to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD, and is estimated by the Pub-

from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 271. An act to improve judicial machinery by amending the requirement for a three-judge court in certain cases and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 797. An act to direct the Secretary of Transportation to make a comprehensive study of a high-speed ground transportation system between Washington, District of Columbia, and Annapolis, Maryland, and a high-speed marine vessel transportation system between the Baltimore-Annapolis area in Maryland and the Yorktown-Williamsburg-Norfolk area in Virginia, and to authorize the construction of such system if such study demonstrates their feasibility; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1585. An act to prevent the unauthorized manufacture and use of the character "Woodsy Owl," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on illegal, improper, or unethical activities during the Presidential election of 1972; to the Committee on House Administration.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4682. An act to provide for the immediate disposal of certain abaca and sisal cordage fiber now held in the national stockpile.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 18, 1973

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 18, 1973, 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:

1038. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to benefits for employees of the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1039. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the inventory of nonpurchased foreign currencies as of December 31, 1972, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2363; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1040. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting his annual report for fiscal year 1972, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 604(a)(4); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1041. A letter from the Acting Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; transmitting the first annual report covering measures taken to implement the objectives of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended, pursuant to section 516(a) of the act; to the Committee on Public Works.

1042. A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Water Resources Council, transmitting

the first annual report on level B planning under section 209 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92-500); to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1043. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need for improved consumer protection in interstate land sales under the interstate land sales registration program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McFALL: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 8760. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 93-285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa: Campaign Expenditures Committee. House Report 93-286. Report of Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1972; (Rept. No. 93-286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 542. Joint resolution concerning the war powers of Congress and the President; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mr. GINN, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.R. 8714. A bill to provide for the continued sales of gasoline to independent gasoline retailers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 8715. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit making unsolicited commercial telephone calls to persons who have indicated they do not wish to receive such calls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WINN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 8716. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit making unsolicited commercial telephone calls to persons who have indicated they do not wish to receive such calls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 8717. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to conduct an election for the purpose of a referendum on the question of statehood for the residents of the present District, election of delegates to a constitutional convention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 8718. A bill to reorganize the governmental structure of the District of Columbia, to provide a charter for local government in the District of Columbia subject to acceptance by a majority of registered electors, to delegate certain legislative powers to the local government, to implement certain recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 8719. A bill to provide that after June 30, 1974, not more than 300,000 members of the Armed Forces may be assigned overseas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H.R. 8720. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for citizens actions in the U.S. district courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 8721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.R. 8722. A bill to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code to clarify the intent of the Congress by creating a presumption that a person who voluntarily agrees to travel with another to a particular destination, but does not arrive at such destination after a reasonable period of time, is inveigled or decoyed, within the meaning of such section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. VANIK):

H.R. 8723. A bill to establish a comprehensive program of trade adjustment assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 8724. A bill to amend titles 39 and 5, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8725. A bill to amend the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, title 39, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8726. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of zinc be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 8727. A bill to establish in the State of California the Toyon National Urban Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 8728. A bill to end the authorization of the Asotin Dam, Snake River, Idaho and Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 8729. A bill to amend the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 with respect to recycled wool; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8730. A bill to establish a U.S. Fire Administration and a National Fire Academy in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of death, personal injury, and property damage from fire, to increase the effectiveness and coordination of fire prevention and control agencies at all levels of government, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio:

H.R. 8731. A bill to establish rates of compensation for certain positions within the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NIX (by request):

H.R. 8732. A bill to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission of Control and Supervision as provided in article 14 of the protocol concerning the said Commission to the Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 8733. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 8734. A bill to consent to the Interstate Environment Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUNNELS (for himself and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 8735. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating portions of the Chama River, N. Mex., the Gila River, N. Mex., and the San Francisco River, N. Mex. for study as potential additions to the national wild and scenic rivers system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 8736. A bill to establish a U.S. Fire Administration and a National Fire Academy in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of death, personal injury, and property damage from fire, to increase the effectiveness and coordination of fire prevention and control agencies at all levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 8737. A bill to enlarge the Sequoia National Park in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 8738. A bill to establish a national program to provide income supplements to every family in need thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 8739. A bill to facilitate the completion of the New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 8740. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to terminate the suspension of housing assistance programs under his jurisdiction and cease the withholding of funds for such programs, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to cease the withholding of funds for rural housing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 8741. A bill to establish an arbitration board to settle disputes between supervisory organizations and the U.S. Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 8742. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities and to provide public financing for such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 8743. A bill to provide for the regulation of surface coal mining for the conservation, acquisition, and reclamation of surface areas affected by coal mining activities, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 8744. A bill to provide Federal assistance to States to enable them to provide day-care services for children from needy families where the parents are working, training, or incapable of self-support; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 8745. A bill to modify the project for the Rogue River, Oreg., and Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 8746. A bill concerning medical records, information, and data to promote and facilitate medical studies, research, education, and the performance of the obligations of medical utilization committees in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIGGS (by request):

H.R. 8747. A bill to repeal section 274 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, requiring compulsory vaccination against smallpox for public school students; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 8748. A bill to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate to improve congressional control over budgetary outlay and receipt totals, to provide for a Legislative Budget Director and staff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 8749. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify the standards which apply in determining the basis on which Federal matching will be accorded toward State expenditures for skilled and intermediate care facility services provided under State plans approved under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 8750. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MYERS:

H.R. 8751. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to exempt any nonmanufacturing business or any business having 25 or less employees in States having laws regulating safety in such businesses from the Federal standard created under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself and Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia):

H.R. 8752. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to require the establishment of standards related to rear-mounted lighting systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NIX (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 8753. A bill to provide a penalty for the robbery or attempted robbery of any narcotic drug from any pharmacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 8754. A bill to deauthorize U.S. Army Corps of Engineers projects if Congress has not appropriated funds to carry out the projects for a period of 8 years or more since authorization; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 8755. A bill relating to the dutiable status of fresh, chilled, or frozen cattle meat and fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats, sheep and lambs and beef prepared in airtight containers and beef prepared whether fresh, chilled or frozen, and lamb or mutton

prepared or preserved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 8756. A bill to provide assistance to the town of North Bonneville, Wash., in planning a new town, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 8760. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to authorize a reduction in U.S. troop levels overseas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself, Mr. WOLFE, and Mr. JOHNSON of California):

H.J. Res. 619. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week in November which includes Thanksgiving Day in each year as "National Family Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.J. Res. 620. Joint resolution designation of the month of August of each year as "National Drum Corps Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that after June 30, 1974, not more than 300,000 members of the Armed Forces may be assigned overseas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEMP:

H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that no person should be considered for appointment as Ambassador or Minister if such person or members of his immediate family have contributed more than \$5,000 to a candidate for President in the last election; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

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

252. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Department of Agriculture loan regulations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

253. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the deadline for Federal crop insurance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

254. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relative to the Hatch Act; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 8757. A bill for the relief of Daisy Vargas Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 8758. A bill for the relief of Charles M. Seeger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 8759. A bill for the relief of Fouad R. Khattar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

240. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Gene U. Marshall, Deale, Md., and others, relative to protection of law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.