

Sincoff, Steven L., [REDACTED]
 Sisco, Susan P., [REDACTED]
 Sive, Emanuel R., [REDACTED]
 Skvarenina, Timothy L., [REDACTED]
 Slade, Thomas B., [REDACTED]
 Smith, Dan O., [REDACTED]
 Smith, Douglas G., [REDACTED]
 Smith, George F., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Smith, Jackie C., [REDACTED]
 Smith, Larell K., [REDACTED]
 Smith, Richard D., [REDACTED]
 Smith, Terry S., [REDACTED]
 Smith, William C., [REDACTED]
 Snider, Thomas C., [REDACTED]
 Snipes, Earl R., [REDACTED]
 Snook, Joseph E., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Soderlund, John D., [REDACTED]
 Sonnenberg, James M., [REDACTED]
 Sontag, Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Sorensen, Eugene R., [REDACTED]
 Sparks, Brian R., [REDACTED]
 Spencer, Stephen T., [REDACTED]
 Spiker, John B., [REDACTED]
 Spink, Bradley R., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Spiva, James W., [REDACTED]
 Sprague, Michael W., [REDACTED]
 Springer, Bruce D., [REDACTED]
 Springer, William C., [REDACTED]
 Stanbro, Joe B., [REDACTED]
 Stanley, James C., [REDACTED]
 Starr, Ronald B., [REDACTED]
 Steffey, Raymond E., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Steinfield, Philip, [REDACTED]
 Stephens, Alton L., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Stephens, April J., [REDACTED]
 Stephens, John D., [REDACTED]
 Stephens, John T., [REDACTED]
 Stevens, David Y., [REDACTED]
 Stever, Richard D., [REDACTED]
 Stewart, Lewis E., [REDACTED]
 Stockett, Romeo P., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Stone, Kerwin B., [REDACTED]
 Stone, Ralph B., [REDACTED]
 Story, Harvey S., [REDACTED]
 Stratton, Vincent V., [REDACTED]
 Straw, Charles A., [REDACTED]
 Sullivan, John G., [REDACTED]
 Sullivan, Kenneth C., [REDACTED]
 Sullivan, Thomas G., [REDACTED]
 Superak, Richard J., [REDACTED]
 Suter, John D., [REDACTED]
 Swann, Michael K., [REDACTED]
 Swedenburg, Robert L., [REDACTED]
 Swift, Susan R., [REDACTED]
 Takahashi, Gilbert T., [REDACTED]
 Talley, Autry L., [REDACTED]
 Tame, Catherine C., [REDACTED]
 Tanzola, John C., [REDACTED]
 Taraba, Thomas S., [REDACTED]
 Tarbell, William W., [REDACTED]
 Tate, Jerome A., [REDACTED]
 Tate, Ted M., [REDACTED]
 Taylor, Francis X., [REDACTED]
 Taylor, James R., [REDACTED]
 Taylor, Robert G., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Teague, Randall C., [REDACTED]
 Teasdale, Donald M., [REDACTED]
 Tenney, Richard E., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Terry, Michael J., [REDACTED]
 Tesoriere, Michael J., [REDACTED]
 Thomas, Richard W., [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Beatrice A., [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Dan H., [REDACTED]
 Thompson, John A., [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Kenneth H., [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Michael W., [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Richard C., [REDACTED]
 Thorpe, William G., [REDACTED]
 Tilton, Frank W., [REDACTED]
 Titus, George W., [REDACTED]
 Tohlen, David R., [REDACTED]
 Tolmich, Harry, [REDACTED]
 Tolson, James D., [REDACTED]

Toops, Emory E., [REDACTED]
 Torkelson, Otis B., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Toussaint, Paul J., [REDACTED]
 Troutman, Jude A., [REDACTED]
 Tubbs, Linda D., [REDACTED]
 Twining, Lawrence E., [REDACTED]
 Uecker, Carolyn D., [REDACTED]
 Uhlik, Felix T., III, [REDACTED]
 Vanmeerten, Dick F., [REDACTED]
 Vann, Orville C., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Varnes, Larrie F., [REDACTED]
 Vigil, Carlos M., [REDACTED]
 Vittatoo, Penrose, [REDACTED]
 Volz, Charles H., III, [REDACTED]
 Wald, Victor J., [REDACTED]
 Walker, Murray L., [REDACTED]
 Walker, Robert, [REDACTED]
 Wallace, Nicholas M., [REDACTED]
 Walsh, James L., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wamstad, Robert C., [REDACTED]
 Wangsvick, Carl L., [REDACTED]
 Ware, Worn E., [REDACTED]
 Washco, George W., [REDACTED]
 Watt, James S. B., [REDACTED]
 Webb, Gary L., [REDACTED]
 Weeks, Larry A., [REDACTED]
 Weeks, Richard P., [REDACTED]
 Weisz, John L., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Weitzel, Michael P., [REDACTED]
 Welch, Frederick R., [REDACTED]
 Weston, John D., [REDACTED]
 White, Charles T., [REDACTED]
 White, James C., [REDACTED]
 Whiting, Larry L., [REDACTED]
 Whyte, Lynn K., [REDACTED]
 Wieland, George A., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wiggins, David B., [REDACTED]
 Wilcox, Truman D., [REDACTED]
 Wilderman, Michael B., [REDACTED]
 Wilkes, Ronald W., [REDACTED]
 Wilkinson, Thomas N., [REDACTED]
 Willey, Chester F., [REDACTED]
 Williams, Eddie L., [REDACTED]
 Williams, Jimmy R., [REDACTED]
 Williams, Michael L., [REDACTED]
 Williams, Richard B., [REDACTED]
 Williams, William G., III, [REDACTED]
 Williford, Randolph J., [REDACTED]
 Willis, Larry D., [REDACTED]
 Winegarden, Perry B., [REDACTED]
 Wintner, Kim M., [REDACTED]
 Witt, Richard H., [REDACTED]
 Womack, Oscar, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Woodson, John L., III, [REDACTED]
 Workman, Joseph F., [REDACTED]
 Worley, Francis F., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Worsham, Richard E., [REDACTED]
 Wright, Karen L., [REDACTED]
 Wright, Michael D., [REDACTED]
 Wright, Robert G., [REDACTED]
 Wright, Ted D., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wyatt, Susan J., [REDACTED]
 Yanek, Joseph R., [REDACTED]
 Yasenovsky, Andrew, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Yonfmura, Rodney K., [REDACTED]
 Young, Dick H., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Young, Robert E., [REDACTED]
 Youngman, Dwight R., [REDACTED]
 Yourtee, Michael W., [REDACTED]
 Yundt, Robert W., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Zambeck, Arthur K., [REDACTED]
 Zerull, Lynn J., [REDACTED]
 Zettler, Michael E., [REDACTED]
 Zietlow, John E., [REDACTED]

The following officer for appointment as a Reserve of the Air Force in the grade of Colonel, Line of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 593, Title 10, United States Code and Public Law 92-129.

Andrews, Charles, [REDACTED]

The following officer for appointment as

a temporary officer in the U.S. Air Force (Medical Corps), in the grade of lieutenant colonel, under the provisions of section 8444 and 8447, title 10, United States Code and Public Law 92-129, with a view to designation as a medical officer under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code:

Sherman, Howard H., [REDACTED]

The following officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force (Medical Corps) in the grade of lieutenant colonel, under the provisions of section 583, title 10, United States Code and Public Law 92-129, with a view to designation as medical officers under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code:

Frank, William E., [REDACTED]

Hunter, David M., [REDACTED]

Sowell, Ellis M., II, [REDACTED]

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be colonel (Dental)

Hansen, Nathan J., [REDACTED]

To be captain (Medical)

Krege, John W., [REDACTED]

Michaelson, Edward D., [REDACTED]

Ward, James G., [REDACTED]

To be captain (Dental)

Mills, Donald E., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenant (Dental)

Saunders, Timothy R., [REDACTED]

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 10, 1973:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Betsy Ancker-Johnson, of Washington, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Wallace H. Johnson, Jr., of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

James N. Gabriel, of Massachusetts, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Massachusetts for the term of 4 years.

James F. Companion, of West Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of West Virginia for the term of 4 years.

Donald E. Santarelli, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Law Enforcement Assistance.

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.)

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

Vincent P. Biunno, of New Jersey, to be a U.S. district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Daniel J. Synder, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a U.S. district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania.

J. Foy Guin, Jr., of Alabama, to be a U.S. district judge for the northern district of Alabama.

James H. Hancock, of Alabama, to be a U.S. district judge for the northern district of Alabama.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 10, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 Col. Ernest Holz, national chief secretary, the Salvation Army, offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, we bow before Thee in need for this day and age acknowledging Thee as our Lord and Creator. This is a day of unrest and anxiety. Re-

mind us of the words of Jesus, "Come unto Me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give thee rest." This is a day of hate, distrust, and little peace in

the world. Remind us of Thy words, "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you." And yet this is a day of great discovery, thrilling living, and glowing hope. Surround these blessings of real life with Thy love. Through the touch of Thy spirit grant us more faith, hope, and love—the greatest of these being love. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. 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.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO FILE A REPORT ON S. 502, HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on S. 502, to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order any time after tomorrow to consider a joint resolution making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1973.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE A REPORT ON JOINT RESOLUTION MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on a House joint resolution making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1973.

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

There was no objection.

ROLLBACK GROSSLY UNFAIR TO FEEDERS

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I urged the House to reject the recommendations of the Banking and Currency Committee that all prices, rents and in-

terest rates be rolled back to January 10 levels. My remarks appear at page 11410 of the Record. I did not attempt to show the adverse impact which such a rollback would have on all segments of society, but did say it would be a disaster for the livestock industry and particularly for independent farmers engaged in small-to medium-sized feeding operations who have purchased replacement feeder cattle at prices which had advanced sharply after January 10. I would like to be more specific as to how such farmers would have no chance at all to escape substantial financial loss if they are to be limited to January 10 prices for fat cattle when he eventually sells them.

I am thinking of a farmer friend who feeds about 200 head a year who bought 81 head of 700-pound yearling steers 4 weeks ago at \$54 per hundredweight. The same feeder cattle would have cost only \$40 in December—they had gone up \$14. He would normally feed these steers six months to bring them up to 1,200 pounds, the proper weight for choice cattle. With the cost of everything he puts into those cattle having already gone up sharply, it will cost him more than 30 cents a pound to put that 500 pound gain on those cattle. Now if when he sells them he is limited to \$39 per hundredweight, which was the average at Sioux City on January 10, he will get only 18 cents a pound for the gain; or a loss of 12 cents a pound. That is \$60 per animal, which means this small operator will have lost \$4,860 on this one small lot of cattle and received absolutely nothing for all the work he has gone to in feeding and tending them over a 6-month period. Actually his loss will be much greater because that figure assumes all 81 cattle will survive, whereas one or two of them will probably die bringing his loss to be between \$5,000 and \$6,000.

My farmer friend cannot afford to take that kind of beating. He should not be thus penalized for having tried in good faith to meet the consumer's well publicized demand for more red meat. He was willing to assume all the normal risks—and they are many—of buying high priced feeder cattle to continue his feeding operations. But he is not willing to have Congress foreclose any possibility of his recovering his costs and making a profit by limiting him to a January 10 selling price. I again urge all Members to vote against this mischievous and grossly unfair rollback proposal.

STETSON SHOE CO. CLOSES IN MASSACHUSETTS

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, along with my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. STUDDS), I take this opportunity to inform the Members of the House that another shoe factory in Massachusetts is closing its doors. The Stetson Shoe Co., a company of many, many years of business, is going to close down due to the unfortunate conditions

of our trade policies that make it impossible for this great firm to continue.

I understand the President is going to send us a trade message here. I have been reading the reports in the newspapers which indicate the President is talking very tough on the one hand but, on the other hand, I find out he is dealing with these trade problems by throwing marshmallows at them. In other words he is looking for permission to further lower the tariff in this country. If we do that we can say goodbye to the industrial complex of America.

The First National Bank of Boston has predicted that within 10 years New England is going to be a service-oriented area. In other words, there are not going to be any mills or factories at work there. It is going to be an area where everybody is going to be a life insurance salesman selling life insurance to each other. Yes, this country has some real problems and we have to face up to them.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. 81]

Abzug	Frey	Pettis
Bell	Goldwater	Pickle
Blatnik	Gray	Price, Tex.
Burke, Calif.	Hansen, Idaho	Reid
Carey, N.Y.	Harvey	Rooney, N.Y.
Carney, Ohio	Hastings	Rosenthal
Chisholm	Hébert	Royal
Clark	Hollfield	Shipley
Dellums	Howard	Slack
Dent	Jones, Ala.	Steiger, Wis.
Diggs	King	Teague, Tex.
Duisk	O'Hara	
Edwards, Calif.	Owens	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 396 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

LEAD NATION ON MEATLESS TUESDAYS

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday I asked the President to reestablish the successful World War II practice of "meatless Tuesdays" until the supply of meat catches up with demand and prices return to a reasonable level.

It is Tuesday once again and there has been no response from the White House. The weeklong meat boycott was effective, but in a limited way. A long term reduction in demand is needed to more nearly coincide with the long leadtime required for the production of meat.

Perhaps Congress should step in and lead the Nation in voluntarily observing meatless Tuesdays in the House and Sen-

ate Restaurants until meat prices stabilize at a level acceptable to all.

RISE OF WHOLESALE PRICE INDEX FOR MARCH

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the Department of Labor reported that the Wholesale Price Index for March rose at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 26.4 percent—the steepest monthly rise since 1951.

Mr. Speaker, surely this Congress needs no further evidence of the total bankruptcy of the Nixon administration's economic policies. The so-called phase III of the economic stabilization program—announced by President Nixon on January 11—is an absolute failure and a disaster for the American people.

Despite the obvious, the administration continues to issue rosy statements promising that better days are just down the road. In truth, they are floundering around and they now appear unable to come to grips with the economic realities of the Nation.

This is a crisis which everyone but the administration seems to recognize. The problems of inflation are no secret to the consumer, the farmer, the businessman, and the worker. They know it exists and they know they are paying a terrible price for the administration's continuing head-in-the-sand attitude.

Mr. Speaker, when economic policies fail so miserably and when the Nation approaches an economic emergency, it is time for the Congress to pick up the initiative and to provide the leadership which is so obviously lacking downtown. We can no longer afford the luxury of a wait-and-see approach to the Nixon brand of economics.

This week, the House of Representatives will be acting on a series of amendments to the Economic Stabilization Act as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee last week. This measure seeks to repeal the disastrous phase III and to provide some very firm economic guidelines for the Nation—guidelines which will return stability to the economy. This legislation will correct the mistakes which have piled up under phase III and will push the President toward a meaningful program to lower prices, rents, and interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are watching closely to see how the Congress performs on these amendments. This is a true test of the Congress ability to deal firmly and effectively with an economic crisis.

MEATS AND CONTROLS

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to my colleague from New York (Mr. PODELL) concerning his proposal to declare "Meatless Tuesdays."

If worldwide demand for meat continues to accelerate, prices will not decline.

Adverse weather conditions in the United States compound the difficulties of raising enough beef to satisfy the market. In one Midwestern State alone, storms have caused us to lose 44,000 head of cattle so far this year. If the Government persists in imposing price controls, ceilings, and even rollbacks, it will be virtually impossible to increase the supply of meat. There will be no need for Congress to proclaim one meatless day—every day will be meatless. Reserves of beef, pork, and lamb will simply dry up.

Most of us can remember the meat shortages that prevailed during World War II. People queued up for blocks for a pound of Spam. But if the present situation continues, there may not even be a pound of Spam available. We will all fast from meat—and it will not be in deference to the will of Congress.

RURAL WATER AND SEWER GRANT PROGRAM—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is: Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, H.R. 3298, an act to restore the rural water and sewer grant program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, the Speaker of the House of Representatives (Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), has yielded to me. I appreciate the years that I served under his leadership on that committee.

In a few minutes, as every Member of this House knows, we will cast one of the critical votes of this session of Congress—critical because of the importance of the subject matter with which we are dealing, and critical because of the challenge which we confront as a law-making body of the Nation.

We are face to face with a confrontation that has been in the making for some time. We are dealing, it seems to me, in a sense, with the basic constitutional system of the Nation. We are dealing with the question of the authority of Congress to make the laws of the land.

Just last month 297 Members of this body, Democrats and Republicans, voted to reinstate this very successful program. I am sure that on that occasion the vote was one of conviction that the program was needed, and that Members in making this vote were doing so in the conviction that they were helping their constituents and their country.

I do not believe there is any argument over the merits of this legislation.

In signing into law legislation which tripled the authorization for water and sewer grants in 1972, President Nixon called the legislation "praiseworthy."

It helps people, it helps communities. It is based on the theory that our people have a right to an abundance of clear

water and sanitary sewage disposal systems. It is based on the principle that what we do to clean up the water of the Nation is important to the environment not only of those who live in this generation, but those who will live in generations to come.

This program over the years, has received consistent bipartisan support because it is a good program. In my own State, for example, 8 years ago not one family was served by rural water systems, not one in the entire State. Today, thanks to this program, over 90,000 families have access to good, clean, running water. In my home country 85 percent of the rural and smalltown families now have water lines coming to their homes. Before this program was begun none of these families were served. I am sure that the same story can be told in most States, and in many counties of the Nation—but the job has not been completed.

Without these grants, the people of many rural areas could not afford water. How is a town with a population of 250 people, many of them children, going to raise the money to build water and sewer lines? There are small, poor communities in districts throughout the country that cannot possibly pay for the construction and maintenance of sophisticated water and sewage plants. Even if they could borrow the money to build the systems, the water and sewer bills would be exorbitant.

The biggest losers in this conflict are the 1,685 small towns that already have qualified for water and sewer grants in accordance with the law, and who were denied the payments on their grants due to impoundment.

The impoundment of money for rural water and waste disposal systems has severely penalized communities. These people went to the polls last November with the full understanding that the law would be faithfully executed. Little did they realize that their dreams would be shattered by an abrupt, unauthorized termination of the program.

The questions before us are simple: Were we right when we voted for this program last month? Were we right in believing that it was a good program? Were we right in believing that it was a program that the American people could afford? Were we right in believing that it would help the people that we represent and our country? It seems to me the overriding question is: Are we going to do what—297 of us thought, and I still think—is in the best interests of this Nation and our people; or are we going to do what the President has asked us to do, namely, to tuck our tails and sustain a veto of a bill which this body has passed by an almost 5-to-1 margin?

The question is with you, your consciences, and your constituents.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to yield half of this time to the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE). I understand that I can only yield to him one time. Is it in order for me at this time to yield him 30 minutes and let him apportion it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). The gentleman has control of the time. He can yield his time.

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from California 30 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Does that mean that I must use all of my 30 minutes together?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may use his time as he sees fit, for purposes of debate only.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the Speaker.

I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President's veto of H.R. 3298.

It is not easy for me, and I know it is not easy for a great many of Members of the House, to vote to sustain the veto on this bill. I say that because the program that has been affected by the President's action is not, in my opinion, a bad program—it is in fact the best of the several agricultural programs for which the President has impounded funds.

It is fortunate, however, that the President has set forth several alternatives to the forced spending that this bill mandates. If it were not for the President's plan to provide grant money through the Environmental Protection Agency while providing loan money through the Farmers Home Administration, it would indeed be most difficult if not impossible to vote to sustain the veto on H.R. 3298.

As he has pointed out in his veto message, the President intends to make \$345 million in water system loan funds and \$100 million in insured sewer loan funds available to rural areas in the next fiscal year. In addition, some \$5 billion will be available through EPA for grants to the States which will set their own priorities while making adequate amounts available to small towns. These grants, incidentally, will be more generous at a 75-percent Federal, 25-percent local ratio than the old FHA grant system which was set on a 50-50-percent matching basis. In fact, some \$148 million of EPA grants have been made to small town of 2,500 persons or less in fiscal year 1972 and the first 6 months of fiscal year 1973.

Even with these alternatives, the decision we face is still a tough one. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we must always remember that the responsibility we have as national legislators in the world's greatest legislative body occasionally demands an action that is politically courageous and difficult.

The issue today is greater than H.R. 3298. It is simply the credibility of the President's effort to apply a brake to what has become runaway Government spending.

If the House of Representatives today decides to reverse the President's austerity program, what is there to stop his reversal on each of the other dozen bills by which the Congress seeks to confront the President with the forced spending of billions of dollars beyond our means?

Today, then, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that if the Republic is to be saved from runaway spending and its twin offsprings of inflation and taxes, the House must bite the political bullet.

The arithmetic is clear: it takes one-third plus one to sustain a veto, and we can deliver that support to our President if we can only muster in our hearts the courage to do so.

Some will say, I am sure, that a vote to preserve fiscal responsibility will hurt us at home.

I do not think so, Mr. Speaker, and I am willing to test my votes with my constituents. And when the dust settles, I think we will all find that America needs fiscal solvency to do all the great things that history and fate have decreed for her in the years past, present, and future.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California desire to yield further at this time?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA).

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I believe we should make an attempt in this situation to separate rhetoric from the facts and I want to allude now to some of the facts. They are these:

We have spent in this fiscal year of 1973 a little more than \$500 million under the Water Pollution Control Act to finance the construction of waste treatment facilities. This leaves us approximately \$1.5 billion of available funds for the balance of the fiscal year 1973, which probably will not be obligated until sometime after July 1, 1973. On that particular date \$3 billion in additional obligational and contrast authority is available making in the next fiscal year a total of about \$4.5 billion for the construction of waste treatment facilities. It seems to me that larger sum is an adequate sum to finance all the waste treatment facilities we are talking about, and more, under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act. At least there is a far more realistic chance of there being funded under the Water Quality Act.

In addition to that, this bill deals with the appropriation of \$150 million for fiscal 1973. That is over the entire United States. That averages out to about \$3 million a State for both water and sewer grants. If we take Ohio as an example, it has 88 counties, and dividing that \$3 million between 88 counties we find a county can get a rather insignificant sum for waste treatment and water system grants under this legislation. Really there is not enough money to do any good, and we are deluding the rural areas into thinking there is going to be a large sum of money available for grants under this program when in fact there is not.

They are much better off under the Water Pollution Control Act, because under the Farmers Home Administration Act they can get grants up to only 50 percent. Under the Water Pollution Control Act they can get grants up to 75 percent. We wrote into that act the provisions that States must set priorities and must decide which projects will be funded first and second and third and so according to their needs.

In addition to that I am advised by EPA when they draft regulations for the

States to set up these priorities, it will be required that due and adequate consideration be given the rural areas. In view of the fact that the States will be making this determination as to priorities, I would much rather, being a small community, deal with the State authorities than have to come to Washington and deal with this Federal bureaucracy and engage in an unending process. I think the rural areas will be far better off under grants under the Water Pollution Control Act with 75 percent than they will be under grants with 50 percent under the FMA. Particularly with such small sums available.

It strikes me this might be of interest to the Members. I represent a rural area. Most of my area is rural but I have a few small towns. The largest town in my district is approximately 35,000 population. They are eligible for a 75-percent grant under the Water Pollution Control Act. I would hate to have to explain to the rural citizens in the rest of that county I represent, approximately 45,000, that they could get a grant from FHA at only 50 percent while the city is eligible for a grant at 75 percent under the Water Pollution Control Act.

I think we would have a great deal of difficulty explaining that position yet that is the situation if the veto is overridden, I think the rural areas of America are far better off under the Water Pollution Control Act with 75 percent grants.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the proliferation of programs only encourages waste, duplication, red tape and excessive Federal employment to say nothing of the confusion created in rural areas particularly of which program to apply for.

We now have grants under FHA, HUD, EPA, and loans under FHA and the Rural Development Act.

It would be far more economically efficient and simplified to have these sewer grants consolidated under one program as the administration is seeking to do.

I urge the support of the President's veto, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking today as a window box farmer, as I was referred to by a gentleman from the minority side the other day, but I want to remind my colleagues that this program, very interestingly, passed the House by 297 votes to 54 votes. And it passed the House because the rural water program is crucial for pollution control and health in rural America.

The President's indiscriminate action on January 10 in terminating this program is just one of a series of sudden and arbitrary moves by the administration to cancel out programs which have long benefited rural America. Like his decision to eliminate the Rural Environmental Assistance Act, this action demonstrated the President's benign neglect of rural programs.

Now, if we allow the President's action to stand, there will be no source of grant

funds for rural water systems. The grants provided under the program, administered through the Farmers Home Administration, are specifically oriented toward small towns and communities in rural areas with populations up to 10,000. These communities, in desperate need of water systems, do not have a tax base large enough to support the loans necessary to finance such a system. Without this grant assistance, they could not establish a rural water system.

But the President claims that the funds would be available for these programs under his special revenue sharing plan for rural America.

Now, I ask the Members, how are these small rural towns under 10,000 going to acquire the political muscle or a tax base large enough for them to scramble adequately to come up with a fair share of the funds? And how are these communities going to build sewer systems if they do not have water systems to feed the sewers?

The need for this program is real and urgent. It is essential if small rural communities are to build water systems. For no other program exists that provides money to small towns for water systems.

Construction of these systems is imperative for rural revitalization, environmental protection and water pollution control. Water pollution begins in the rural areas and must be controlled there if we are to clean up our Nation's waterways. It is completely unrealistic to think that these needs can or will be met by revenue sharing funds or by water pollution funds which have already been cut in half by the administration.

It is interesting to note that since 1965, more than 2,650 rural water and waste disposal systems have been assisted with the grant money provided in the rural water-waste program.

I know that on the minority side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, they are making the claim that there are other funds available for the small, rural communities. Yet, I have been informed by the distinguished gentlemen from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), who has a letter from the Department of Agriculture in his State which points out if we do not override the veto of the President, there are no funds whatsoever to take care of the small farmer and the small town dweller.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation, which we passed earlier this year, is absolutely necessary, and I hope that the President's veto will be overridden.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the text of the letter to which I have previously referred.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL AND
ECONOMIC RESOURCES,
Raleigh, April 4, 1973.

Subject: State and Federal Grant Assistance,
Roper, N.C.
Hon. WALTER B. JONES,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JONES: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 15, 1973, and thank you for your interest in the Town of Roper and their efforts to construct adequate wastewater treatment facilities.

As you already know, there has been a considerable decrease in the Federal grant funds

available to assist in the construction of wastewater collection and treatment facilities. The only Federal grant assistance known to be available at the present time is through the Environmental Protection Agency under Public Law 92-500. Although P.L. 92-500 authorizes 75% Federal Grant participation in wastewater treatment works, interceptor sewers and collection sewers, the Environmental Protection Agency has advised that since only 40% of the funds authorized for F.Y. 73 are to be released, priority will be given wastewater treatment facilities and interceptor sewers connected with the treatment works. It appears, therefore, that unless additional funds are made available, it will be some time before EPA will approve grants for collection sewers.

The North Carolina Clean Water Bond Act of 1971 authorized \$50 million for State grants for construction of wastewater treatment plants and interceptor sewers, and \$25 million for State grants for wastewater collection system projects. The \$50 million account is on a Statewide basis and was to be used to provide State matching grants for wastewater treatment works projects approved for Federal grants. The Board of Water and Air Resources on January 18, 1973, adopted a policy under which 12.5% State grants would be authorized for wastewater treatment works projects approved for 75% EPA Federal grants. However, the State's Bond Attorneys have raised a question concerning the validity of issuing bonds to provide State grants for projects which are approved for 75% Federal grants and for which the Federal law does not require a specified State matching grant. An effort is now being made to resolve this issue by legislation authorizing a Statewide referendum on the question of using these funds in the Pollution Control Account designated specifically for matching grants to provide supplemental grants for wastewater treatment works projects approved for 75% Federal grants and for which a State matching grant is not specifically required for the project to qualify for a Federal grant. We believe this question will be satisfactorily resolved. However, until it is, we will be unable to extend State grant offers to wastewater treatment works projects approved for 75% Federal grants.

The \$25 million account for wastewater collection systems is allocated to the counties in the proportion that the population of each county bears to the total population of the State. These funds are available for a period of five years and can only be approved for use by local units of government within the county during this period. Washington County has an allocation of \$69,057 from this account. According to the information provided in your letter and the information in our files, there are insufficient funds allocated to Washington County to provide a 25% State grant for the collection sewers proposed by the Town of Roper. Also, with the present EPA regulations, only the wastewater treatment plant and interceptor sewers could be certified for a 75% Federal grant.

The fact that we cannot certify a State grant for wastewater treatment works projects until the above referred to legal question is resolved, does not preclude the Town from submitting an application for a 75% Federal grant pursuant to P.L. 92-500, and a 25% State grant pursuant to the State Clean Water Bond Act of 1971 for assistance in the construction of a wastewater collection system. However, since Roper's financial condition is such that it cannot provide the required local financing (75% of the cost of the collection system and 25% of the cost of the treatment works) it appears that the Town will have to, in some manner, improve its financial capacity or delay

the project until a supplemental State grant can be made for the wastewater treatment works portion of the project and Federal funds become available to provide a 75% grant for the collection system.

We recognize the Town's needs with respect to a modern sewerage system and will assist the Town officials in every way possible. On the other hand, there is little we can do until sufficient Federal, State, and local funds are available with which to finance the project.

For your information, I am transmitting herewith one copy each of the documents relating to State and Federal grants:

1. Rules and Regulations Governing State Grants For Wastewater Treatment Works, Wastewater Collection Systems, and Water Supply Systems.

2. A Breakdown of the North Carolina Clean Water Grant Fund.

3. Rules and Regulations Governing EPA Federal Grants Under P. L. 92-500.

Thank you for your continued interest in our program. If you have any questions concerning the Town of Roper or other municipalities in your district, please let me know.

Sincerely,

E.C. HUBBARD,
Assistant Director, Office of
Water and Air Resources.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SEBELIUS).

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss the Presidential veto of H.R. 3298, legislation to restore the rural water and waste disposal grant program.

I share the conviction that we must restore commonsense to our Federal spending and hold Federal outlays to the ceiling level of \$250 billion. However, how we "spend" this limited budget is debatable. It is a matter of priorities.

I think it is imperative to project the return on the Federal Government's investment for alternative programs so that we can insure maximum benefit from each taxpayer's dollar.

Funds for the development of rural water and sewer programs are a wise investment that pay for themselves many times over in the economic growth, food production, and tax revenues that are generated by this development.

A recent study by the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service evaluated the impact of a rural water district. The following summary is pertinent in discussing this legislation:

The economic impact of a water district on an area for a five-year period totaled \$1,194,156, or an average increase of \$238,831 per year. This is an average of \$2,462 per household per year for increased land values, home improvements, increased livestock production, and savings from hauling water. Thus, a \$125,000 investment has resulted in an economic impact of 191 percent to the area each year.

In Kansas alone, we have a backlog of 62 water district applications on file that are awaiting funding. These applications come from sparsely populated communities and rural areas whose growth and economic development are limited due to the lack of a reliable supply of useful water. The extremely low ratio of subscribers per mile and the lack of adequate income in these areas makes the availability of grant money a necessity.

before the necessary resources are available to build these projects.

The most obvious limitation on economic growth in these project areas is an artificial ceiling on livestock production since livestock require an abundant supply of good water. The availability of these grant funds and the resultant water district development could stimulate livestock production to help satisfy our Nation's skyrocketing demand for meat at a reasonable cost.

There is no other Federal program to provide grants for rural water district development if funds for this program are not restored through the enactment of H.R. 3298. Hundreds of small communities will be dealt a severe blow if Congress does not override this Presidential veto.

There is authority for the Environmental Protection Agency to provide grant funds for sewer systems. I am concerned that the limited funds available through EPA will be largely devoted to the tremendous water pollution problems in our cities. This would leave the small communities of our country with pollution problems of a similar magnitude per capita with growing intensity and dwindling resources to provide a solution.

There are 23 sewer applications pending in Kansas alone whose limited resources require Federal assistance for construction.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize I do not think this issue is a matter of partisan politics, nor is it an issue involving our obvious need to limit our Federal spending. This issue involves the many small rural communities that are not sharing in this Nation's prosperity and who do not have an adequate supply of water. I submit to you that this program represents an investment rather than a cost and that the resources of our Federal Government must be committed to rural development on an equal basis with the rest of our Nation. In addition, the availability of these funds would indirectly increase livestock production to help alleviate our Nation's meat supply and meat price problem. I urge my colleagues to consider these benefits and the investment potential to all Americans in determining your vote on this legislation.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President in his veto message stated that it was his opinion the legislation before us today raised a grave constitutional issue. I quote from the veto message. The President says:

A grave constitutional question is also raised by H.R. 3298, which purports to mandate the spending of the full amount appropriated by the Congress. The Attorney General has advised me that such a mandate conflicts with the allocation of executive power to the President made by Article II of the Constitution. Thus, H.R. 3298 is objectionable not only in its practical and economic aspects, but on basic legal grounds as well.

Mr. Speaker, repeated requests made to the Departments of Justice and Agricul-

ture for a copy of such an opinion have been unsuccessful.

If such a written opinion exists, the Department of Justice does not acknowledge it. Of course, there may be an oral opinion somewhere. In any case, it would seem that the President in his veto message could have helped the Congress on this point by setting out in detail the legal and constitutional arguments to support his contention that Congress cannot mandate spending.

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that it is not the Congress which is in violation of the Constitution. On the contrary, it is the President's action that seems to be an unconstitutional invasion of the power of the legislative branch in refusing to faithfully execute the laws. It is incumbent upon the President under our Constitution to obey the law.

In article I, section 8, the Constitution makes it clear that only Congress has the power of the purse, the power to tax, and the power to appropriate funds.

The President does not have the right to a line item veto. And most certainly he does not have the right to impound funds when mandatory expenditure is required under the law. His claim to such a right is in reality an attempt to avoid the constitutional prohibition against line item vetoes.

Mr. Speaker, the statement of the President in his veto is even more perplexing when considered in the light of the testimony of his Deputy Attorney General, the Honorable Joseph T. Sneed, in his appearance before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on February 6, 1973, regarding S. 373. In his statement Mr. Sneed said:

This history compels the conclusion that if the Congress wishes to mandate full spending for a particular program, it must do so in unmistakably clear terms.

Obviously, Congress in this legislation does mandate spending in unmistakably clear terms. And the President in vetoing it only underscores this fact.

Interestingly enough, the Deputy Attorney General had in the same statement on February 6 expressed some doubts about whether constitutionally Congress can mandate spending, although he added a caveat that the President had some unusual powers to control spending in the fields of defense and foreign policy.

Any doubts the Deputy Attorney General may have had about the Congress power to mandate spending apparently are now dispelled. Otherwise, why should the President veto the bill?

This is not legislation which involves spending in the defense and foreign policy fields; it involves a congressional mandate to expend the full amount of the money appropriated for the rural water-sewer grant program in unmistakably clear terms.

The only conclusion I can draw from the President's veto is that the President has attempted to defuse this issue by asserting a constitutional provision which heretofore the Department of Justice had so clearly attempted to define differently than is now stated.

If there is such a conflict, a conflict be-

tween the Congress and the President in their rightful powers, it is the President who is failing to exercise his responsibility to faithfully execute the laws. What is involved here is not only the merits of this program but a direct attack by the administration on the power of the Congress to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MIZELL).

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, the baseball season is underway, and I am afraid we are getting a few wild pitches here this afternoon, and I will just for 1 minute see if I cannot get one in the strike zone.

Let us take a look at the issue that is before us this afternoon as it relates to what is really in the best interest of rural America, as well as what is in the best interest of the country.

In 1972 \$42 million was made available for sewer and water programs to rural America; \$26 million of that was in grant money for water systems and \$16 million for sewer systems.

In 1973 the amount was \$30 million; \$20 million again went for water systems and \$10 million for sewer.

I think we would agree this is only a drop in the bucket as to what is really needed in rural America. However, in 1972 and 1973 EPA has made grants of more than \$148 million to small communities of 2,500 or less for sewer planning. This is in the towns, as I said, of 2,500 or less. As can be seen, I do not think there is any question at this point but what the needs for sewer and waste treatment in rural America are being met now in a much greater way than they were prior to the enactment of the Clean Water Act.

I might point out, also, what my colleague from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA), said, namely, that these grants are made in the form of 75-25 matching funds rather than under the old formula.

In regard to the question of rural water systems. The President has said that he will make available \$345 million for loans for this program. In addition to that another \$100 million will be available for loans for sewage systems, for a total of \$445 million available to rural America for water and sewage treatment systems in the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out one further thing, namely, the grant money that has been made available for rural water systems in this country is only a drop in the bucket as to their actual cost. The overwhelming amount of money for the systems have always been from the loan program. Under the President's proposal there is no question but what there will be far more money available for loans for these systems.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I would like to submit that we are talking about \$120 million being restored

this afternoon for that purpose in comparison to \$445 million under the President's proposal.

I would like to point out, also, that if it is grant money that is needed, it is much closer to the statehouse than to Washington, D.C., to get some grant money to apply to the loan funds that would be available.

I also submit that a State government, at this time, is in much better condition financially than the Federal Government is for these purposes. What we are spending in the Federal Government is what is contributing to inflation and placing the dollar in jeopardy on the world markets today.

I hope this body will sustain the President's veto whereby it will be possible for the Congress and the administration to keep their firm commitment to rural America and also bring inflation to a halt.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, our delightful and beloved colleague from North Carolina has just once again demonstrated his prowess as a pitcher. During the first 2 of his 3 minutes I thought I saw that ball coming right straight down the center of the alley as he was extolling the needs of rural America for sewer and water programs, but the ball suddenly broke just as it came toward the plate, and I think it went outside, because I am not sure where it is now.

Admittedly there is another program voted by this House over the President's veto last year to provide grants for municipalities to attend to their sewer needs—not water needs but sewer needs. Yet it is certainly specious today to contend that we are supporting that program by voting down this bill, when that other program, notwithstanding our overriding that Presidential veto, was unilaterally reduced to less than one-half the congressionally authorized level of activity.

Certainly it would be nice for all of these rural communities if they could qualify and get the 75-percent grants authorized by the water pollution bill, but we know that this will not happen. As a result of the arbitrary cuts made by the President in impounding those funds, some 30 of the 50 States have less money this year than they had last year under that program notwithstanding our bold congressional determination to move forward.

This has been a popular program and a helpful and effective program. Since 1966, in 6 years, it has helped some 2,650 communities to solve their water and sewer needs. Today there are 1,865 applications pending. It has helped about 450 communities a year. With 1,865 applications pending, it would take us several years to attempt to meet the already certified needs.

So I suggest to you that if we desire to help rural America, if we are serious about the problems of clean water, the only way we can do it is to override the veto, and thus to reaffirm once again the

high priority that this Congress gives to clean water in the United States.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK).

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the announced goal of the President of the United States to reduce and control inflationary Federal spending. I have in the past upheld the President in his vetoes when I felt that he was doing the right thing for the American people, especially with regard to preventing possible future tax increases. During my 7 years in Congress I have always opposed big-spending, inflationary giveaway programs.

I supported the rural and sewer water bill when it passed the House, and I still believe there is a marked necessity for clean water in rural America. However, to support the veto of the President today raises the question: For whom are we saving the money? The President remains adamantly committed to rebuilding North Vietnam. It just does not make sense to me, or the people I represent, to cut off money to worthwhile domestic programs as "inflationary," just to turn around and give the money to North Vietnam or more than 100 other foreign countries and call it a noninflationary "investment in peace." I intend to cast my people's vote to override the President's veto. At least when our people's tax money is spent in the United States, there is a possibility that it may benefit the original taxpayer.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, based on the 1970 Bureau of Census Report, there were 29,611,000 people living in urban areas that had lived in rural areas at the age of 16. Each decade millions of Americans are attracted to the cities, accelerating the depopulation of the countryside.

Now, when a poor, unskilled, uneducated family pulls up stakes from a farm or a small town, and moves to Little Rock, Memphis, St. Louis, Dallas, or Los Angeles, they need help, and lots of help. They need help to find a job, or they need welfare. Their children need classroom space. They need medical care, housing, police, and fire protection.

Not long after that poor family moves to the city, those of you who are here from urban areas can look for a tax increase.

The moneys for the additional services required by the citizens who left the heartland comes out of the pockets of the average homeowners in Little Rock and Memphis, in increased property taxes.

Mr. Speaker, this program works. It saves money because it provides an incentive for people to stay down on the farm.

To vote against this program is to replace the cost of a water system in the country with a tax increase in the city. That is pennywise and pound-foolish.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that the administration has an alternative plan. In the Wall Street Journal of Friday, April 6, 1973, Mr. Roy Ash, Director of OMB, indicated what this plan was when he stated that it is not "the role of the Federal Government to overcome everybody's error of judgment as to where he lives."

Mr. Ash should be advised of a recent Gallop poll where it was discovered that 65 percent of the urban people would rather live in the country.

Country towns with less than 2,500 people will be written off under the administration's plan. Those towns need grants to help defray the costs of improvements. Mr. Nixon is asking you to treat millions of rural people like unwanted children. I plead with you to open the doors of this House to the small towns of America.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER).

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, abolition of the Farmers Home Administration water and sewer grants was done by the administration stated in an effort to save money.

When Under Secretary of Agriculture Phil Campbell and his assistants testified on this bill to restore the grants, I asked what would be saved by their action, and their reply was \$12 million. They added. Yes, but we are transferring the program over to the Environmental Protection Agency.

Listen to their testimony as they testified before the Committee on Agriculture. I said:

*** you have knocked out \$12 million from the Farmers Home Administration funding. Is that correct?

Yes, sir."

I went further:

And you are now recommending that those who want grants go to EPA where they can get 75 percent grants rather than 50?"

Mr. Campbell replied:

Some of them had been getting 75 percent last year and the year before. This is not new."

I said:

You are really recommending that they get more money only under a different agency?"

Mr. Campbell said:

Yes, under a different agency. That agency has more money, though."

I say, so much for the administration's argument about saving money. It is a subterfuge.

The vote should come on overriding the veto on the question of what is good for the people of this country, and good where they need it—in their own towns and communities—where they need water and sewer grants. The talk of the administration of saving money is refuted by Under Secretary Campbell's testimony.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina hit the nail on the head, as a very practical matter. He put it in different words, but I think the point he was trying to make is the one everybody ought to understand. The question really is: Do you want to get grants that have a long line waiting that may mean that your area or your group will have to stand in line an unbelievably long period of time? That is one alternative.

On the other hand, if you utilize loans under the rural development program, there will be more money available, and your area can get considerable favorable action much more quickly.

It is my judgment that your constituents would be better served by getting a loan more quickly than having a long wait to get a grant.

What are the facts? As the gentleman from North Carolina pointed out in fiscal year 1972 under the rural water and sewer grant program for both water and sewer, there was \$42 million made available. For the same purposes in fiscal year 1973, the current fiscal year, the total for both programs is \$30 million, so for a 24-month period there will be \$72 million made available in grants. Everybody in this Chamber knows that is not nearly enough to supply the legitimate demand, and the consequence is people will be waiting and waiting and waiting to have their needs satisfied.

On the other hand, if we take the rural development program with the money that is promised for the water supply program, \$345 million, and for the sewer program, \$100 million, we have \$445 million available for the help and assistance in water and sewer programs. So we have \$445 million in loans and we have had a history of \$72 million in grants. I think as a practical matter our people would prefer better service more quickly in a loan than a long loan delay in grants. It is just that pragmatic.

Then we can add what EPA has done. As the gentleman from Ohio pointed out, for fiscal year 1973 there is \$2 billion, of which only \$500 million has been obligated, leaving a net unobligated balance for this fiscal year of \$1.5 billion, which we can add to the \$3 billion which is in the President's budget under EPA for a grand total of \$4.5 billion. In effect, under the Clean Water Act these are grants at 75 percent of the total cost.

The question can legitimately be asked, has EPA done anything for communities of 2,500 and less? Here is a list which shows that in the last 15 to 18 months EPA has granted under the 75-percent authority \$148 million. That is a pretty good track record. So what I am really saying to the Members is EPA has a considerable amount of money available under better terms and they have a record to prove that they will cooperate. What more do we want?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. It should be pointed out that \$148 million went to towns of 2,500 or less, so they are taking care of the small towns.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. That is correct. So the rural water and sewer program has not adequately met the problem. For what reason, I do not know. But if we keep all three programs going, the rural development, the EPA, and the rural water and sewer, we have this never ending duplication and proliferation of programs. It is better to have two spigots rather than three, particularly when two have a better track record than the third.

Now what about the overriding issue? I commend the other body for performing a very excellent function in sustaining the veto last week of the vocational rehabilitation program. We have this rural water and sewer program before us today. As I understand the strategy of the leadership on that side of the aisle, we probably have the prospect of anywhere from 12 to 13 more bills in the next few weeks, and if in all of these programs the President will veto the legislation and then the vetoes are overridden, the impact on the Treasury will be substantial. We have to look at the 15, or thereabouts, proposals as a package. If the package is sustained, the Congress will have built a record of fiscal responsibility—at least those who sustain the vetoes. But if the Congress overrides, there is inevitably an extra, unnecessary and undesirable burden on the Federal taxpayer on the one hand or more inflation on the other.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge for the purpose of fiscal responsibility that the House of Representatives stand up today as the Members of the other body did last week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER).

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding. Does it not follow, then, that the Farmers Home Administration sewer grants, which are for only 50 percent, would be less costly than the EPA grants, which are for 75 percent?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I believe that point can be made, except that under the rural development program it is a loan, not a grant, so there is quite a different result as far as Federal fiscal responsibility is concerned.

Mr. MELCHER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I refuse to yield. The gentleman asked a question, and I responded.

If the gentleman wishes more time, he can get it from the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the committee (Mr. POAGE).

Let us reiterate the two points. No. 1, we get better service, more quickly, out of EPA and rural development than we would get out of the rural water and sewer grant program.

No. 2, this bill is just one of a number of spending bills which are coming down the line. The Senate did a good job last week; it is our turn to do an equally good job on this budget busting program

by sustaining the President on the rural water and sewer program.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself my remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, there are two issues involved in our consideration of the President's veto.

The first, is the issue of the constitutional division of powers under our tripartite form of Government. Can any President unappropriate funds—the appropriation of which he has previously approved?

I think it is interesting to note that in his budget message for the current fiscal year, the President said that funds were needed: "To help finance critically needed waste disposal and water supply systems for nearly 500,000 rural families."

Later with obvious pride, he sent a rural development message to Congress in which he told of "administrative steps to improve our rural development programs" and added: "funding for community sewer and water facilities has reached a record high of \$300 million in loans, plus \$42 million in direct grants."

Can any President wipe out a congressionally authorized program—not just withhold money he feels is not needed, but directly wipe out the program without any congressional action just because he has changed his mind?

In his veto message the President speaks of the "resurrection" of the rural water and sewer program. Resurrection indicates that the program must be dead. Who killed it? Certainly not the Congress. And, then he says the program is bad because it would undercut the practice of local financing.

Thus the unilateral termination of the program is not predicated on any claimed budgetary savings, but on the alleged demerits of the program.

I think these issues are fundamental to the very existence of our form of representative Government, but they have been authoritatively discussed by our Speaker.

I now want to pass to the second, albeit rather mundane, question of the practical effect of the President's termination of this program of aid to our rural areas which are trying to provide water and sewer systems.

Although the President later repudiates the whole program of aid for rural water and sewer systems, he begins this message by saying that he asks one simple question: "Would this program justify an increase in taxes in order to pay for it?"

Now this sounds like a noble yardstick, but all of the President's spokesmen have today suggested that they propose to spend even more money but did the administration ask this same question when it asked us to appropriate \$6 billion for revenue sharing which is already proving to be the hoax that many of us predicted it would be.

Did the President use this same yardstick when he officially promised several billion of our tax dollars presumably to build water and sewer and other systems in North Vietnam? Did he use this yardstick when he asked and received tax

money to purchase 17 new helicopters at a cost of \$37 million to replace an existing fleet of 18-month-old copters for his White House staff.

And let us look at the budget he sent us in January. He asked for \$169 million for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries. Will that not require tax money?

This same budget asks for \$153,000,000 for the arts and humanities—an increase of about 80 percent. I have no criticism of either sport fishing or of the arts. I believe that they both contribute to the quality of American life. But I want to suggest that a Federal dollar used for sport fishing or for the arts has exactly the same effect on the need for taxes as a dollar spent on rural sewer systems. The President simply claims the right to determine priorities. This has nothing to do with the total of expenditures.

Actually, for the past 6 years this aid has averaged just about \$40 million per year. Rural communities have paid and obligated themselves for 6½ times as much as the Government has given to these projects—a pretty good record of self-help. But, the President feels that this is denying these rural people the opportunity to enjoy a greater degree of self-reliance. What other groups have such a record of self-reliance?

The gentleman from California tells us and the President tells us that the Environmental Protection Agency can care for any needed help. EPA has no legal authority to grant a dime of aid to rural water systems and of what possible value is a sewer system without water?

No, my friends, the harsh truth is that if we do not restore these funds for rural systems, one-third of the people of the United States are going to continue to make do as best they can. According to the President's own figures, a half million housewives are going to continue to get water from wells, barrels or tanks, and 3 times that number of our citizens are going to wade through mud, rain or snow to an outhouse you and I led them to believe they could abolish.

And what are you going to tell these disillusioned people? Most of you who were here last year for the Latta amendment more than doubling the amount authorized by the committee. The President approved \$300 million for this purpose last summer but by January he had decided that the whole program was bad. Are you going to say that you changed your mind? The need has not changed, or are you going to say that you are one of those fellows who do little if any thinking for yourself and that you are just following instructions?

You and I and the President all supported this program last fall, and it also must have looked pretty good to the people because we were all elected. Most of the new Members are also recorded in favor of this program because about a month ago this House voted 5½ to 1 to restore the program. I do not know what you are going to tell your people, but I am going to tell mine that I continued to vote just like I indicated I was going to vote, and that means to override this veto.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much misunderstanding about what the administration has done to the rural water and sewer program that I think it important that we take the time to establish some basic facts, which I am including in a table for the RECORD:

OBLIGATIONS FOR THE CONSOLIDATED FARM AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT, 1966-72

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Loans	Grants	Loans as percent of total
Water.....	\$961.5	\$117.8	89
Sewer.....	356.7	94.7	79
Total....	1,318.2	212.5	86

I hope my colleagues realize that water loans will be continued next year, which means that 73 percent of program outlays are not even affected by the administration's action of January 10. So from the start let us not pretend that the administration has engaged in indiscriminate program termination, for it has done nothing of the sort. The issue is not congressional power versus Presidential power: It is how we can best meet the water and sewer system needs of rural America.

This table also shows how small the amounts of water grants have been, and suggests—as I hope to show—that revenue-sharing funding will easily replace funds lost through termination of this program.

Finally, it indicates the minuscule amounts of sewer grant and loan money which we are talking about. I will shortly provide figures to demonstrate that far more money has been reaching rural communities through EPA than has ever been distributed through FHA, and that the tremendous boost in EPA funding voted in last year will result in more money reaching rural areas.

WATER LOANS

Water loans are continuing to be made now, and will be increased next year under the rural development insurance fund, created last year. These loans were formerly made under the agricultural credit insurance fund, and totaled \$200 million in fiscal year 1972. Next year, loan obligations will increase 70 percent above 1972 levels. Surely on this score, the administration has not been derelict in its aid of rural communities.

WATER GRANTS

Water grants—which last year were only \$22 million—have been discontinued. This is for two very good reasons:

First, this year there will be \$6.8 billion in new outlays under revenue sharing which did not exist last year.

Now I am not saying that all this money is available for water systems construction—it certainly is not—but I am saying that it is a potential source of funds if needs are great enough. Remember, at the time the water and sewer grant program was terminated, only \$253 million in potential loan and grant

applications were on hand: this is less than 4 percent of total revenue sharing money available this year. Here again, the objective is sound. No longer will water systems be guaranteed a certain amount of funding. Instead, States and communities will have to weigh the need for such systems against the need for schools, hospitals and other vital community facilities. Then if it is decided that water systems are top priority, revenue sharing funds can be used to build them. To me it would be a gross inequity to leave a hospital unbuilt simply because Uncle Sam did not have enough funds to donate under revenue sharing due to the amounts of money going into special interest group type programs such as rural water and sewer grants. If there is a need, let it compete with other needs: there should be no reason to be afraid of letting it stand up against other claims of society. It is precisely because there is so much screaming about the termination of this program that I suspect that this program isn't really meeting crucial needs, and that advocates of the program's continuation simply want a guarantee that they still can have the whole pie while others go hungry. Many communities in my own State who had grant applications pending on January 10 simply switched to loans and will build their systems without grant aid. I cannot fault these communities for having applied for the grants: the money was there, so why not take advantage of it? However, I think that we in Congress have a responsibility to ourselves and to the people that we represent to see that this type of giveaway philosophy does not get out of hand. A vote to sustain the President's action would be a solid step towards a crackdown on giveaways.

For those who scoff at the idea that revenue sharing could possibly cover the costs of the water systems needed, I include a chart here to show that indeed revenue sharing is adequate to the task:

WATER GRANT APPLICATIONS ON HAND AS OF JAN. 10, 1973, AND FISCAL YEAR 1973 REVENUE-SHARING FUNDS FOR ILLINOIS COUNTIES

	Water grants	Revenue sharing	Percent
Bond.....	\$100,000	\$276,874	277
Bureau.....	35,000	800,184	1,143
Dewitt.....	38,000	393,680	1,036
Franklin.....	144,408	951,932	659
Gallatin.....	246,000	168,274	68
Henderson.....	77,000	181,344	235
Sangamon.....	215,000	2,304,238	1,071
Washington.....	80,000	272,270	340
Woodford.....	30,000	551,140	184
Illinois total.....	965,408	5,899,926	611

Aside from the fact that there is plenty of revenue-sharing money which can be tapped for water systems construction, it also turns out that many of the communities which have applied for grants have been able to finance projects on their own anyway. Fully half the applicants whose requests for grants were denied went ahead and built their water projects anyway, which sounds to me like applications were being made because the money was there, not necessarily because there was a dire need. It seems reasonable to assume that if the need is

great enough, revenue-sharing money can do the job.

SEWER GRANTS AND LOANS

Sewer loans for this year will continue at normal levels, but no new authority for sewer loans is requested in fiscal year 1974. Sewer grants are being terminated completely, but these grants amounted to only 6 percent of all outlays under the rural sewer and water program anyway. Total sewer grants and loans for fiscal year 1972 were less than \$125 million, yet EPA has received \$5 billion more in budget authority this year than it had in fiscal year 1972, for identical sewer construction grants. True, the President has specifically ordered that the full amount of funds not be spent, but his own estimate of reasonable outlays in the budget demonstrate that in fiscal year 1974, EPA will spend nearly four times the amount it spent in fiscal year 1972 on construction of waste treatment plants. All told, EPA expects to have outlays in this area of \$1.6 billion next year—over 12 times the amount of money being taken out of the FHA sewer grant and loan program. Certainly this is adequate to meet needs far into the future.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who fear that despite these massive amounts of funds for EPA construction activity, somehow the rural communities will not get their fair share of money due to lack of political power. Statistics show otherwise.

The first chart shown here compares FHA fiscal year 1972 grants and fiscal year 1972 EPA grants, for select States which have notably large amounts of rural residents. It demonstrates that not only has the FHA grant and loan program been minuscule in the past compared to amounts given under EPA, but that in fiscal year 1974 States are receiving a huge increase in EPA funds which will far more than offset the effect of terminating the sewer grant and loan program:

COMPARISON OF FHA GRANTS AND LOANS WITH EPA WASTE WATER TREATMENT CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

[In thousands]

State	Fiscal year 1972 FHA sewer grants plus loans	Fiscal year 1972 EPA sewer grants
Alabama	0	\$33,700
Arkansas	\$463.0	19,500
South Dakota	113.5	7,300
Iowa	1,644.9	27,600
Pennsylvania	1,202.0	112,400
New York	11,886.0	172,900

Mr. Speaker, there are those who will say that it does not matter what States receive in the aggregate, for rural communities will be systematically excluded from participation in the EPA program due to their lack of political power. I have read this claim many times, yet never have seen the statistics to substantiate it. My own findings indicate quite the opposite: that for some reason, towns with less than 10,000 population—which are the only ones eligible for grants and loans from FHA—have received a disproportionately large share of EPA funds in the past, and may be reasonably expected to do so in the

future. The chart below illustrates my point:

PROPORTION OF EPA SEWAGE CONSTRUCTION GRANTS RECEIVED BY PLACES UNDER 10,000 POPULATION COMPARED TO PROPORTION OF PLACES UNDER 10,000 POPULATION WITHIN STATE

State	Percent of total fiscal year 1972 EPA sewage construction grants going to places less than 10,000 population	Population in places less than 10,000 population as percent of total State population	Ratio
	10,000 population	total State population	
Alabama	22.5	19.7	1.14
Arkansas	39.0	24.8	1.57
South Dakota	92.0	32.5	2.83
Iowa	55.5	31.9	1.73
Pennsylvania	55.0	21.4	2.57
New York	30.0	11.0	2.72

I hope these tables alleviate the fears of those who believe that money for sewage construction will dry up without the rural water and waste disposal program. It is ironic that in heavily urbanized States such as New York and Pennsylvania, rural populations in towns less than 10,000 population are receiving over two and one-half times the amount of EPA money that they would receive if such funds were distributed evenly on a per capita basis. Lack of political power certainly does not seem to be the problem it is assumed to be.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have adequately demonstrated three simple points. First, that 73 percent of outlays under the rural water and waste disposal program were not even affected by the President's action, and will continue as normal. Second, that six times as much money has gone into EPA grants as has been distributed by FHA for comparable programs now facing termination, and only 4 percent of revenue sharing money would be used up to meet all the loan applications on hand when the program was terminated. Finally, that not only will significantly more funds be available for water and waste disposal purposes in the aggregate, but that past history indicates that rural communities will get at least, if not more than their fair share within each State; so that there is no need to continue a program designed specifically for rural populations. Stripped of rhetoric and distortions of fact, our debate rests on one issue: Will Congress side with the President in his efforts to control inflation and reduce spending by eliminating wasteful or duplicative programs, or will it stubbornly resist the President for the sake of making political hay? I hope my colleagues join me in taking the former responsible course of action rather than the latter.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this effort to override the veto by which the administration seeks to terminate the rural water and sewer grant program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act.

Currently, 21 communities in the State of Maine have applications on file seeking assistance under this program. The total amount of funds necessary to fund these applications amounts to more than \$6 million. There are, of course, scores of other communities which will require

future assistance such as the Poage-Aiken Act has been providing for more than 6 years.

The President's veto, if sustained, will without question force Maine citizens in these communities to pay increased taxes or charges for water and sewer use. I do not for a moment believe that these communities will be able to find grant assistance available under other programs. For instance, when I wrote to the President last January protesting termination of the program, I was advised that communities could seek sewer funds from the Environmental Protection Agency, or spend revenue-sharing funds for this purpose. Both these suggestions are completely unrealistic. The urgent need for municipal treatment plants and the impounding of funds under the 1972 Water Pollution Control Act preclude, at least in Maine, the spending of EPA funds for sewer construction. Use of revenue-sharing funds is simply out of the question for small communities—the funds are totally insufficient for major capital investment.

Unless we again act to restore the rural water and waste disposal program, as we did on March 1 of this year, we will in effect be telling these towns that they must borrow all of the funds needed for sewer construction. This is going to be a severe burden on the municipalities and utility districts, and precisely the burden Congress sought to alleviate with passage of the Poage-Aiken Act in 1965.

For the past several years, Congress has wisely sought to pass measures designed to limit the migration of Americans from rural to urban areas. Our urban areas now require increased attention and Federal capital expenditures for circumferential highways, mass transit, and pollution treatment plants, to name only a few areas in which Federal grant funds are provided. If we deny grants to our smaller communities for sewer construction, we will be joining with the administration in contributing to the neglect of rural America, and we will be losing faith with our rural citizens who had been given reason to believe that our national Government would be willing to help their communities provide for a cleaner environment.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 3298, an act to restore the rural water and sewer grant program. My vote is not a vote against rural and small communities who have a need for water and sewer development and improvements. My vote is for fiscal responsibility and against duplication and against a tax increase.

To sustain the President's veto does not mean the end of Federal participation in water and sewer programs in our rural areas. On the contrary, the administration has pledged to use its authority under the Rural Development Act to provide qualified rural communities with loans not only for water facilities but also for the development of sewage facilities.

These loans for sewer services will be available in fiscal years 1973 and 1974. This step, incidentally, can be taken at

less cost to the taxpayer than required by H.R. 3298.

It should also be pointed out that a portion of the \$5 billion in grants for waste disposal facilities funded through the Environmental Protection Agency during fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974 is available to small towns.

Rural development statutes currently authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants and loans for water and waste disposal systems and grants for comprehensive area long-range water and sewer planning.

Mr. Speaker, I have been and continue to be a staunch supporter of rural and small town development. One of the greatest threats to small town America, and to every American, is runaway Federal spending and inflation.

It is time to set aside partisan politics; it is time to work together to get control of the Federal budget, control inflation, and avoid the necessity of a tax increase of any size.

There are those who believe that by sustaining this presidential veto we will harm rural development in America. Let me tell you that there is pending legislation, H.R. 6168, that goes far beyond the request of this administration, and provides for a roll back of food prices to where they were 1 year ago and freeze all other prices at this year's level. The passage of this legislation, in my opinion, will wreak more havoc upon rural and small town America than sustaining the veto of the President on the Rural Water and Waste Disposal Act.

Mr. HUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to override President Nixon's veto of H.R. 3298, a bill to restore the rural water and sewer grant program. As I stated on March 1, when H.R. 3298 was before the House originally, this legislation is an assault not only on the President's efforts to control expenditures, but also on his attempts to provide better methods of delivering services to those who need them.

The rural water and sewer program, which was launched 8 years ago, has forced the taxpayers to pay for services that should be financed locally. The program was terminated by President Nixon on January 1, 1973, as part of his determined effort to combat inflation and hold down taxes. I agree with the President that it would be a disservice to the taxpayers of this country to revive the program.

Experience under this program has shown that water and sewer grants have been distributed in a scatter-shot fashion. Many rural communities, although qualified under the program, have built their own water and sewage systems without waiting for Federal help. They need no incentive from Washington. Yet, in other cases, the water and sewer grants actually delay construction, as communities which ordinarily finance the facilities on their own, choose instead to wait in line for Federal subsidies. The result has been a very uneven pattern of distribution.

Furthermore, for those communities which need help in construction of such facilities, there are alternative methods

of Federal financial help available. For example, the fiscal 1974 budget provides \$345 billion in rural development aid loan funds for water supply systems in rural areas which will help local communities borrow at favorable interest rates. In addition, the Environmental Protection Agency has \$5 billion to use for grants for waste disposal facilities in fiscal years 1973 and 1974. Taken together, the loan and grant programs already available should provide sufficient Federal support to those communities which critically need water and sewage systems without shattering the limits of sound fiscal policy.

In my view, this is one instance where we can vote for fiscal restraint and a more conservative stewardship of the dollars supplied by hardworking taxpayers. I believe this is what a great majority of the American people want us to do. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 3298.

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, some of the debate, on the floor of this great House, has caused me considerable distress. H.R. 3298, an act to restore the rural water and sewer grant program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, was supposed to have been the subject of the debate. However, there was very little discussion on rural water and sewer systems.

It seems that the real subject of the debate was a fight between the Congress and the administration. H.R. 3298 seemed to be only a vehicle or weapon to fight with, rather than a serious subject to be decided upon according to merit.

I feel that this type of debate is a disservice to our country. Honorable men can have honest differences of opinions. Such differences should not be twisted and distorted into ominous and misleading accusations against the other man's intentions and integrity.

I will cast my vote to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 3298. That vote was cast solely on the basis of the merits of the bill, not on the immaterial arguments heard on the floor of the House.

The problem that H.R. 3298 was attempting to solve was rural water and sewer system needs. Therefore, I felt that the obvious questions to be faced were: First. Do we actually have a need for rural water and sewer systems? Second. If so, how is the best way to provide these systems?

After careful consideration, I found that, yes, there is a need for these systems. H.R. 3298 had recognized that need. However, the second question—how best to fulfill the need—was what prompted me to vote to sustain the veto.

My study revealed that there exist two different means of satisfying rural water and sewer needs. One would have been through the provisions of H.R. 328, the other would be through the Clean Water Act, which was passed earlier by the Congress.

Further study revealed to me that the Clean Water Act was really the best answer. For one thing, the Clean Water Act is administered by the Environmental Protection Agency—EPA—which

is an independent agency dedicated only to cleaning up the air and water in our Nation—systematically with logical planning.

EPA coordinates its grants according to need with careful planning by State and local bodies. This feature is not included in the grants under H.R. 3298. In other words, there is a supervised system—with controls at the State and local level—built into the EPA plan.

Another desirable feature, found in the EPA plan, is the assistance to those small communities that do not have sufficient tax base to raise capital for sewer and water systems. Under EPA, a small community can get a 75 percent grant, whereas under the provisions of H.R. 3298 it would have to ante up 50 percent of the cost of construction. A protection factor in the EPA plan—approved by State and local agencies—would assure that only those communities with real need would be certified for the 75 percent grants.

While I realize that my vote on this matter could be rather unpopular with members of my party, I do not feel that this is a partisan issue. As I stated in the beginning, this is not a vote either for or against the President, it is a vote—based on merit—against a system of providing rural water and sewer systems, where a more desirable system exists.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I concur with my colleagues who object to H.R. 3298 on the grounds that it is another one of those programs which, if we let it continue, makes it impossible to obtain a proper relationship between spending and taxes. I concur that fiscal responsibility at this point in time is the No. 1 objective of the Nation if we are to avoid higher taxes, more inflation, or both.

I would like to make the point further that providing grants for all water and sewer systems simply is not an appropriate use of Federal tax dollars. Providing most local water and sewer systems is a responsibility of local governments, just as is providing police and fire protection. These systems benefit almost exclusively the persons and businesses directly served by them. Therefore providing these facilities is the responsibility of the people benefited. Most communities accept this responsibility and go ahead and provide these facilities for themselves. So it seems unfair that those who accept this local responsibility have to pay for facilities for those who do not.

In doing some research on this bill I learned that the very existence of a Federal water and sewer grant program may delay the construction of these facilities. The reason is that some localities which otherwise would finance the costs on their own, instead choose to wait in line for a Federal grant. Another pertinent fact is that more than half of the grant applicants which are turned down go ahead and proceed with the project themselves.

And again I make the point that the average taxpayer gets hit with a double burden under this legislation. Not only must that average taxpayer pay his share of the water and sewer facilities to service his own needs, he must turn around and pay part of the cost through his

Federal taxes of facilities of someone else. This is particularly onerous to people as they approach the April 15 Federal income tax filing deadline.

As if these reasons were not compelling enough to vote to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 3298 I would like to point out that this program duplicates other Federal grant programs. Environmental Protection Agency grants for waste disposal facilities in urban and rural areas total \$2 billion for fiscal year 1973 and \$3 billion for fiscal year 1974. While waste treatment has a high priority, the States still have a dominant role in selecting projects for funding under the EPA program. And President Nixon pointed out Thursday that if his veto is sustained, he will use his authority under the Rural Development Act to provide qualified rural communities with loans for sewer systems and water systems. He said he will—and I quote—"provide qualified rural communities with loans not only for water facilities but also for the development of sewage facilities. These loans for sewer services will be available in fiscal years 1973 and 1974. This step—taken at a fraction of the cost to the taxpayer required by H.R. 3298—will permit qualified small communities to compete for credit on reasonable terms." Termination of this program is in keeping with the philosophy which is gaining in popularity of moving away from narrow categorical grants with their associated Federal decisionmaking toward moving the decisionmaking to the State and local level.

It is for these reasons that I urge you to vote to sustain the veto on H.R. 3298.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, today Members of the House of Representatives have an opportunity to stand up and be counted on the subject of fiscal responsibility. I intend to vote to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 3298, and I hope that considerably more than one-third of my colleagues will do likewise.

H.R. 3298 is another in a seemingly unending series of bills through which this Congress, with the noblest of intentions, attempts to solve every problem at least twice by burying it under a deluge of money. The bill mandates spending. Any bill which forces spending of a certain sum, whether the spending is needed or not, and whether the projects are ready or not, should be immediately suspect.

In the second place, the bill duplicates programs in operation in other agencies of government. For instance, under the Clean Water Act, the Environmental Protection Agency has authority to fund waste disposal facilities. In fact, with a State cost sharing, the EPA can fund up to 75 percent of a facility, while the FHA can only fund 50 percent.

In addition, the Rural Development Act, a priority in the President's budget for fiscal 1974, provides \$345 million in loan funds for water supply systems in rural areas.

In my own State, a couple of years ago, a rural community built a sewer system. For that system it received grants from the old FWPCA, HUD, FHA, EDA, and the Regional Development Commission.

A vote to sustain the President's veto

today is a vote to begin the end of that kind of grantmanship and administrative overlap. It is also a vote against mandated spending, even when such spending is duplicate spending.

Fiscal sanity does not require a slavish adherence to the President's budget. It does require that when the President is right, and when he vetoes unworthy bills, his judgment be upheld.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, today the House is faced with its first vote on a Presidential veto this year. There are those who are predicting that we will be in this situation on many occasions this year. Mr. Speaker, I truly hope that will not be the case. As I have stated here before in recent weeks, it is my hope that Congress and the President will be able to resolve their differences prior to the confrontation atmosphere provoked by vetoes.

For those of us seeking to find that middle ground so badly needed to insure the ongoing nature of a Federal commitment in a number of areas, the present situation is most difficult. The decision thrust upon us, today, is a good example.

When the bill, H.R. 3298, was considered on this floor on March 1, I stated my opposition to its enactment. My position has not changed and so, today, I will vote to sustain the President's veto. But the decision, both on the bill originally, and now the veto, was not necessarily one that was easily made.

Obviously, the objective of the Farmers Home Administration water and sewer grant program is laudable. Smaller communities may, indeed, need some type of assistance to improve the quality of their water and to insure the proper treatment of their waste. But the question one must not forget to ask is whether or not this particular program is the most appropriate or equitable vehicle to meet those objectives.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have always harbored some reservations about both the Farmers Home Administration grant program for water and sewer systems, and the similar program for larger cities administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The provision of local water and sewer systems was traditionally regarded, and with some legitimacy can still be regarded as a local responsibility. It was with the best of intentions that we ventured, several years ago, to lift through these Federal aid programs some portion of that local burden. But it is probably true that, given the other demands on the Federal Treasury, there simply were not enough Federal dollars available to meet the resulting demand. Hence, we unintentionally have slowed local initiative—where it might otherwise have been applied—and have struggled along with two programs where there was not the equity one would hope to find in the dispersal of Federal funds.

But what is particularly disconcerting in the legislation now before us is the fact that future spending on the water and sewer grant program administered by the Farmers Home Administration would be mandatory. From what I can ascertain, no searching analysis of the

program was made by the appropriate committees before reporting the bill before us. No compelling rationale for its continued and unchanged existence has been provided, except for the fact that the President has terminated the program and, come hell or high water, Congress is going to force him to reinstitute it. We do have a responsibility to provide a more defensible rationale for our action than this, Mr. Speaker.

When discussing the merits of H.R. 3298 on March 1, I stated:

I would be something considerably less than a proper Representative of the many communities of less than 10,000 population in my district if I did not try to help them meet their needs.

For that reason, I am gratified that the President has made clear that there will be at least \$100 million available for loans to such communities for water and sewer projects in the next fiscal year. In addition, I have been assured that the Farmers Home Administration will continue to administer the old program, eliminating any possibility that the communities with applications pending would have to refile, or begin their work all over again with another agency. Applications from communities—and there are seven from my own congressional district—will be processed along the same lines as was the case before the program termination.

The availability of the loan funds under the Rural Development Act will here provide the transition period we still are seeking in many other areas. This also, I believe, will protect the interests of the communities who earlier, in good faith, undertook projects under the existing program.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible to enumerate in more detail the problems with this program—the fact that its benefits were often unrelated to need—that it does duplicate—that it does distort local priorities—and so on. But what is of concern to me, in a somewhat broader perspective, is the congressional response.

It is my earnest hope that the vetoed bill before us today is not the forerunner of a host of other bills similar to it. For, if our response to Presidential program terminations and cutbacks is simply to attempt to force the President to spend on those same programs, we will, in no uncertain terms, have abdicated much of our own responsibility. I assume, as I believe we all should, that the President has not taken these actions lightly, or without—at least in his mind—good cause. Instead of a "knee-jerk" reaction, typified in the bill before us now, we should undertake a reasoned and comprehensive re-evaluation of the programs in question and, in a timely and serious manner, determine our response. That has not been the case to date, and certainly is not the case with regard to H.R. 3298, the vetoed bill.

It is true that I do have my own differences with the President over certain of his choice of priorities, and have been dismayed by the abruptness with which he has moved to slow down or terminate certain programs. Nevertheless, my own response has been that of first attempting to obtain assurances of a reasonable

transitional arrangement which, I believe, is the case here, and then attempting to persuade the responsible Members and committees of the Congress to begin work on the pertinent legislative proposals made by the President, working out as best we can the differences that exist, but in a climate of harmony and not confrontation. This pending legislation was designed for confrontation. It is the kind of action that, for the good of the Nation, we cannot afford. It is my hope that the veto will be sustained, so that we can go on to attempt to find more constructive and positive responses in the Congress to the challenges we all face.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, during the past 7 years, under the terms of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act of 1965—CFRDA—the Department of Agriculture's Farmers Home Administration has made approximately 8,500 loans totaling \$1.6 billion and 3,363 grants totaling \$240 million to assist an estimated 1,250,000 families in obtaining desperately needed water and waste facilities. Yet, although the Administration admits "that the need for water and waste disposal grants in rural areas is great," the program was unilaterally terminated on January 10 by a Department of Agriculture fiat, leaving 1,685 applications for Federal aid amounting to some \$253 million unacted upon.

Similarly, when Congress demonstrated its extreme displeasure with this action by overwhelmingly approving H.R. 3298 which amends CFRDA to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants and loans in the amounts specified in appropriation acts, Mr. Nixon, on April 5, vetoed the bill claiming that the mandatory spending language within the measure conflicts with the constitutional allocation of executive power to the President. Moreover, Mr. Nixon added that programs such as rural development loan funds for water systems and the Environmental Protection Agency's sewerage grant program will be capable of compensating for the loss of CFRDA money. However, these claims are simply not true.

To begin with, article II, section 3, of the Constitution requires the President to faithfully execute all laws, not just the ones he supports. The practice of selectively withholding funds—impoundment—employed by Mr. Nixon is, in effect, an item veto, which is not sanctioned by the Constitution. By refusing to spend duly appropriated money, the President is illegally usurping congressional legislative responsibility.

In addition, fiscal 1974's budget proposes \$345 million for Rural Development Act loans only, not the 50-percent grants needed by poor rural communities to build water systems. Furthermore, EPA grants for construction of sewer facilities are useless to many rural towns who do not have water systems to feed the sewers.

Clearly, the continuance of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is essential if rural communities with populations of less than 10,000 people are to build water systems. Mr. Nixon's

veto is a regressive and unwarranted action which will have a severe impact upon small towns and villages attempting to make an honest effort to effectively deal with their pollution problem and therefore assure the health of rural America.

Congress should and must save the water and waste grant program. By overriding Mr. Nixon's veto, this goal would be achieved.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the motto of so many rulers, "Divide and Conquer," is surely the motto of this administration. One of the deep divisions now being fostered is that between city and country dwellers. At every opportunity it is made to appear that the interests of urban and rural people are irreconcilably at odds. In current issues such as inflated prices, the farmer is pitted against the consumer.

On transportation, water resources and other issues, the same thing is happening. City people are made to feel that rural water supplies and sewage problems are of no concern to them; country people are not supposed to care whether cities stifle in their own smog.

Obviously this is nonsense. In today's world we are interdependent; people and supplies move back and forth so rapidly that what happens in San Francisco or in Iowa concerns us in New York, and vice versa.

Therefore I am very much concerned when the President vetoes a bill that the Congress has passed to help rural dwellers solve their problems. I think they deserve our help, just as I think the people of New York City deserve the help of this House in securing mass transportation funds and other people-aiding programs.

I am going to vote to override this veto and I hope that my colleagues from rural areas will remember, when other bills reach the floor, that pollution, hunger, the need for child care, the need for economic opportunity, and the need for housing know no boundaries.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the President's veto in the overriding interest of combating inflation and higher taxes. At the same time, I want to urge my colleagues to consider an alternative to the vetoed program and set about the job of putting our own house in order when it comes to controlling spending.

Some of my colleagues have criticized the Farmers Home Administration program on a number of grounds. I do not share those criticisms. The rural water and sewer program is an effective response to real needs in our hard-pressed smaller communities.

The real issue is inflation. The real issue is a tax increase. It is one matter to vote for a single bill individually on its merits, as I voted for this bill in the past. But when the President is faced with a dozen or so bills which combine to bust the budget, it's an entirely different issue.

It has been argued that the Environmental Protection Agency's 75-percent grants for sewage treatment are preferable to FHA's 50-50 matching program, and that water system needs can be met by loans. I would reply that some smaller communities are likely to be bypassed

in State allocation of EPA waste treatment grants, while many have not a prayer of meeting their water needs solely through loans.

Accordingly, I urge colleagues to consider legislative provisions to assure that smaller communities get fair consideration in setting of State priorities, and to broaden EPA's grant programs to include smalltown water systems.

I recognize that the administration has been criticized for veto action as disregarding the needs of the people. It is time for Congress to stop scoring political cheap shots by belaboring the administration for "cash-register" mentality and set about the tough job of putting its own house in order.

There is an urgent need to establish a mechanism to set an overall spending limit and set priorities among conflicting demands so as to live within that limit. This would make it possible to weigh our actions in terms of their economic impact: inflation or higher taxes.

The steering committee of the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control has under consideration such a mechanism. But I find it ironic that such a long overdue measure should—after all the furor over impoundment, vetoes and talk of constitutional confrontation between Congress and the White House—still remain in the study stage.

It is my hope that we will sustain the President's veto and maintain the pressure on this body to move ahead with spending reforms so that the Congress itself regains the power of decisionmaking over these vital areas of public policy.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 3298, the act to restore the rural water and sewer grant programs.

My vote to override is not made in a partisan spirit. It is not cast in a spirit of confrontation. My vote to override is predicated in the sincere belief that we should perpetuate a program proven to be of greater benefit to our rural areas than any other single program of comparable cost. One has only to observe the sharp contrasts between a county which enjoys the benefits of a rural water system and one that does not. One literally blossoms with verdant bounty that comes from an adequate supply of fresh pure water. The other frequently has no water except by hauling it at almost prohibitive expense. The latter continues to suffer from the economic loss that comes with each dry summer.

There are really two foremost reasons why I vote to override the veto:

First. The presence of rural water districts and waste disposal plants in our small communities makes the difference between comfortable, attractive rural living and the old styles of rural life which, in the past, have been the cause of the out-migration of millions from the farmlands of America to our already overcrowded metropolitan areas.

Second. At issue here is the principle of constitutional prerogatives and the matter of who shall establish spending priorities. Bear in mind, that from all the propaganda advanced by the White House in favor of sustaining this veto, there has never been a word said that it would avoid a deficit. As a matter of

fact, the President quite frankly and openly agrees that the deficit will be about \$24 billion for fiscal year 1973 and about \$13 billion for fiscal year 1974—or a total of about 37 billion. This is an administration assertion, not mine. But what is disturbing is that the White House insists that within the framework of this deficit it alone shall retain the sole prerogative to select priorities. This proposal I reject.

The real facts are that with a conceded deficit of \$37 billion for this and next year all that Congress is seeking to do today is to assert the right to say what use is made of the total of \$300 million of that deficit over a period of not 1 year, or 2 years, but for a period of 3 years—or just about \$100 million a year for these worthwhile rural program. That in perspective is the sole issue. How can it be fiscal irresponsibility for the Congress to establish this one single priority no larger than this \$100,000,000 a year? Is not it rather irresponsible for the President to say that he and he alone has the sole right to determine all priorities when it is agreed there will be a \$37 billion deficit?

Put in different words, the White House insists that it set all priorities and leave none for the Congress. The argument is that the White House should assume the power to legislate.

Mr. Speaker, last fall the President was fully convinced that the continuation of these water and sewer grant programs was worthwhile. We passed the same bill last year. There were no questions by our Chief Executive at that time on the merits of the legislation. It was promptly signed into law. The President bestowed some lofty words of high praise in sharp contrast with the words used in the veto message delivered on April 5. Last fall he called the program praiseworthy. It was one that would help the people. It was a program that was clearly needed. The most flowery language of all was that this program would help not only this generation but many generations yet to come.

In the veto message, from the same source, the White House, less than 6 months later, there is a different refrain. Now the program is identified as a program that should be reformed because it had failed its test. In the veto message, it was called a program that would be a disservice to the taxpayers and undercut the tradition of local authority rather than Federal direction. By April 5 this program was said to be for only a small group of people for their own private benefit. Think of that. Moreover it would make the majority of taxpayers pay double taxes. My goodness. Surely the Harvard lawyers and the public relations experts must have worked hard on this language. But it is language that will not wash because everyone knows there is no private advantage. These are public water supply districts and public sewer districts. They are subdivisions of the State, just as much as a school district or a township or a municipality. And where these word hucksters got the idea of double taxation is impossible to comprehend.

But the really low blow in the veto message is the suggestion that, "the pro-

gram has attained a distinct flavor of pork barrel." Why even a student in high school knows that the expression pork barrel carries the overtone of something that is costly with a slight or no benefit. The truth of the matter is that there has never been a rural water district funded that has not had an excellent cost-benefit ratio and moreover there has never been a rural water or sewer district constructed that has not resulted in a tremendous increase property values within the district and in areas adjacent to the district.

Finally, one of the most difficult things to understand about this veto is the fact that the President strongly endorsed the revitalization and development of the rural areas. Last year this rural redevelopment theme was one of the highest national priorities. It must have been a good one. He was elected. The Congress was elected. The people must have liked this as a priority. Now we all have a right to question whether the President really meant what he said when he espoused that one of his greatest goals was to make rural life attractive. Notwithstanding, for many of us it will continue to be a goal and the only way we can attract and hold job-creating industry to meet this goal of rural revitalization is by adequate water and sewer systems. To continue the pursuit of rural revitalization is reason enough to override this veto.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, do I correctly understand that under the wording of the question a "no" vote is a vote to sustain the President's veto?

The SPEAKER. A vote of "yea" is a vote for the bill; a vote of "no" is a vote against the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 189, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—225

Abdnor	Boggs	Clark	Derwinski	Jarman
Abzug	Bolling	Clay	Devine	Johnson, Colo.
Adams	Bowen	Cohen	Dickinson	Johnson, Pa.
Addabbo	Brademas	Conyers	Dorn	Jones, Okla.
Alexander	Brasco	Corman	Duncan	Keating
Anderson,	Breaux	Cotter	du Pont	Kemp
Calif.	Breckinridge	Culver	Edwards, Ala.	Kuykendall
Andrews, N.C.	Brinkley	Daniels,	Erlenborn	Landgrebe
N. Dak.	Brooks	Dominick V.	Esch	Landrum
Annunzio	Brown, Calif.	Danielson	Findley	Lent
Ashley	Burke, Mass.	Davis, Ga.	Flynt	Lott
Aspin	Burleson, Tex.	Davis, S.C.	Ford, Gerald R.	Lujan
Badillo	Burlison, Mo.	de la Garza	Forsythe	McClory
Barrett	Burton	Delaney	Frelinghuysen	McCloskey
Bergland	Camp	Dellenback	Frenzel	McCollister
Bevill	Carey, N.Y.	Dellums	Frey	McDade
Biaggi	Carney, Ohio	Denholm	Froehlich	McKinney
Bingham	Carter	Dent	Giaimo	Madigan
Blatnik	Casey, Tex.	Dingell	Gilman	Mailiard
	Chisholm	Donohue	Goodling	Mallary
			Green, Oreg.	Mann
			Griffiths	Maraziti
			Gross	Martin, Nebr.
			Grover	Martin, N.C.
			Gubser	Mathias, Calif.
			Gude	Mayne
			Guyer	Mazzoli
			Haley	Michel
			Clancy	Milford
			Clausen,	Hammer-
			Don H.	schmidt
			Clawson, Del	Hanrahan
			Cleveland	Mills, Ark.
			Cochran	Harsha
			Collier	Mills, Md.
			Collins	Minshall, Ohio
			Conable	Mitchell, N.Y.
			Conlan	Mizell
			Conte	Montgomery
			Coughlin	Moorhead,
			Crane	Calif.
			Cronin	Mosher
			Daniel, Dan	Nelsen
			Daniel, Robert	O'Brien
			W., Jr.	Parris
			Davis, Wis.	Passman
			Dennis	Peyser
			Dennis	Powell, Ohio
			Ichord	Pritchard

Quile	Spence	Wiggins
Quillen	Stanton,	Williams
Regula	J. William	Wilson, Bob
Rhodes	Steele	Wilson,
Rinaldo	Steelman	Charles H.,
Robinson, Va.	Steiger, Ariz.	Calif.
Robison, N.Y.	Symms	Wilson,
Rogers	Talcott	Charles, Tex.
Roncallo, N.Y.	Taylor, Mo.	Winn
Rousselot	Teague, Calif.	Wolff
Ruth	Thomson, Wis.	Wyatt
Sandman	Towell, Nev.	Wydler
Sarasin	Treen	Wylie
Satterfield	Veysey	Wyman
Saylor	Waggoner	Young, Alaska
Schneebeli	Walsh	Young, Fla.
Shoup	Ware	Young, Ill.
Shriver	Whalen	Zion
Smith, N.Y.	Whitehurst	Zwach
Snyder	Widnall	

NOT VOTING—19

Bell	Harvey	Rosenthal
Burke, Calif.	Holifield	Roybal
Diggs	Jones, Ala.	Shipley
Dulski	King	Steiger, Wis.
Edwards, Calif.	Pettis	Teague, Tex.
Goldwater	Pickle	
Hansen, Idaho	Rooney, N.Y.	

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pickle and Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Goldwater against.

Mr. Holifield and Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Pettis against.

Mr. Edwards of California and Mr. Rosenthal for, with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Shipley and Mr. Dulski for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Roybal and Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. Bell against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Harvey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE TRADE REFORM ACT OF 1973—
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC.
NO. 93-80)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:
The Trade Reform Act of 1973, which I am today proposing to the Congress, calls for the most important changes in more than a decade in America's approach to world trade.

This legislation can mean more and better jobs for American workers.

It can help American consumers get more for their money.

It can mean expanding trade and expanding prosperity, for the United States and for our trading partners alike.

Most importantly, these proposals can help us reduce international tensions and strengthen the structure of peace.

The need for trade reform is urgent. The task of trade reform requires an effective, working partnership between the executive and legislative branches. The legislation I submit today has been developed in close consultation with the Congress and it envisions continuing cooperation after it is enacted. I urge the Congress to examine these proposals in a spirit of constructive partnership and to give them prompt and favorable consideration.

This legislation would help us to:

- Negotiate for a more open and equitable world trading system;
- Deal effectively with rapid increases in imports that disrupt domestic markets and displace American workers;
- Strengthen our ability to meet unfair competitive practices;
- Manage our trade policy more efficiently and use it more effectively to deal with special needs such as our balance of payments and inflation problems; and
- Take advantage of new trade opportunities while enhancing the contribution trade can make to the development of poorer countries.

STRENGTHENING THE STRUCTURE OF PEACE

The world is embarked today on a profound and historic movement away from confrontation and toward negotiation in resolving international differences. Increasingly in recent years, countries have come to see that the best way of advancing their own interests is by expanding peaceful contacts with other peoples. We have thus begun to erect a durable structure of peace in the world from which all nations can benefit and in which all nations have a stake.

This structure of peace cannot be strong, however, unless it encompasses international economic affairs. Our progress toward world peace and stability can be significantly undermined by economic conflicts which breed political tensions and weaken security ties. It is imperative, therefore, that we promptly turn our negotiating efforts to the task of resolving problems in the economic arena.

My trade reform proposals would equip us to meet this challenge. They would help us in creating a new economic order which both reflects and reinforces the progress we have made in political affairs. As I said to the Governors of the International Monetary Fund last September, our common goal should be to "set in place an economic structure that

will help and not hinder the world's historic movement toward peace."

TOWARD A NEW INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER

The principal institutions which now govern the world economy date from the close of World War II. At that time, the United States enjoyed a dominant position. Our industrial and agricultural systems had emerged from the war virtually intact. Our substantial reserves enabled us to finance a major share of international reconstruction. We gave generously of our resources and our leadership in helping the world economy get back on track.

The result has been a quarter century of remarkable economic achievement—and profound economic change. In place of a splintered and shattered Europe stands a new and vibrant European Community. In place of a prostrate Japan stands one of the free world's strongest economies. In all parts of the world new economic patterns have developed and new economic energies have been released.

These successes have now brought the world into a very different period. America is no longer the sole, dominating economic power. The new era is one of growing economic interdependence, shared economic leadership, and dramatic economic change.

These sweeping transformations, however, have not been matched by sufficient change in our trading and monetary systems. The approaches which served us so well in the years following World War II have now become outmoded; they are simply no longer equal to the challenges of our time.

The result has been a growing sense of strain and stress in the international economy and even a resurgence of economic isolationism as some have sought to insulate themselves from change. If we are to make our new economic era a time of progress and prosperity for all the world's peoples, we must resist the impulse to turn inward and instead do all we can to see that our international economic arrangements are substantially improved.

MOMENTUM FOR CHANGE

The United States has already taken a number of actions to help build a new international economic order and to advance our interests within it.

—Our New Economic Policy, announced on August 15, 1971, has helped to improve the performance of our domestic economy, reducing unemployment and inflation and thereby enhancing our competitive position.

—The realignment of currencies achieved under the Smithsonian Agreement of December 18, 1971, and by the adjustments of recent weeks have also made American goods more competitive with foreign products in markets at home and abroad.

—Building on the Smithsonian Agreement, we have advanced far-reaching proposals for lasting reform in the world's monetary system.

—We have concluded a trade agreement with the Soviet Union that

promises to strengthen the fabric of prosperity and peace.

—Opportunities for mutually beneficial trade are developing with the People's Republic of China.

—We have opened negotiations with the enlarged European Community and several of the countries with which it has concluded special trading agreements concerning compensation due us as a result of their new arrangements.

But despite all these efforts, underlying problems remain. We need basic trade reform, and we need it now. Our efforts to improve the world's monetary system, for example, will never meet with lasting success unless basic improvements are also achieved in the field of international trade.

BUILDING A FAIR AND OPEN TRADING WORLD

A wide variety of barriers to trade still distort the world's economic relations, harming our own interests and those of other countries.

—Quantitative barriers hamper trade in many commodities, including some of our potentially most profitable exports.

—Agricultural barriers limit and distort trade in farm products, with special damage to the American economy because of our comparative advantage in the agricultural field.

—Preferential trading arrangements have spread to include most of Western Europe, Africa and other countries bordering on the Mediterranean Sea.

—Non-tariff barriers have greatly proliferated as tariffs have declined.

These barriers to trade, in other countries and in ours, presently cost the United States several billion dollars a year in the form of higher consumer prices and the inefficient use of our resources. Even an economy as strong as ours can ill afford such losses.

Fortunately, our major trading partners have joined us in a commitment to broad, multilateral trade negotiations beginning this fall. These negotiations will provide a unique opportunity for reducing trading barriers and expanding world trade.

It is in the best interest of every nation to sell to others the goods it produces more efficiently and to purchase the goods which other nations produce more efficiently. If we can operate on this basis, then both the earnings of our workers and the buying power of our dollars can be significantly increased.

But while trade should be more open, it should also be more fair. This means, first, that the rules and practices of trade should be fair to all nations. Secondly, it means that the benefits of trade should be fairly distributed among American workers, farmers, businessmen and consumers alike and that trade should create no undue burdens for any of these groups.

I am confident that our free and vigorous American economy can more than hold its own in open world competition. But we must always insist that such competition take place under equitable rules.

THE URGENT NEED FOR ACTION

The key to success in our coming trade negotiations will be the negotiating authority the United States brings to the bargaining table. Unless our negotiators can speak for this country with sufficient authority, other nations will undoubtedly be cautious and non-committal—and the opportunity for change will be lost.

We must move promptly to provide our negotiators with the authority their task requires. Delay can only aggravate the strains we have already experienced. Disruptions in world financial markets, deficits in our trading balance, inflation in the international marketplace, and tensions in the diplomatic arena all argue for prompt and decisive action. So does the plight of those American workers and businesses who are damaged by rapidly rising imports or whose products face barriers in foreign markets.

For all of these reasons, I urge the Congress to act on my recommendations as expeditiously as possible. We face pressing problems here and now. We cannot wait until tomorrow to solve them.

PROVIDING NEW NEGOTIATING AUTHORITIES

Negotiators from other countries will bring to the coming round of trade discussions broad authority to alter their barriers to trade. Such authority makes them more effective bargainers; without such authority the hands of any negotiator would be severely tied.

Unfortunately, the President of the United States and those who negotiate at his direction do not now possess authorities comparable to those which other countries will bring to these bargaining sessions. Unless these authorities are provided, we will be badly hampered in our efforts to advance American interests and improve our trading system.

My proposed legislation therefore calls upon the Congress to delegate significant new negotiating authorities to the executive branch. For several decades now, both the Congress and the President have recognized that trade policy is one field in which such delegations are indispensable. This concept is clearly established; the questions which remain concern the degree of delegation which is appropriate and the conditions under which it should be carried out.

The legislation I submit today spells out only that degree of delegation which I believe is necessary and proper to advance the national interest. And just as we have consulted closely with the Congress in shaping this legislation, so the executive branch will consult closely with the Congress in exercising any negotiating authorities it receives. I invite the Congress to set up whatever mechanism it deems best for closer consultation and cooperation to insure that its views are properly represented as trade negotiations go forward.

It is important that America speak authoritatively and with a single voice at the international bargaining table. But it is also important that many voices contribute as the American position is being shaped.

The proposed Trade Reform Act of

1973 would provide for the following new authorities:

First, I request authority to eliminate, reduce, or increase customs duties in the context of negotiated agreements. Although this authority is requested for a period of five years, it is my intention and my expectation that agreements can be concluded in a much shorter time. Last October, the member governments of the European Community expressed their hope that the coming round of trade negotiations will be concluded by 1975. I endorse this timetable and our negotiators will cooperate fully in striving to meet it.

Second, I request a Congressional declaration favoring negotiations and agreements on non-tariff barriers. I am also asking that a new, optional procedure be created for obtaining the approval of the Congress for such agreements when that is appropriate. Currently both Houses of the Congress must take positive action before any such agreement requiring changes in domestic law becomes effective—a process which makes it difficult to achieve agreements since our trading partners know it is subject to much uncertainty and delay. Under the new arrangement, the President would give notice to the Congress of his intention to use the procedure at least 90 days in advance of concluding an agreement in order to provide time for appropriate House and Senate Committees to consider the issues involved and to make their views known. After an agreement was negotiated, the President would submit that agreement and proposed implementing orders to the Congress. If neither House rejected them by a majority vote of all members within a period of 90 days, the agreement and implementing orders would then enter into effect.

Thirdly, I request advance authority to carry out mutually beneficial agreements concerning specific customs matters primarily involving valuation and the marking of goods by country of origin.

The authorities I outline in my proposed legislation would give our negotiators the leverage and the flexibility they need to reduce or eliminate foreign barriers to American products. These proposals would significantly strengthen America's bargaining position in the coming trade negotiations.

OBJECTIVES IN AGRICULTURAL TRADE

I am not requesting specific negotiating authority relating to agricultural trade. Barriers to such trade are either tariff or non-tariff in nature and can be dealt with under the general authorities I am requesting.

One of our major objectives in the coming negotiations is to provide for expansion in agricultural trade. The strength of American agriculture depends on the continued expansion of our world markets—especially for the major bulk commodities our farmers produce so efficiently. Even as we have been moving toward a great reliance on free market forces here at home under the Agricultural Act of 1970, so we seek to broaden the role of market forces on the international level by reducing and removing barriers to trade in farm products.

I am convinced that the concerns which all nations have for their farmers and consumers can be met most effectively if the market plays a far greater role in determining patterns of agricultural production and consumption. Movement in this direction can do much to help ensure adequate supplies of food and relieve pressure on consumer prices.

PROVIDING FOR IMPORT RELIEF

As other countries agree to reduce their trading barriers, we expect to reduce ours. The result will be expanding trade, creating more and better jobs for the American people and providing them with greater access to a wider variety of products from other countries.

It is true, of course, that reducing import barriers has on some occasions led to sudden surges in imports which have had disruptive effects on the domestic economy. It is important to note, however, that most severe problems caused by surging imports have not been related to the reduction of import barriers. Steps toward a more open trading order generally have a favorable rather than an unfavorable impact on domestic jobs.

Nevertheless, damaging import surges, whatever their cause, should be a matter of great concern to our people and our Government. I believe we should have effective instruments readily available to help avoid serious injury from imports and give American industries and workers time to adjust to increased imports in an orderly way. My proposed legislation outlines new measures for achieving these goals.

To begin with, I recommend a less restrictive test for invoking import restraints. Today, restraints were authorized only when the Tariff Commission finds that imports are the "major cause" of serious injury or threat thereof to a domestic industry, meaning that their impact must be larger than that of all other causes combined. Under my proposal, restraints would be authorized when import competition was the "primary cause" of such injury, meaning that it must only be the largest single cause. In addition, the present requirement that injury must result from a previous tariff concession would be dropped.

I also recommend a new method for determining whether imports actually are the primary cause of serious injury to domestic producers. Under my proposal, a finding of "market disruption" would constitute *prima facie* evidence of that fact. Market disruption would be defined as occurring when imports are substantial, are rising rapidly both absolutely and as a percentage of total domestic consumption, and are offered at prices substantially below those of competing domestic products.

My proposed legislation would give the President greater flexibility in providing appropriate relief from import problems—including orderly marketing agreements or higher tariffs or quotas. Restraints could be imposed for an initial period of five years and, at the discretion of the President, could be extended for an additional period of two years. In exceptional cases, restrictions could be extended even further after a two-year period and following a new investigation by the Tariff Commission.

IMPROVING ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

Our responsibilities for easing the problems of displaced workers are not limited to those whose unemployment can be traced to imports. All displaced workers are entitled to adequate assistance while they seek new employment. Only if all workers believe they are getting a fair break can our economy adjust effectively to change.

I will therefore propose in a separate message to the Congress new legislation to improve our systems of unemployment insurance and compensation. My proposals would set minimum Federal standards for benefit levels in State programs, ensuring that all workers covered by such programs are treated equitably, whatever the cause of their involuntary unemployment. In the meantime, until these standards become effective, I am recommending as a part of my trade reform proposals that we immediately establish benefit levels which meet these proposed general standards for workers displaced because of imports.

I further propose that until the new standards for unemployment insurance are in place, we make assistance for workers more readily available by dropping the present requirement that their unemployment must have been caused by prior tariff concessions and that imports must have been the "major cause" of injury. Instead, such assistance would be authorized if the Secretary of Labor determined that unemployment was substantially due to import-related causes. Workers unemployed because of imports would also have job training, job search allowances, employment services and relocation assistance available to them as permanent features of trade adjustment assistance.

In addition, I will submit to the Congress comprehensive pension reform legislation which would help protect workers who lose their jobs against loss of pension benefits. This legislation will contain a mandatory vesting requirement which has been developed with older workers particularly in mind.

The proposed Trade Reform Act of 1973 would terminate the present program of adjustment assistance to individual firms. I recommend this action because I believe this program has been largely ineffective, discriminates among firms within a given industry and has needlessly subsidized some firms at the taxpayer's expense. Changing competitive conditions, after all, typically act not upon particular firms but upon an industry as a whole and I have provided for entire industries under my import relief proposals.

DEALING WITH UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES

The President of the United States possesses a variety of authorities to deal with unfair trade practices. Many of these authorities must now be modernized if we are to respond effectively and even-handedly to unfair import competition at home and to practices which unfairly prejudice our export opportunities abroad.

To cope with unfair competitive practices in our own markets, my proposed legislation would amend our antidumping and countervailing duty laws to pro-

vide for more expeditious investigations and decisions. It would make a number of procedural and other changes in these laws to guarantee their effective operation. The bill would also amend the current statute concerning patent infringement by subjecting cases involving imports to judicial proceedings similar to those which involve domestic infringement, and by providing for fair processes and effective action in the event of court delays. I also propose that the Federal Trade Commission Act be amended to strengthen our ability to deal with foreign producers whose cartel or monopoly practices raise prices in our market or otherwise harm our interest by restraining trade.

In addition, I ask for a revision and extension of my authority to raise barriers against countries which unreasonably or unjustifiably restrict our exports. Existing law provides such authority only under a complex array of conditions which vary according to the practices or exports involved. My proposed bill would simplify the authority and its use. I would prefer, of course, that other countries agree to remove such restrictions on their own, so that we should not have to use this authority. But I will consider using it whenever it becomes clear that our trading partners are unwilling to remove unreasonable or unjustifiable restrictions against our exports.

OTHER MAJOR PROVISIONS

Most-Favored-Nation Authority. My proposed legislation would grant the President authority to extend most-favored-nation treatment to any country when he deemed it in the national interest to do so. Under my proposal, however, any such extension to countries not now receiving most-favored-nation treatment could be vetoed by a majority vote of either the House or the Senate within a three-month period.

This new authority would enable us to carry out the trade agreement we have negotiated with the Soviet Union and thereby ensure that country's repayment of its lend-lease debt. It would also enable us to fulfill our commitment to Romania and to take advantage of opportunities to conclude beneficial agreements with other countries which do not now receive most-favored-nation treatment.

In the case of the Soviet Union, I recognize the deep concern which many in the Congress have expressed over the tax levied on Soviet citizens wishing to emigrate to new countries. However, I do not believe that a policy of denying most-favored-nation treatment to Soviet exports is a proper or even an effective way of dealing with this problem.

One of the most important elements of our trade agreement with the Soviet Union is the clause which calls upon each party to reduce exports of products which cause market disruptions in the other country. While I have no reason to doubt that the Soviet Union will meet its obligations under this clause if the need arises, we should still have authority to take unilateral action to prevent disruption if such action is warranted.

Because of the special way in which state-trading countries market their

products abroad, I would recommend two modifications in the way we take such action. First, the Tariff Commission should only have to find "material injury" rather than "serious injury" from imports in order to impose appropriate restraints. Secondly, such restraints should apply only to exports from the offending country. These recommendations can simplify our laws relating to dumping actions by state-trading countries, eliminating the difficult and time-consuming problems associated with trying to reach a constructed value for their exports.

Balance of Payments Authority. Though it should only be used in exceptional circumstances, trade policy can sometimes be an effective supplementary tool for dealing with our international payments imbalances. I therefore request more flexible authority to raise or lower import restrictions on a temporary basis to help correct deficits or surpluses in our payments position. Such restraints could be applied to imports from all countries across the board or only to those countries which fail to correct a persistent and excessive surplus in their global payments position.

Anti-Inflation Authority. My trade recommendations also include a proposal I made on March 30th as a part of this Administration's effort to curb the rising cost of living. I asked the Congress at that time to give the President new, permanent authority to reduce certain import barriers temporarily and to a limited extent when he determined that such action was necessary to relieve inflationary pressures within the United States. I again urge prompt approval for this important weapon in our war against inflation.

Generalized Tariff Preferences. Another significant provision of my proposed bill would permit the United States to join with other developed countries, including Japan and the members of the European Community, in helping to improve the access of poorer nations to the markets of developed countries. Under this arrangement, certain products of developing nations would benefit from preferential treatment for a ten-year period, creating new export opportunities for such countries, raising their foreign exchange earnings, and permitting them to finance those higher levels of imports that are essential for more rapid economic growth.

This legislation would allow duty-free treatment for a broad range of manufactured and semi-manufactured products and for a selected list of agricultural and primary products which are now regulated only by tariffs. It is our intention to exclude certain import-sensitive products such as textile products, footwear, watches and certain steel products from such preferential treatment, along with products which are now subject to outstanding orders restricting imports. As is the case for the multilateral negotiations authority, public hearing procedures would be held before such preferences were granted and preferential imports would be subject to the import relief provisions which I have recommend-

ed above. Once a particular product from a given country became fully competitive, however, it would no longer qualify for special treatment.

The United States would grant such tariff preferences on the basis of international fair play. We would take into account the actions of other preference-granting countries and we would not grant preferences to countries which discriminate against our products in favor of goods from other industrialized nations unless those countries agreed to end such discrimination.

Permanent Management Authorities. To permit more efficient and more flexible management of American trade policy, I request permanent authority to make limited reductions in our tariffs as a form of compensation to other countries. Such compensation could be necessary in cases where we have raised certain barriers under the new import restraints discussed above and would provide an alternative in such cases to increased barriers against our exports.

I also request permanent authority to offer reductions in particular United States barriers as a means of obtaining significant advantages for American exports. These reductions would be strictly limited; they would involve tariff cuts of no more than 20 percent covering no more than two percent of total United States imports in any one year.

REFORMING INTERNATIONAL TRADING RULES

The coming multilateral trade negotiations will give us an excellent opportunity to reform and update the rules of international trade. There are several areas where we will seek such changes.

One important need concerns the use of trade policy in promoting equilibrium in the international payments system. We will seek rules changes to permit nations, in those exceptional cases where such measures are necessary, to increase or decrease trade barriers across the board as one means of helping to correct their payments imbalances. We will also seek a new rule allowing nations to impose import restrictions against individual countries which fail to take effective action to correct an excessive surplus in their balance of payments. This rule would parallel the authority I have requested to use American import restrictions to meet our own balance of payments problem.

A second area of concern is the need for a multilateral system for limiting imports to protect against disruptions caused by rapidly changing patterns of international trade. As I emphasized earlier, we need a more effective domestic procedure to meet such problems. But it is also important that new arrangements be developed at the international level to cope with disruptions caused by the accelerating pace of change in world trade.

We will therefore seek new international rules which would allow countries to gain time for adjustment by imposing import restrictions, without having to compensate their trading partners by simultaneously reducing barriers to other products. At the same time, the interests of exporting countries should be protected by providing that such safe-

guards will be phased out over a reasonable period of time.

PROMOTING EXPORT EXPANSION

As trade barriers are reduced around the world, American exports will increase substantially, enhancing the health of our entire economy.

Already our efforts to expand American exports have moved forward on many fronts. We have made our exports more competitive by realigning exchange rates. Since 1971, our new law permitting the establishment of Domestic International Sales Corporations has been helping American companies organize their export activities more effectively. The lending, guaranty and insurance authorities of the Export-Import Bank have been increased and operations have been extended to include a short-term discount loan facility. The Department of Commerce has reorganized its facilities for promoting exports and has expanded its services for exporters. The Department of State, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce, is giving increased emphasis to commercial service programs in our missions abroad.

In addition, I am today submitting separate legislation which would amend the Export Trade Act in order to clarify the legal framework in which associations of exporters can function. One amendment would make it clear that the act applies not only to the export of goods but also to certain kinds of services—architecture, construction, engineering, training and management consulting, for example. Another amendment would clarify the exemption of export associations from our domestic antitrust laws, while setting up clear information, disclosure and regulatory requirements to ensure that the public interest is fully protected.

In an era when more countries are seeking foreign contracts for entire industrial projects—including steps ranging from engineering studies through the supply of equipment and the construction of plants—it is essential that our laws concerning joint export activities allow us to meet our foreign competition on a fair and equal basis.

THE GROWTH OF INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT

The rapid growth of international investment in recent years has raised new questions and new challenges for businesses and governments. In our own country, for example, some people have feared that American investment abroad will result in a loss of American jobs. Our studies show, however, that such investment on balance has meant more and better jobs for American workers, has improved our balance of trade and our overall balance of payments, and has generally strengthened our economy. Moreover, I strongly believe that an open system for international investment, one which eliminates artificial incentives or impediments here and abroad, offers great promise for improved prosperity throughout the world.

It may well be that new rules and new mechanisms will be needed for international investment activities. It will take time, however, to develop them. And it is important that they be developed as

much as possible on an international scale. If we restrict the ability of American firms to take advantage of investment opportunities abroad, we can only expect that foreign firms will seize these opportunities and prosper at our expense.

I therefore urge the Congress to refrain from enacting broad new changes in our laws governing direct foreign investment until we see what possibilities for multilateral agreements emerge.

It is in this context that we must also shape our system for taxing the foreign profits of American business. Our existing system permits American-controlled businesses in foreign countries to operate under the same tax burdens which apply to its foreign competitors in that country. I believe that system is fundamentally sound. We should not penalize American business by placing it at a disadvantage with respect to its foreign competitors.

American enterprises abroad now pay substantial foreign income taxes. In most cases, in fact, Americans do not invest abroad because of an attractive tax situation but because of attractive business opportunities. Our income taxes are not the cause of our trade problems and tax changes will not solve them.

The Congress exhaustively reviewed this entire matter in 1962 and the conclusion it reached then is still fundamentally sound: there is no reason that our tax credit and deferral provisions relating to overseas investment should be subjected to drastic surgery.

On the other hand, ten years of experience have demonstrated that in certain specialized cases American investment abroad can be subject to abuse. Some artificial incentives for such investment still exist, distorting the flow of capital and producing unnecessary hardship. In those cases where unusual tax advantages are offered to induce investment that might not otherwise occur, we should move to eliminate that inducement.

A number of foreign countries presently grant major tax inducements such as extended "holidays" from local taxes in order to attract investment from outside their borders. To curb such practices, I will ask the Congress to amend our tax laws so that earnings from new American investments which take advantage of such incentives will be taxed by the United States at the time they are earned—even though the earnings are not returned to this country. The only exception to this provision would come in cases where a bilateral tax treaty provided for such an exception under mutually advantageous conditions.

American companies sometimes make foreign investments specifically for the purpose of re-exporting products to the United States. This is the classic "runaway plant" situation. In cases where foreign subsidiaries of American companies have receipts from exports to the United States which exceed 25 percent of the subsidiaries' total receipts, I recommend that the earnings of those subsidiaries also be taxed at current American rates. This new rule would only apply, however, to new investments and to situations where lower taxes in the for-

ign country are a factor in the decision to invest. The rule would also provide for exceptions in those unusual cases where our national interest required a different result.

There are other situations in which American companies so design their foreign operations that the United States Treasury bears the burden when they lose money and deduct it from their taxes. Yet when that same company makes money, a foreign treasury receives the benefit of taxes on its profits. I will ask the Congress to make appropriate changes in the rules which now allow this inequity to occur.

We have also found that taxing of mineral imports by United States companies from their foreign affiliates is subject to lengthy delays. I am therefore instructing the Department of the Treasury, in consultation with the Department of Justice and the companies concerned, to institute a procedure for determining inter-company prices and tax payments in advance. If a compliance program cannot be developed voluntarily, I shall ask for legislative authority to create one.

THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGE

Over the past year, this Administration has repeatedly emphasized the importance of bringing about a more equitable and open world trading system. We have encouraged other nations to join in negotiations to achieve this goal. The declaration of European leaders at their summit meeting last October demonstrates their dedication to the success of this effort. Japan, Canada and other nations share this dedication.

The momentum is there. Now we—in this country—must seize the moment if that momentum is to be sustained.

When the history of our time is written, this era will surely be described as one of profound change. That change has been particularly dramatic in the international economic arena.

The magnitude and pace of economic change confronts us today with policy questions of immense and immediate significance. Change can mean increased disruption and suffering, or it can mean increased well-being. It can bring new forms of deprivation and discrimination, or it can bring wider sharing of the benefits of progress. It can mean conflict between men and nations, or it can mean growing opportunities for fair and peaceful competition in which all parties can ultimately gain.

My proposed Trade Reform Act of 1973 is designed to ensure that the inevitable changes of our time are beneficial changes—for our people and for people everywhere.

I urge the Congress to enact these proposals, so that we can help move our country and our world away from trade confrontation and toward trade negotiation, away from a period in which trade has been a source of international and domestic friction and into a new era in which trade among nations helps us to build a peaceful, more prosperous world.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 10, 1973.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

MR. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 205, CREATING AN ATLANTIC UNION DELEGATION

MR. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 348 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 348

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 205) to create an Atlantic Union delegation. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.J. Res. 205, the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution S.J. Res. 21, and it shall then be in order to consider the said Senate joint resolution in the House.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

MR. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

MR. SPEAKER. House Resolution 348 provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate on House Joint Resolution 205, which is a bill creating an Atlantic Union delegation to organize and participate in a convention of delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty parliamentary democracies as may wish to participate.

Adoption of this resolution will have a positive impact on European nations. It will reassure them that Atlantic community interests occupy very high priority in the U.S. Congress. It will also impart new confidence in world money markets at this critical time. Passage of this resolution will be consistent with the President's foreign policy objectives and will give important balance to our global policy.

The cost of this resolution is \$200,000 over a 3-year period. The delegation will disband after that time.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs reported the joint resolution by a vote of 21 to 8.

Mr. Speaker, I just add that I consider the resolution this bill would permit the House to consider as a very forward step toward bringing together the peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples and nations of the world. Our opposition has too often been much more united than we lovers of freedom in the world have been.

This resolution would authorize a U.S. delegation of 18 eminent citizens to participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty parliamentary democracies as desire to join in the enterprise, and other parliamentary democracies the convention may invite, to explore the possibility of agreement on—

A declaration that the goal of their peoples is to transform their present relationship into a more effective unity based on federal principles;

A timetable for the transition by stages to this goal;

A commission to facilitate advancement toward such stages.

House Joint Resolution 205 provides that the convention's recommendations shall be submitted to the Congress.

The 18 delegates to the convention which House Joint Resolution 205 would authorize are appointed, six by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the leadership, six by the President of the Senate, after consultation with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the leadership, and six by the President of the United States. It appears, therefore, that all House Joint Resolution 205 would do is to authorize members of the United States chosen by the Speaker, the President of the Senate, and the President, not more than half of whom shall be from one political party, to meet and talk about a greater unity and closer cooperation among the major freedom-loving and peace-loving nations of the world. This is a step toward which the freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples and nations of the world have been moving a long, long time, however slowly. It is a further step which must be taken if we are to provide for the welfare of our peoples and to have peace in the world.

There will be those who are frightened by this proposal. There will be misrepresentations concerning the real meaning of House Joint Resolution 205 and the authority of our delegation. There will be those who will harken back to our days of isolation and want to see the return of those days and those days' tragic policies.

The nations which make up the NATO Treaty group and the United States and Canada have the power to provide a better life for all our people by working closer together and we have the power by working in closer unity to keep peace in the world. And time is running out. Nothing but good can come out of these discussions in the convention which our delegates would attend. They have no power to bind our Nation to anything. These discussions would be exploratory only. Any final action would have to be taken by the Congress of the United States. I hope, therefore, that in the in-

terest of the prosperity and the peace of the free democratic nations of the world and for the betterment of the world in general, this rule shall be adopted and the House will have an opportunity to consider and I hope approve House Joint Resolution 205.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the same resolution that was before the Committee on Rules last session. At that time the Committee on Rules decided to keep it in the committee.

The resolution that it kept provided for an expenditure of \$300,000. This one provides for an expenditure of \$200,000, so by keeping this resolution in the last Congress, the Committee on Rules saved the taxpayers \$100,000.

But that is not all what the committee did. It gave the membership time to read the resolution. I think, after the membership of the House read the resolution and became familiar with it, the Members learned it was not a simple resolution. I think it is something with which all Americans should become familiar. Especially since we are preparing to celebrate the 200th anniversary of our Nation's birth. We are pleased with our independence and do not seek a federal union with the nations of Europe. As a matter of fact, I have not had any letters from my district urging that we yield any of our sovereignty to an Atlantic Union. This is precisely what this resolution would provide.

I was amazed yesterday, in interrogating some of the witnesses before the Committee on Rules, that they were in doubt on this question. When this resolution came out of the important Committee on Foreign Affairs, it came out with a very substantial vote. Yes, we heard that the other body had passed this resolution unanimously, only to hear from a subsequent witness that the other body had only three or four Members on the floor when they voted on it.

Naturally, I do not like to stand in the well and oppose a piece of legislation which has been pursued for so many years by my very good and close friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), but many of the reasons for which I oppose this bill are found in his statement to the President of the United States. The gentleman does not equivocate as to what is in this resolution or what is its intended goal.

On March 15, 1973, the gentleman from Illinois advised none other than the President of the United States as to the intent and purpose of this resolution. On page 8320 of the RECORD, at the bottom of the page, the gentleman from Illinois, states:

The current monetary crisis, imbalances in trade, troop levels in Europe, negotiations with Warsaw Pact over weapons, the environmental problem, all could be more effectively handled by a Federal Government of the Atlantic Nations.

Could anything be clearer than that as to the intent and goal of this resolution? If there is any doubt, let me go further. The gentleman from Illinois also advised the President of the United

States on this same date, and this appears on the same page of the RECORD:

While no government is today ready for federation, there is growing realization on both sides of the Atlantic that some joint exercise of sovereignty is needed.

Does this leave any doubt in the mind of anyone?

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Does this leave anybody in doubt as to the intent, purpose, and goal of this legislation?

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

Mr. LATTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to call attention to the hearings held on almost an identical resolution, in 1971. One of the long-time proponents has been Clarence Streit. In answer to a question he said this:

I would strongly favor including in such a Union's powers not only the common defense but a common foreign policy, a common currency, a common market and a common system for handling such interstate matters as mail, cables, aviation, etc.

So I believe the intention and the justification for a union is quite clear. It is a transformation of present relationships into a union and the transfer of certain aspects of national sovereignty to this new supranational entity.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

If Members will turn to the resolution itself, on page 2, line 6, it provides authority as follows:

to explore the possibility of agreement (a)

I emphasize this—
to transform their present relationship into a more effective unity based on Federal principles:

And this is not all. Subtitle (b) provides:
a timetable for the transition by stages to this goal;

I have not heard from any people in my district asking me to vote for legislation to surrender sovereignty and independence to some supernational government envisioned by this resolution. Have any Members in this Chamber been advised to do so? But, lo and behold, this resolution came out of the Rules Committee on yesterday to be voted on today.

I know some of the Members who voted for the legislation in the committee said they were going to oppose it on the floor. Well, I do not happen to believe we should vote for legislation in committee which we cannot support on the floor. I vote to kill bad legislation at every opportunity. On yesterday the Rules Committee would have done this House and this Nation a tremendous service by doing as it did last year. I mean we should have refused to report it for your consideration.

I fear that many Members of this House may have depended on the Rules Committee to defeat it and have not taken the time to examine its contents

others may reason, "Well, we have the United Nations, why not the Atlantic Union?"

This is not another United Nations or anything like it. This is an attempt to bring about a federation with Europe, and I have not heard that a single nation in Europe is for such an Atlantic Union today. Should there be one, I hope the sponsors of the legislation will insert the name of the country in the record.

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

Mr. LATTA. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I certainly would like to associate myself 100 percent with the statement of my colleague from Ohio. I believe it is one of the most effective, forceful, and accurate statements I have heard.

It is absolutely correct that you could not have an Atlantic Union without some reduction in American sovereignty. I think that is the key issue here. If every member had heard the gentleman's brief statement, I think the vote against the bill would be overwhelming.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate what the gentleman said, and I congratulate him.

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

Mr. LATTA. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER).

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio and ask for a vote against this resolution. I oppose the resolution on the Atlantic Union.

If the time for Atlantic Union ever came, it has long since passed. Today passage of the resolution would be disruptive and counterproductive to the unification of Europe that has been accomplished during the past few years.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution is a quixotic, emotional anachronism, and it ought to be laid to rest by a decisive negative vote.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER).

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say that I hope the House will have its say during the 1-hour debate on the rule, and that we then vote down the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chief sponsor of this resolution, my good friend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with the rule that the Committee on Rules granted for this resolution. The original request was for 1 hour of debate and an open rule permitting amendments. At the request of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) who has already been heard on the resolution, the time was extended by the Committee on Rules to 2 hours.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of debate on the rule, I presume, is to deal with the

quality of the rule itself, so I will not impose upon the time of the Members with an extended discussion of the resolution (H.J. Res. 205) or of the points that have been made by the speakers so far, except to this extent:

One might conclude from hearing these voices of concern from the Republican side of the aisle that here in this resolution is a demon brought to life and supported and conjured up by forces entirely beyond the Republican Party.

To those who might have misapprehension, I will call your attention, first of all, to the words of the President of the United States, the Honorable Richard Nixon, in a letter to me dated March 10, 1973. He said as follows:

As a goal and a concept I have favored Atlantic Union for many years, dating back to my service in the Congress.

During the interview which I had with him on March 2, which predated this letter, the President assured me that he would sign the bill, and subsequent to our interview the Department of State issued a favorable report on the bill with these words in it—

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

Mr. FINDLEY. May I ask the gentleman, for what purpose?

Mr. LATTA. I would like the record to be complete.

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I think it is well to point out that the President did not specifically endorse this particular proposal.

He said further in that letter:

As President I have made it a policy not to give specific endorsement to resolutions of this kind, but I want you to know that my long-standing position on the concept and the goal which you are seeking to achieve through this resolution has not changed.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman has read the entire letter, because it underscores the President's support for not only the concept, but for the goal, and I think it gives added meaning to the assurance he gave to me in the interview that he will sign the bill.

He has been on record in support of resolutions of this kind as a private citizen, and the fact that he did not deem it suitable to be out front for specific language in advance of action by the Congress cannot be construed as casting any doubt upon his action as President when the time comes to sign the legislation.

Furthermore, one would think that this was somehow contrary to the wishes of the conservatives of the Republican Party.

Those who voiced their concern about it must necessarily find themselves to the right of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, because just last week I had word that he stands by a letter of 1966 in which he endorsed the resolution, an almost identical resolution, in these words:

The resolution that you introduced relative to the establishment of an Atlantic Union delegation is a good idea in my opinion. While I don't believe the North Atlantic

unity is just around the corner, I do believe it is coming, in fact, I believe it will be a must before we can present a solid front to our communist enemies.

Just this past week such eminent soldier statesmen as the men who have served recently as supreme commander of NATO forces, Lyman L. Lemnitzer, and Lauris Norstad have added their voices of strong support to the enactment of this resolution.

In the Senate, where it passed without objection, its chief sponsor was a Democrat, GALE McGEE, but right next to the name of GALE McGEE were two other names, MIKE MANSFIELD and HUGH SCOTT.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, confession is good for the soul. I am listed in the report, and properly so, as a co-sponsor of this resolution. However, I have become convinced from the developments that have occurred, particularly this year, and from what I learned of our situation in Europe as a result of my membership on a NATO subcommittee, and from a visit recently to a NATO defense conference in Munich, that this is not the proper time for us to take up this resolution and talk about some form of federal union in the Atlantic.

In particular I believe the remarks made by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), yesterday which appeared in the RECORD this morning on that very point are most persuasive, and so I intend to vote against the rule.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to speak out in opposition to the proposal of Atlantic Union. My friend and colleague the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) has just returned from the Amsterdam Conference and from his report the Europeans do not want or expect the United States to press for European unity.

These views of course are somewhat in variance with those voiced by the resolution's chief sponsor. In the March 15 RECORD, Mr. FINDLEY states:

Atlantic Union captures the genius of the American system of government-federalism and adapts it to meet the common problems of the experienced democracies of Europe and the Americas.

By this statement we are inferring here that the Europeans want and desire our form of government. This, of course, is not necessarily true, and it would be the first time in history that the United States has ever sought to impose its way of life on other nations.

In his remarks, my colleague goes on to say—

Atlantic Union, a proposal under which the experienced democracies of Western Europe would be brought together with the United States and Canada in a single federal union government.

Let us just take a look at the meaning of the last four words of that quote, "sin-

gle, federal, union, government," as defined by Webster's Dictionary:

Single, one only: . . . 3a(1): consisting of or having only one part, feature, or portion . . .

Federal, 1 archaic: of or relating to a compact or treaty: 2a: formed by a compact between political units that surrender their individual sovereignty to a central authority but retain limited residuary powers of government.

Union, 1a: an act or instance of uniting or joining two or more things into one: as (1): the formation of a single political unit from two or more separate and independent units . . .

Government, 2: the act or process of governing.

Mr. Speaker, the United States should take an active role in preserving peace and stability in the world. This, however, is not the way. I do not think many Americans will sit still for this resolution and I know I will not. I am opposed, and will go on record accordingly when the Atlantic Union is put to a vote.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 205, which would create an Atlantic Union delegation, composed of what is termed 18 eminent citizens, to organize and participate in a convention jointly with delegations from other North Atlantic Treaty parliamentary democracies that desired to join in exploring the possibility of such an agreement.

I am sure you, my colleagues, are aware that studies are undertaken for one of two reasons. Either a study is undertaken to eliminate an existing program or institution, or it is undertaken to bring into existence a new program or institution.

The proposal before us today would bring into existence another additional layer of government to burden the American people. With each additional layer of government that is added, the American people lose part of their freedom to determine their own futures, and more and more of their money is committed to financing enterprises that is often not in their best interests.

We have only to look at our history as a nation to see the ultimate end to which this "exploitation of unity based on Federal principles" will lead, if it is permitted to take its natural course. We, as a nation, started as 13 independent, sovereign, culturally different colonies—a situation that is directly analogous to the present situation among the European parliamentary democracies and the United States. The only difference is that the Original Thirteen Colonies were threatened by an outside enemy and joined together in a "league of friendship," with each State remaining sovereign and independent, and retaining every right not ceded by it under the Articles of Confederation. However, as we all know, the Articles of Confederation failed as an instrument for government and was replaced by the Constitution. It might be interesting to recall why the Articles of Confederation failed. On paper, almost every important national authority was turned over to Congress, save three: the authority to raise money directly; the authority to enlist troops directly, and the authority to regulate commerce.

But the paper powers were not the actual powers. The States failed to re-

spect the needs and requests of the National Government, especially in supplying money and men, and hence the so-called league of friendship could not function.

We have no reason today to expect more cooperation among Great Britain, France, Italy, West Germany, and the others who might join an Atlantic Union Convention, than there was among North Carolina, Georgia, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, Virginia, and the other Original Colonies under the Articles of Confederation.

In fact, we have good reason to suspect the opposite because there is no common enemy threatening all concerned governments individually, hence, there is less reason to relinquish our national prerogatives, especially those relating to defense, currency, and welfare.

If, however, we could presume by some quirk of fate, that all the Atlantic parliamentary democracies did relinquish these important national prerogatives, then we would be well on our way to a United States of Europe and North America with all the curtailment in national sovereignty that such a unity implies. But, on the other hand, if all the North Atlantic Treaty parliamentary democracies did behave in the past accustomed manner, then we would be on our way to financing another debating society such as the United Nations. Either way, the American taxpayer loses, and I hope my colleagues will see the folly of this proposal and defeat the resolution.

I am a firm believer in the self-determination principle whereby people have the right to choose the kind of government they want, and that governments should be instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Contrary to what the majority report states, I believe that House Joint Resolution 205 violates this principle not only with respect to our own people who are largely unaware that this bill is before us and would severely curtail our national sovereignty, but also with respect to the people of our North Atlantic Treaty allies whose national identity and sovereignty will be called into question if they choose to participate in the proposed convention. Especially if they go as delegates free from official instruction as the resolution proposes ours do.

Are we so scared of a little honest competition from a strong European Economic Community that we seek by the oldest device in the world to join them, rather than to compete with them? I submit that the interests of the United States are best served by making our economy, our defenses, and the welfare of our people our primary concerns and letting the other countries do the same, without the benefit of elaborate alliances, such as this proposed exploration for an Atlantic Union.

The alternative to this proposal, if carried to its obvious conclusion, would lead to an Orwellian world, with super world governments controlling whole continents of people who look, act, and speak the same, instead of the marvelous diversity of cultures, languages, and philosophies which we have in the world today.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that our way of life, and our goals as a Nation are too precious to put in jeopardy by having us join in a federal union with other nations, each of which has its own culture and national aspirations.

Mr. Speaker, let us cooperate with other nations when it is demonstrably in our interest to do so, but let us say "No" to this unrealistic concept of an Atlantic Union as proposed by the bill before us today.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 348. In my opinion, the best way to defeat House Joint Resolution 205 is to vote against the rule. I am opposed to House Joint Resolution 205 not merely because it is impractical and unrealistic—which indeed it is—but because I believe it will serve to undermine rather than strengthen the cause of Atlantic cooperation. This is a cause which I personally favor.

I cannot emphasize my reservations too strongly. Passage of this resolution would be unwise; it would not lead to agreement regarding its professed objective—an Atlantic Union. The motives of Members of Congress in approving such a proposal would be suspect. In Europe at least we would be considered knaves or fools—or perhaps both. Though proponents may mean well, they could damage, not strengthen, existing ties between friends.

Many Members, I realize, share some of my misgivings about the wisdom of an Atlantic Union, but nevertheless, they have decided to go along with this resolution. They hope that it may do some good, others believe it will do no harm, that it is innocuous. Proponents assert that adoption of this resolution will have a positive impact on Europeans, that it will reassure them of congressional interest in the development of even stronger ties.

To act—even with the best of intentions—on such untenable assumptions by approving this resolution could kick off quite different, and decidedly adverse, reactions. Passage of this resolution, I am convinced, will not aid and might well damage efforts already underway to promote closer cooperation and understanding between this country and our Atlantic allies. Those who believe that the present generation of European leaders, or the people of Western Europe, will welcome a U.S.-sponsored initiative of this kind, are laboring under a dangerous delusion. There is no interest in Western Europe in transforming present United States-European relationships into a more effective unity based on federal principles. On the contrary, many fear that union with the United States would only signify U.S. economic and even political domination on the continent. Such a development they would view with alarm. Indeed, the continuing efforts—over a period of decades now—to encourage economic and political integration in Europe can be described at least in part as a major effort to avoid a takeover by the United States.

Europeans also would have reason to be apprehensive about the semiofficial character of the proposed U.S. delegation to an Atlantic Union convention. It is

to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, and the President of the United States. In European eyes, this gives the delegates—whether instructed or uninstructed—the official sanction of the U.S. Government. Moreover, because this initiative originates in Congress, it will be suspect as an ill-concealed device to promote U.S. "hegemony" in European affairs.

Mr. Randolph Burgess, in his book, "Europe and America: The Next 10 Years," explained why Atlantic federation has much less support in Europe than the concept of European federation. The size and power of the United States, he feels, causes a natural fear that preponderant U.S. influence will become hegemony—militarily, politically and economically.

If this resolution should be passed, we shall undoubtedly hear Europeans use once again the old rhetoric about the United States as Great Britain's "Trojan horse" in Europe—about an imminent U.S. "takeover" of the European economy—about rampant "dollar diplomacy"—and so forth. No one in this body should be misled into thinking that passage of House Joint Resolution 205 will be welcomed in Europe as an unmitigated blessing.

This simply is not the case. If you think that by voting in favor of this resolution, you are promoting the cause of transatlantic harmony, I can only urge: Think again.

Mr. Speaker, I recently attended a 3-day Europe-America conference in Amsterdam. It was privately organized, and brought together over 300 delegates from 10 countries—including approximately 90 from the United States. Its purpose was to discuss the problems facing the Atlantic Alliance today, to explore possible solutions to these problems, and to consider also the future relationships between Europe and the United States. Incidentally, I was the only delegate from either House or Senate present at these sessions, though I know of several Members from both bodies who were invited.

The representation at this conference was heavily weighted in favor of what Flora Lewis has described, in the New York Times, as the "loose but recognizable Atlantic Establishment." Unquestionably, there were many distinguished representatives from both sides of the Atlantic. Many of them had been influential in shaping the early destiny of postwar Europe. At the same time, however, it must be pointed out that the delegations varied greatly in numbers, character, and quality. The German delegation, for instance, did not include a single member of Chancellor Willy Brandt's Social Democratic Party. Why? Perhaps partly, as Miss Lewis has pointed out, because "the younger people who have come to prominence and influence are interested in quite different matters."

Nevertheless, even among this generally Atlantic-oriented, Amsterdam group, there was an atmosphere of somberness and frustration—a mood of skepticism and suspicion. One French delegate went so far as to charge that

the British and American sponsors of the conference were actually seeking to disrupt the newly enlarged European community. The Italian delegates neither joined in debate on, nor did they approve, a resolution, which was intended to be noncontroversial, urging further efforts to maintain a dialog. A West German delegate, the editor of a prominent newspaper, warned the Europeans present of the dangers of "Canadianization," which he defined as a form of economic subservience by Europeans to the United States.

On only one occasion, Mr. Speaker, did anyone even mention Atlantic Union—either formally or informally—and obviously the idea ranked at the very bottom of anyone's immediate agenda. When I brought the subject up, at my own initiative, during informal discussions with individual delegates, the reaction was one of skepticism and apprehension—even among those Europeans who were most friendly to the United States. The general consensus was that there were more than enough practical problems to contend with—especially in the trade and monetary fields—without taking on this additional impossible dream. Instead, talk centered on possible institutional improvements and changes in procedures, and the development of machinery for discussions and for working out transatlantic differences. Even within this limited and less ambitious framework, however, agreement remained elusive.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of House Joint Resolution 205 concede that "no government today is ready for federation"—but they suggest Atlantic Union as an ultimate goal which should now be explored. What is that far-off—or perhaps far-out—visionary goal? According to the sponsors, Congress should agree on a search for ways to transform present relationships among friendly nations—not necessarily limited to the Atlantic community—into a more effective union based on federal principles.

Let us take a look at the dictionary's definitions of some of these words, Mr. Speaker. To transform means to—change in character or condition; transform implies a *major change* [italics added] in form, nature or function.

The definition of "union" is equally illuminating. Union means—

The formation of a *single political unit* [italics added] from two or more separate and independent units.

What is meant by federal principles? Well, Webster's dictionary defines the adjective "federal" as—formed by a compact between political units that *surrender their individual sovereignty to a central authority* [italics added], but retain *limited* [italics added] residuary powers of government.

The sponsors of House Joint Resolution 205 quite frankly admit that what is sought—among other things—is a common defense, a common currency, a common policy regarding international trade, a common foreign policy and an agreement as to how this new federal union might increase its aid to develop-

ing nations. Instead, most of these aims are specified in the wording of the resolution. These decisions, it should be emphasized, are to be made by the Union. They will be binding on all members of the Union, regardless of the feelings of individual member nations.

Since we are already in the realm of the hypothetical, let me present a hypothetical case: Let us suppose that the Mansfield resolution—which, incidentally, I have consistently opposed—should be suddenly passed by both Houses of Congress and agreed to by the President. This resolution, I am sure I need not point out, calls for the unilateral withdrawal by the United States of a substantial number of our troops from Europe.

As matters stand now, a national decision of this kind, relating to the disposition of our own troops, could not be blocked by our Allies. However, if the United States belonged to an Atlantic Union and other member nations objected to our decision, our troops could not be withdrawn even though that was our desire. One can only wonder, Mr. Speaker, how much thought certain distinguished Members of the other body could have given this subject when 2 weeks ago they routinely passed an Atlantic Union resolution, without debate and by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, I have been opposed to unilateral reduction of our forces in Europe, but I believe it essential that the United States retains the right to make a reduction. My friend, PAUL FINDLEY, wants to qualify that right. In his memorandum to President Nixon he describes the Mansfield resolution as a "sword of Damocles" hanging over our European policy. In Mr. Findley's opinion, Atlantic Union will give stability and depth to our present policy beyond Mr. Nixon's term of office. In other words, an Atlantic Union could prevent us from changing our national policy and deciding to withdraw our troops.

The Senate, regrettably, has already acted, but Members of this body can still give adequate consideration to the possible consequences of this ill-advised proposal. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, this resolution is before us today only because its sponsors—who unquestionably mean well—have managed to convince a large segment of the membership of our Foreign Affairs Committee that this proposal, at worst, is harmless. No commitment is being made at this stage, they assert, and only if sufficient interest is shared by those participating and if tentative agreement can be reached on specific proposals, will authorization be sought from the appropriate national legislative bodies. Perhaps an argument of this kind may appeal to those who are indifferent to the Atlantic Union concept—and I suspect that most Members of both Houses of Congress would fall into that category. However, I do not believe this resolution is harmless. Unquestionably, approval by Congress of House Joint Resolution 205 gives tacit approval to the goal of federal union. Why else would we authorize an exploration of the possibility of agreement? I hope it will not be passed on the basis of inertia and

indifference. That is hardly the proper way to legislate.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this resolution is not in the interest of the United States. It is not in the interest of any of the member nations of the Atlantic Alliance, or, indeed, of any group which is seriously interested in the improvement of American-European relations. I urge that House Joint Resolution 205 be rejected.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that there are practical, and important, ways in which Congress this year can concern itself with respect to relationships with our European Allies. Of overriding importance is the problem of trade negotiations. In order to develop more equitable trading relationships with other nations, the President is requesting substantial changes in our present laws. This should be priority business, Mr. Speaker. This should receive our prompt attention, and we should today abandon the pursuit of an unrealistic and unwise goal—Atlantic Union.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the rule, but I have grave doubts about House Joint Resolution 205.

While an Atlantic Union of like-minded democratic countries, based on federal principles is an idea which has had some appeal in the past, it does not address itself, in my judgment, to the problems of 1973.

The important international problems of the day, security aside, are world trade, international money, the multinational corporation, aid and tariff preferences to developing countries, the availability and conservation of natural resources such as oil, and the environment. A political federation, such as this resolution seeks, tends to stress political values over economic realities.

Our international economic policies remain, to say the least, ramshackle. Why should we strain at the gnat of political federation, while swallowing the camel of economic disarray?

Not only does the resolution thus over-emphasize politics at the expense of economics. By its exclusive concentration on the Atlantic area—the United States, Canada, Western Europe—it ignores those countries which, like Japan, deserve membership in any consortium of the industrialized nations. Unless the word "Atlantic" is to be deprived of all meaning, it excludes Japan. And this should not be.

There is, indeed, a need for a convention of eminent citizens—perhaps the same kind of eminent citizens as are referred to in House Joint Resolution 205. But the subject matter of the convention should be economics, and the areas represented should include Japan.

That need is well set forth in a helpful little book, published in the last few weeks by the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, "Europe and the United States," by Prof. Karl Kaiser of the University of the Saar in Saarbruecken, West Germany. Professor Kaiser says:

The United States, the European Community, and Japan . . . should establish a commission of eminent and knowledgeable private citizens from Europe, Japan, and

North America. Its task should be to review the major interdependent problems of the international economic system and develop recommendations for approaches and solutions. The report of the commission should serve to focus public attention and mobilize opinion, invigorate the international dialog, and provide a working basis for legislatures and governments . . . The governments involved should put at the disposal of the commission all necessary expert advice and research facilities as well as making it possible to consult any political or economic group in major countries and international organizations active in related fields. Since it will take some time for the commission to produce its report, a link should be established between its deliberations and the discussions of reform being carried out simultaneously by various international organizations, within countries, and between governments. This will ensure mutual benefits to all concerned parties.

I commend the question of a commission along these lines to the attention of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, when House Joint Resolution 205—to create an Atlantic Union delegation—was before the Rules Committee yesterday, I expressed my thoughts regarding some of the dangers and pitfalls connected with the establishment of this kind of an 18-member delegation to debate and resolve on some of our stupendous, complicated, and highly important international problems. The dangers connected with the Congress establishing a so-called third foreign policy committee to sit down with a number of European nations to discuss, debate, and make recommendations on the course our Nation should follow in regard to our Atlantic nation neighbors could easily lead to embarrassing pitfalls and false interpretations on the part of other nations as to how the U.S. Congress would officially act on some of the decisions made by the proposed Atlantic Union delegation.

The Congress has created the House Foreign Affairs Committee and also the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who are more or less constantly holding hearings during regular sessions of Congress and recording testimony from individuals, organizations, Members of the Congress, the Secretary of State, and any other of the executive department that may desire to testify. These two important congressional committees are well qualified to contact any of our European or Atlantic neighbors and invite their duly constituted officials to present all sides of any international problems which may be in dispute or up for debate and decision without depending upon 18 members of the so-called Atlantic Union delegation to speak for the Congress.

One of the alarming paragraphs in House Joint Resolution 205 was the following:

(d) All members of the delegation shall be free from official instructions, and free to speak and vote individually in the convention.

Judging from that paragraph in the bill, this proposed delegation would be free to ignore instructions from the President or the Congress of the United States but would have authority to speak and vote their individual conclusions on

international problems in the convention.

This situation would be interpreted by the other nations of the world that the Atlantic Union delegation of 18 members could make policy and decisions that would greatly undermine the authority and jurisdiction which the Constitution of the United States specifically gives to the President and the Congress.

I distinctly remember back in 1954 when John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State under President Eisenhower, almost singlehandedly convinced the Congress that we should enter into the Southeast Asia Treaty. At that time, in a House Foreign Affairs Committee meeting, he specifically stated in answer to a question that, "no American boys would ever be called upon to fight on the Asiatic continent, that the Southeast Asiatic Treaty would be limited strictly to military equipment, airplanes, advisers, and so forth."

The Congress acted on these assurances but, of course, at the time of Vietnam, most newspapers over the country heralded that we must follow through with our commitment to Southeast Asia and engage in a fighting war in order to underwrite and follow through with the commitments we made in the Southeast Asia Treaty. These so-called commitments did not include a fighting war in Asia.

The Southeast Asia Treaty led us into our unfortunate experience in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, et cetera. Each day the news media reminds us that we may spend billions more before we have complied with the so-called imaginary obligations of the SEATO.

The Congress should have learned a valuable lesson on treaties and Atlantic Union delegations when solving our international problems.

I am opposing the Atlantic Union resolution.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I find it strange that the Congress would even consider such a resolution proposing Atlantic Union at this time when people across the Nation are preparing to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the American Revolution, the war which freed our people from English rule.

The bill before us would create a delegation of Americans to explore entering into a union based on federal principles. Such a union could only result in restoring economic, financial, and military ties with European countries, thus placing the destiny of the United States and its people in the hands of a federation of governments in which the United States had only one vote.

It is only reasonable to expect that the result of every vote taken in such a union would be favorable to European interests which could be detrimental to the United States and the interests of the American people. We should have learned this lesson from our participation in the United Nations or in SEATO, both of which include Britain and France. We received no committed support in SEATO from the British or the French for our involvement in Vietnam. I do not know what argument could be used to indicate that we would have

support under any Atlantic alliance unless the action taken by the union directly involved or benefited our English or French friends.

Should the union proposed by this resolution become a reality, the Congress of the United States would become a secondary body subject to the dictates of a majority vote of representatives of foreign nations. I believe in the sovereignty of the people of the United States and their right to control their destiny. They can do this only if the Congress asserts its constitutional power, its voice, to legislate and control the activities of this Nation.

Americans fought to gain their sovereignty and have fought too many wars to keep this sovereignty to give it away now merely because the President has promised to sign the bill.

If the President understands the provisions of the legislation and endorses its thrust, then we must conclude that he stands ready to give our national sovereignty away.

It is inconceivable to me how any Member can support the resolution before us and at the same time speak out for restoration of congressional authority to return power of government to the people. The two ideas simply do not go together.

Furthermore, I cannot visualize why it is necessary for us to submit to some Atlantic Union in which the United States would have only one vote. We have already given unparalleled economic and financial assistance to the countries of Europe and we have sent our men, resources, and military equipment to save them in two past wars. We have absolutely nothing to gain by returning our country to European domination.

Finally, I am convinced that the American people are sick and tired of continued involvement in international organizations and movements. The American people will not tolerate any action that threatens our national sovereignty and limits their ability to control their own lives. The American people sent us here to represent them and vote on matters that decide our Nation's policies. A vote even to grant a rule on this resolution should be taken as an indication that we cannot do our job. I do not believe this. I believe in our form of government and will cast my people's vote against the rule and the Atlantic Union resolution.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend my distinguished colleague from Illinois for his tireless efforts on behalf of House Joint Resolution 205—the legislation before us today that would create an Atlantic Union delegation. For several years, I have been pleased to join PAUL FINDLEY in sponsoring this far-reaching resolution, and I urge its passage this afternoon.

As I am certain you are all aware, House Joint Resolution 205 would create an Atlantic Union delegation to participate in a convention with the delegations from other North Atlantic States. The convention would determine the possibility of agreement on: First, a dec-

laration of the goal of a more effective unity based on federal principles; second, a timetable for the transition to this goal; and third, a commission to facilitate the advancement of the goal.

I cannot emphasize too strongly how vital it is for our country to begin to explore new ways of dealing with other North Atlantic States. The economic, social, and political problems which confront our Nation do not respect national boundaries. Some type of international institution must be set up to deal with the problems which are supranational in scope.

There is a serious monetary crisis. NATO has steadily been losing its influence. And, of course, there is the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. The time has never been more ripe for the Congress to enact legislation that would permit representatives of our country to explore the question of Atlantic Union with representatives of other North Atlantic States. Such legislation has already been cosponsored by nearly 80 House Members. It has passed the Senate. Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, the former Supreme Commander of NATO, has endorsed the resolution. The State Department explained House Joint Resolution 205 "would be consonant with the goals and concepts which this administration is seeking to achieve in transatlantic relationships." The President himself has been a longtime supporter of Atlantic Union and has assured the chief sponsor of the resolution that he would sign it.

Let us wait no longer. Without further delay, let us pass House Joint Resolution 205.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House, making in order legislation creating an Atlantic Union delegation, ought to be defeated without further loss of time.

If there is one thing this country does not need at this time it is another international organization through which to expend the taxpayers' money. The facts of life dictate that there are many of these organizations that ought to be abolished forthwith.

If the countries bordering on the Atlantic want to federate into a one-world organization, why have they made no move to that end? The truth of the matter is that not a single one has demonstrated any real interest. Only a few misguided Americans are carrying this torch.

Amid all the unanswered questions attending the reason for attempting to promote this international organization there is one question to which the answer is self-evident: It will cost \$200,000 just to get it in motion and thereafter the cost to U.S. taxpayers can be anything.

This is the time and place for Members of the House to ask themselves how much of their sovereignty and that of their constituents they are ready to surrender to this proposed one-world outfit.

In the interest of devoting time to something worthwhile, the pending rule should be defeated and the resolution which it makes in order should be sunk without a trace.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in

support of House Joint Resolution 205 creating an Atlantic Union Delegation. I am among the 78 House Members who are sponsors of this legislation.

House Joint Resolution 205 authorizes the appointment of an 18-member delegation to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from other NATO countries to seek agreement on federation as the long-term goal of their present relationships. The supporters of this concept foresee several positive effects that would result from congressional adoption of this resolution. We believe it would demonstrate to our European partners the importance our Nation attaches to the interests of the Atlantic community and to stronger institutional ties with Western Europe as well as Canada. Certainly there is growing awareness on both sides of the Atlantic that solutions must be found to common problems such as monetary and trade policies. We also believe that acceptance of this resolution would lend new confidence in world money markets at a particularly crucial time.

It is important to point out that this resolution merely authorizes the exploration of an agreement and that the proposed convention would have no power to bind or commit our Government. The convention could make recommendations only and these, of course, would be subject to the approval of Congress.

President Nixon has indicated in clear terms his support for the Atlantic Union concept. The administration supports this resolution and has stated that its passage would be in accord with the goal of strengthening the Atlantic community. An identical resolution has already passed the Senate unanimously, and I hope my colleagues in the House will also act favorably to authorize this important American initiative.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HOSMER. 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 197, nays 210, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

YEAS—197

Abzug	Bingham	Carey, N.Y.
Adams	Biatnik	Chisholm
Addabbo	Boggs	Clay
Alexander	Boland	Cleveland
Anderson,	Bolling	Conte
Calif.	Bowen	Conyers
Anderson, Ill.	Brademas	Corman
Annunzio	Brasco	Culver
Arends	Breckinridge	Daniels,
Ashley	Brooks	Dominick V.
Aspin	Broomfield	Danielson
Badillo	Brotzman	Dellenback
Barrett	Brown, Calif.	Dellums
Bennett	Brown, Mich.	Dingell
Bergland	Burke, Mass.	Donohue
Biester	Burton	Drinan

du Pont McCloskey Rooney, Pa.
 Eckhardt McCormack Rostenkowski
 Elberg McDade Ruppe
 Erlenborn McFall Ryan
 Esch McKinney St Germain
 Evans, Colo. Macdonald Sarasin
 Fascell Madigan Sarbanes
 Findley Mallary Schneebell
 Fish Mathias, Calif. Schroeder
 Flood Matsunaga Seiberling
 Foley Mayne Sisk
 Ford, Gerald R. Mazzoli Skubitz
 Ford, Meeds Slack
 William D. Melcher Smith, Iowa
 Forsythe Metcalfe Smith, N.Y.
 Fraser Mezvinsky Stanton
 Frenzel Mills, Md. J. William
 Fulton Mink Stanton
 Giaimo Mitchell, Md. James V.
 Gibbons Moakley Stark
 Gonzalez Mollohan Steelman
 Grasso Moorhead, Pa. Stokes
 Gray Morgan Studds
 Green, Pa. Mosher Sullivan
 Griffiths Moss Symington
 Gubser Murphy, Ill. Thompson, N.J.
 Gude Murphy, N.Y. Thornton
 Hanley Nedzi Udall
 Hanna Nix Van Deerlin
 Harrington Obey Vander Jagt
 Hawkins O'Hara Vanik
 Hébert O'Neill Vigorito
 Heckler, W. Va. Owens Walidie
 Heckler, Mass. Patman Wampier
 Heinz Pepper Ware
 Heistoski Perkins Whalen
 Hogan Pike Whitehurst
 Holtzman Podell Widmull
 Horton Preyer Wiggins
 Howard Price, Ill. Williams
 Hungate Quie Wilson, Bob
 Johnson, Calif. Railsback Winn
 Johnson, Colo. Rangel Wright
 Jordan Rees Wyder
 Karth Regua Yates
 Kluczynski Reid Yatron
 Koch Reuss Young, Ga.
 Kyros Riegle Young, Ill.
 Leggett Rinaldo Zablocki
 Lehman Robison, N.Y. Zwach
 Litton Rodino
 Long, Md. Roncalio, Wyo.

NAYS—210

Abdnor Davis, Ga.
 Andrews, N.C. Davis, S.C.
 Andrews, N. Dak. Davis, Wis.
 Archer de la Garza Johnson, Pa.
 Armstrong Denholm Jones, N.C.
 Ashbrook Dennis Jones, Okla.
 Bafalis Dent Jones, Tenn.
 Baker Derwinski Kastenmeier
 Beard Devine Kazen
 Bevill Dickinson Keating
 Biaggi Dorn Kemp
 Blackburn Downing Ketchum
 Bray Duncan Landgrebe
 Breaux Edwards, Ala. Landrum
 Brinkley Eshleman Latta
 Brown, Ohio Fisher Lent
 Broihill, N.C. Flowers Lott
 Broihill, Va. Flynt Lujan
 Buchanan Fountain McClory
 Burgener Frelinghuysen McCollister
 Burke, Fla. Frey McEwen
 Burleson, Tex. Froehlich McKay
 Burlison, Mo. Fuqua Madden
 Butler Gaydos Mahon
 Byron Gilman Mailliard
 Camp Ginn Mann
 Carney, Ohio Goodling Maraziti
 Carter Green, Oreg. Martin, Nebr.
 Casey, Tex. Gross Martin, N.C.
 Cederberg Grover Mathis, Ga.
 Chamberlain Grover Michel
 Chappell Gunter Milford
 Clancy Guyer Miller
 Clark Haley Mills, Ark.
 Clausen, Don H. Hamilton Minish
 Clawson, Del Hammer Minshall, Ohio
 Cochran Schmidt Mitchell, N.Y.
 Cohen Hanrahan Mizell
 Collier Harsha Montgomery
 Collins Hastings Moorhead,
 Conable Henderson Calif.
 Conlan Hicks Myers
 Cotter Hillis Natcher
 Coughlin Hinshaw Nelsen
 Crane Holt Nichols
 Cronin Hosmer O'Brien
 Daniel, Dan Huber Parris
 Daniel, Robert Hudnut Patten
 W., Jr. Hunt Peyser
 Foage

Powell, Ohio Scherle Thorne
 Price, Tex. Sebellus Tiernan
 Pritchard Shoup Towell, Nev.
 Quillen Shriver Trean
 Randall Shuster Ullman
 Rarick Sikes Veysey
 Rhodes Snyder Waggonner
 Roberts Spence Walsh
 Robinson, Va. Staggers White
 Roe Steed Whitten
 Rogers Steele Wilson, Charles, Tex.
 Roncalio, N.Y. Steiger, Ariz. Stephens
 Rose Stratton Wolff
 Roush Stubblefield Wyatt
 Roussetot Stuckey Wylie
 Roy Runnels Symms Young, Alaska
 Ruth Sandman Talcott Young, Fla.
 Satterfield Taylor, Mo. Young, S.C.
 Taylor, N.C. Taylor, N.C. Young, Tex.
 Saylor Thomson, Wis. Zion

NOT VOTING—26

Bell Holifield Roybal
 Burke, Calif. Jones, Ala. Shipley
 Diggs King Steiger, Wis.
 Dulski Long, La. Teague, Calif.
 Edwards, Calif. McSpadden Teague, Tex.
 Evins, Tenn. Passman Wilson
 Goldwater Pettis Charles H., Calif.
 Hansen, Idaho Pickle
 Hansen, Wash. Rooney, N.Y. Rosenthal
 Harvey

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. King.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Pettis.

Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Pickle.

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. McSpadden.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Passman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

AMNESTY

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

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, once again we are hearing talk of general amnesty for draft dodgers and deserters and once again I rise in solid opposition to these proposals.

I cannot believe a majority of Americans would favor a national policy which would say, in effect, that our citizens now have a choice as to which laws they will obey and which they will violate.

If amnesty were granted those who

chose to abandon responsibility to law, then our entire system of government would be in peril of collapse.

There are those who say we should forgive and forget those who ran when called to serve. They suggest that now the war is done, everyone should be allowed to come home free forever of the stigma they have attached to themselves by fleeing the country rather than serve.

The people I represent do not go along with this kind of thinking. My mail and my conversations with the people of the Fourth District of Florida indicate to me a majority of those I serve agree with me.

I cannot conceive facing the parents of families of those who are still missing in Southeast Asia, or the loved ones of those wounded, or the prisoners of war who now, thankfully, have been returned to us, to tell them their Government ranks their sacrifice no higher than the disservice of a draft dodger.

Each of us has responsibilities to freedom, Mr. Speaker. While we may not always agree with the exact policies of our Government, it is our duty to work within that Government for change. That is what Congress is all about. That is the precise purpose of an election. It is the function of a public forum. Most assuredly those who run from responsibility should not be given the cloak of amnesty.

I hope the day never comes when there are alterations in that policy.

This Nation was founded on compassion for human beings, with justice for all. To grant amnesty would be to abandon the concept of uniform justice, for amnesty would destroy justice and make it a mockery. Those who chose to cut and run should pay the penalty for what they have done against their homeland.

FAYETTEVILLE MAN CHALLENGES DETROIT

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, for many years, a constituent and good friend of mine, Arthur Zankowski of Fayetteville, N.Y., has been working on a dream. Mr. Zankowski is an inventor, and his dream is a highly modified, efficient, and inexpensive internal combustion engine.

Recently, an article appeared in the Syracuse New Times concerning Art and his efforts. I commend the article to my colleagues:

[From the Syracuse New Times, Mar. 8, 1973]

FAYETTEVILLE MAN CHALLENGES DETROIT

(By Ellis B. Simon)

A Fayetteville inventor with a ninth-grade education has developed an auto pollution control system which is so efficient that it is far beyond anything Detroit technologists believe can be built. For 16 years, Arthur Zankowski has worked on a system which reduces emissions of a standard internal combustion engine to the point where it can be run in a closed room without harming humans.

Zankowski's system recycles exhaust back into the engine. "Detroit treats exhaust as a 'sewer,'" whereas my fundamental belief has been that the exhaust is really a rich source of elements and energy," he said.

The basic components of engine exhausts are hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide and nitrous oxides. In Zankowski's system, these

are converted through a series of chemical and physical reactions into water vapor and carbon dioxide.

However, the exhaust still includes minute traces of the original exhaust products. These amounts, the inventor claims, are less than 10 parts per million—far below the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) standards for 1975 and 1976, which require 500 to 600 parts per million.

The water vapor produced is condensed and recycled. It is broken down into hydrogen and oxygen—the hydrogen used to enrich the gasoline and the oxygen to support combustion.

In a large engine, the water can also be used to cool the engine block, replacing the need for a radiator and water pump. Zankowski also envisions the possibility of taking the water vapor, heating it with raw exhausts and using it to drive a steam turbine.

The most fascinating feature about Zankowski's system is its ability to operate without air intake. Although some air intake is needed to get the engine started, as the system begins producing oxygen and building pressure, there is a sufficient oxygen-fuel mixture to eliminate the need for additional outside air. Zankowski's one-cylinder engine can maintain 2,600 revolutions per minute (maximum of 3,200 rpm) without air intake. Thus, a carburetor is not needed.

Other advantages of Zankowski's system are more efficient use of fuel and ability to run on crude gasoline without additives. In fact, he claims additives have a negative effect on the engine's performance. In addition, there would be no parts to replace during the lifetime of the engine block and maintenance costs would be minimal.

In contrast to this, Detroit-designed systems would require use of more gasoline with additional additives. The Detroit plan also requires a catalytic muffler which would have to be replaced every 12,000 miles.

DETROIT DIFFERENCE

Zankowski feels Detroit and he are moving in opposite directions because of the different approaches manufacturers take to the pollution problem; Detroit's approach is based on technology and his based on science. He explained that the scientist tries to determine, by whatever means he can realize, the constituent parts of a system—whereas the technician tries to take the present "state of the art" knowledge and try to force it into various designs and engineering postures which in no way relate to the overall problem.

"I treat the entire sequence of events and its component chemical and physical reactions as a total environment. Detroit does it piecemeal," Zankowski said.

Zankowski has applied for a United States patent for his air control system and has formed a corporation, AZAPCO Inc., to fund continuing work on the system. He has also enlisted the aid of several local scientists in his research. Zankowski has sent copies of the patent application to various Detroit auto interests and Curtiss-Wright, inventor of the Wankel rotary engine.

Detroit manufacturers and the federal government have shown no interest in Zankowski's work, despite efforts by Rep. James M. Hanley, D-Syracuse, to get government officials to examine the system. Fuji Heavy Industries of Japan, manufacturers of the Subaru car, is the only firm to have sent a representative to see the system in action.

TOO OBVIOUS?

Zankowski feels the lack of interest on the part of the American manufacturers may be due to the simplicity of his mechanical design. He is critical of a "Detroit syndrome" among government environmental officials, who believe only Detroit technicians can solve the problem of automobile pollution. "This Detroit syndrome has done more to

stifle research into this area than any other factor," he said.

Zankowski's involvement in his pollution control system started 16 years ago as a small spare-time project and has grown to be his whole life. In 1957 he was fishing on Lake Oneida and became annoyed by the fumes and oil slicks produced by the small engine on his boat.

He underwent an intensive study of physics and chemistry to learn the principles behind his early discoveries. He postulated new hypotheses, which he applied to the development of his pollution-control system.

Expressing the personal significance of his work, Zankowski said: "If nothing ever happens from this, I've got the satisfaction of knowing I did it."

RUSSIA RELENTS ON SOVIET JEWRY

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

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, as one of the many supporters of the Mills-Vanik bill which authorized economic sanctions against the Soviet Union if that country did not relent in its policy of discrimination against its Jewish citizens, I am pleased to have recently received a letter from Rabbi Israel Miller, president of the American Zionist Federation, thanking each of us for our actions.

Rabbi Miller said that our bill was of considerable assistance in forcing the Soviet Government to remove its deplorable "diploma tax" of up to \$30,000 against educated Jews who wish to emigrate to Israel.

I know that my colleagues who also supported the Mills-Vanik bill are equally proud to know that our efforts in this fight against injustice were successful. I only hope that our victory today is not a hollow one, which will disappear whenever the Soviet dictatorship feels it to be advantageous to once again persecute Jews in their midst.

We in this great country have made many advances in our relations with different races and ethnic groups which comprise our population. Although discrimination still exists, the dedicated efforts of such leaders as Abraham Lincoln, Louis Brandeis, Martin Luther King, and other advocates of freedom for all peoples have not been in vain.

And, if America's pursuit of equality for our people is to be taken seriously, then we must also be on guard against such injustices abroad.

At this time, I would like to insert Rabbi Miller's letter in the RECORD:

AMERICAN ZIONIST FEDERATION,
New York, N.Y., March 28, 1973.
Hon. ANTONIO B. W. PAT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PAT: There can be no question that the responsible leadership you have provided in lending your support and name to the Mills-Vanik Bill, relating to the granting of most-favored-nation status to the Soviet Union, has resulted in recent moves by the Soviet authorities to ameliorate the edict on the diploma tax. On behalf of the more than 600,000 enrolled Zionists joined in the American Zionist Federation, I offer my sincere thanks for the efforts you have made which resulted in what we hope

is a break-through, in at least one aspect of Jewish emigration. We trust that the inhuman and onerous ransom tax will soon be officially abrogated for all and we must continue to press for the rights of an unhampered, free emigration. The Bill will help achieve this goal.

This is not just a Jewish question but one which, as a moral issue, concerns all men. Your actions have again emphasized your leadership in the struggle for human rights.

We wish you continued success.

Very truly yours,
Rabbi ISRAEL MILLER,
President.

TAXATION OF RETIREMENT CONTRIBUTIONS

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

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that litigation is now pending in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan questioning the Government's entitlement currently to tax the contributions of Federal employees to the civil service retirement and disability fund. The National Association of Internal Revenue Employees and the AFL-CIO Letter Carriers maintain that income tax should be levied against such contributions at the time they are returned to the employees in the form of retirement annuities. This, of course, would make such funds taxable at a time when an employee's income is reduced and so the tax rate applicable to such funds would be lower.

On March 29, 1973, the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives notified all Members and employees of the House as follows:

The outcome of this case could result for certain individual taxpayers, in substantial refunds on income taxes paid over the last few years. Resolution of this case will be a lengthy matter of appeals that could take it all the way to the Supreme Court.

Section 6511 of the Internal Revenue Code provides that claims for refunds be made within three years from the date the income tax return was filed or two years from the time the tax was paid. Since the statute of limitations is applicable in this matter, the Clerk wrote on February 22, 1973, to the Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, seeking the optimum way to protect the rights of House Members and employees. The Commissioner replied on March 21, 1973 advising "taxpayers to file protective Claim, Form 843, in order to preserve their rights to possible refunds" together with filing instructions

Today, together with my colleague, Congressman JEROME R. WALDIE, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on Retirement and Employee Benefits of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am introducing legislation which I believe to be a better way of approaching the problem. In essence, the legislation would suspend the running of the statute of limitations on income tax returns for the years 1969 on, by operation of law, until the litigation has been finally concluded. This legislative protection of the rights of civil servants has the following advantages over the approach suggested by the Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service:

First. It eliminates the need for 2 million civil servants to file forms to preserve their rights pending final court decision;

Second. It eliminates the need for the Internal Revenue Service to handle and file 2 million forms;

Third. It takes care of the many thousands of civil servants across the country who do not even know the question exists and that they might be entitled to refunds at some future date, but who would be barred by the applicable 3-year statute of limitation; and

Fourth. It avoids the possibility discussed by John Cramer in his "9 to 4:30" column in the Washington Evening Star and Daily News of March 10, 1973, that the filing of a claim of rebate would "almost guarantee IRS will audit their returns for the years in which rebates are claimed. On its face that has the ring of an ugly threat. Actually, it pretty much states a fact." Whether true or false there can be no doubt that such an allegation would discourage some faithful, hard-working Government employees from filing protective claims even though they have been honest and conscientious in the preparation of their tax returns.

I emphasize that this legislation does not address the substantive question of whether a Government employee's compensation withheld and contributed to the retirement and disability fund is taxable income in the year it was withheld. The bill merely preserves the rights of the employees until the courts determine this question.

To do anything less would be grossly unjust, and to require millions of protective filings would be grossly inefficient.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND ABUSE PREVENTION ACT

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, on March 29 I introduced H.R. 3179, the Child Development and Abuse Prevention Act. This bill, which has the bipartisan support of more than 45 of my colleagues, is designed to serve as a vehicle for an in-depth examination of the medical, sociological, and legal aspects of child abuse and to promote reasoned and effective solutions.

On Saturday, March 31, in Denver, I was privileged to join with the Senate sponsor of a substantially identical bill, WALTER F. MONDALE, in hearings held by his Subcommittee on Children and Youth. We heard 4 hours of testimony from nationally recognized authorities in the field about the magnitude and seriousness of the problem.

Dr. C. Henry Kempe, director of the widely acclaimed Center for Child Abuse and Neglect in Denver, lead a team of witnesses which articulately and with obvious compassion addressed itself to the many and varied aspects of the problem.

We are all aware of the atrocities being committed against an incredible number of children in this country. But many of us, including myself, are perhaps a little less aware of the long-range implications.

I would like to quote from the testimony of Grant M. Steele, a psychiatrist working with the Denver center:

It is now recognized that the abusive parent of today was the abused child of yesterday. The transmission of this form of aggressive discharge is transmitted from generation to generation, repeating its tragic injuries. Some abused children doubtless grow up to be essentially normal, healthy adults. In other instances the experience of being subjected to violence in the earliest formative years of life seem to provide the seeds for aggressive and violent behavior in later life. There is an increasing body of evidence that from the great pool of neglected and battered children come significant numbers of juvenile delinquents, murderers and assassins. The development of aggressive behavior in the abused child is a crucially important aspect of our ongoing studies.

If compassion is not sufficient motivation for action in this area, then perhaps self-protection will be.

The studies and programs being carried out in Denver are impressive. Imaginative and positive strides are being taken to develop more insight and to discover better methods of dealing with the problem. However, it is just a beginning. More programs like that are needed to effectively reach the estimated 60,000 children a year who are now abused.

I am reintroducing this bill today with additional cosponsors. Child abuse is a national problem that deserves national attention.

HORSEMEAT

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, bogus remedies, quack prescriptions, and fake maneuvers are being proposed concerning meat prices. I noticed in the media stories attributed to the late Premier Khrushchev of Russia recommending horsemeat. This ghoulish suggestion is incredible. We do not need the advice of the late Premier Khrushchev, nor for that matter the advice of Mr. Brezhnev, Mr. Kosygin, or Mr. Podgorny, who, through the well known "Wheat Deal," are the recipients of American feed grains, which of course creates a scarcity of grain and therefore raises the price of meat.

Mr. Speaker, any moment now I expect to hear again of kangaroo meat pouring into this country as hamburger meat. With kangaroo meat, horsemeat, billy-goat meat and donkey meat, along with other proposals, we could well undermine the finest standards of meat in the world, now provided for the American housewife. Mr. Speaker, the meat consumer is protected in our country by high standards and good legislation.

A rollback of prices to January would put many feeder cattle farmers out of business. We need more cattle farmers in the business and with fair prices to the farmer, by his superior production, prices will level off. It is as simple as the law of supply and demand. We are not going to solve the meat situation by lambasting the farmer, crippling his production, rolling back prices, and importing bogus meat.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the cattle farmer is not the cause of the high cost of beef and pork. For the first time in 25 years the cattle farmer is receiving a fair price for cattle and hogs. The cattle and hog producer has borne the high cost of fertilizer, machinery, high interest rates and taxes, and has contended constantly with "money changers in the temple."

Mr. Speaker, the article referred to which follows below appeared in the media throughout the Nation Sunday morning:

KHRUSHCHEV PROMOTED VIRTUES OF HORSEMEAT

NEW YORK.—President Nixon might take a page from Nikita Khrushchev's book in easing the beef crisis.

Faced with a severe meat shortage in 1964, the late Soviet premier went on a cross-country tour promoting the virtues of horse meat (which, indeed, some beef-starved Americans have been trying in recent days).

"I have tasted horse meat and it is delicious," Khrushchev told a farm-belt audience in Kazakhstan in August, 1964.

"Nothing tastes better than 'friendship sausage,'" he said. "Friendship sausage" is the name he gave to a wurst made from horse meat and pork.

"Fried horse meat is remarkable," he went on. "It is worthwhile to develop horse breeding to supplement meat resources."

The beefy premier concluded: "He who cannot eat horse meat need not do so. Let him eat pork. But he who cannot eat pork, let him eat horse meat."

The advice went down particularly hard in Kazakhstan, which has a heavily Moslem population. Moslem are not allowed to eat pork.

Three years earlier, on the same theme, Khrushchev pronounced in a nationwide radio broadcast, "Horsemeat is very nourishing and has many calories and is very cheap."

He said he felt sorry for anybody who hadn't tried horse meat. "But once they have tasted it," he promised, "you will not be able to drag them by the ears from this meat."

PROPOSED FOREIGN AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have withheld comment on aid to North Vietnam until our prisoners of war were safely home. I did not want to do or say anything that might cause the North Vietnamese to back down on the release of all our prisoners.

Now that all our POW's are back on American soil and the North Vietnamese can no longer use them as a political football, I can publicly say emphatically that not one American penny of foreign aid should go to North Vietnam.

All of the fish in the Gulf of Mexico could be caught and cooked from one big jubilee and my position would still not change.

As I see it, there are basically three trains of thought here in the Congress on the subject at present.

One group says it would not oppose aid to North Vietnam if it was done through a third party and there was no direct American presence. This view holds that unilateral aid could prove never-ending and, worse, that it might again entrap the United States in a military involvement in Asia.

Another group argues that there are plenty of worthy poor people and programs in America that need help. They are calling on the Government to meet the needs of American cities before financing the rebuilding of North Vietnam.

Then there is a broad view which is strongly opposed to aid of any form to North Vietnam at any time. I share this broad view.

It has been speculated that the President agreed to consider aid to North Vietnam in the peace talks because it was a bargaining point which helped to bring the agreement about. Aid to its conquered enemies has always been a part of America's history.

Now, I am not going to fault the President for agreeing to aid in order to get our boys home. But that does not mean I have got to vote for it when it comes before the Congress.

We have not conquered anyone. In fact, North Vietnam is claiming victory. Maybe, then, they ought to give us some aid.

It was different in World War II. Japan and Germany were totally defeated. They both offered unconditional surrender. We felt an obligation to help these defeated people rebuild into economically self-dependent countries. It is no secret that we were trying to keep them from falling under the influence of the Communists.

In Vietnam, we would be foolish if we did not realistically recognize that the north will vigorously continue to try to bring the south into its fold; and, yes, we would be foolish, too, not to recognize that the Communist world will vigorously continue to bring all of Indochina under its influence.

In fact there have been massive movements of men and equipment by North Vietnam into South Vietnam since the peace agreement, in direct violation of its terms. The cease-fire has been little more than a veil for Communist military activity.

The aid to the north being mentioned by the President would amount to up to \$2.5 billion over the next 4 years. This equals the annual economic assistance to North Vietnam in recent years from Russia and European countries combined. In addition, China is expected to increase its aid and Japan is considering sending aid to North Vietnam.

If American aid is given to the North Vietnamese, it, like the bad coin, will consistently show up in the future to

haunt us. It would almost be a certainty that most of this aid would be used to promote the north's ambitions of conquer toward the south.

If Russia and China are so strong on the subject of rebuilding North Vietnam, let them provide the money. While they are at it, they can also contribute toward the rebuilding of South Vietnam, which has had widespread destruction caused by the Communist aggressors.

It is impossible to forget two additional facts while considering this subject. First, there are still over 1,000 Americans missing in action in Southeast Asia. Aid to North Vietnam should not even be considered until there is a full and complete accounting for these men. Second, the hearts and minds of all Americans have been shocked by the accounts of torture and abuse which our prisoners of war suffered at the hands of North Vietnam and the Vietcong. Rather than concerning itself with aid to North Vietnam, the United States should urge every possible international sanction of these savage actions. Every nation of the world should join together in total, unabridged condemnation of the inhumane acts which the North Vietnamese and Vietcong performed on our prisoners of war. These barbaric actions and the use of our men under duress as propaganda tools stamp on North Vietnam even more indelibly than before the classification of "outlaw nation."

Mr. Speaker, it will be up to the Congress to appropriate money for aid, and I can say now that the North Vietnamese are going to have a long wait at the wharf before I approve of any American dollars being shipped to North Vietnam.

PROPOSAL TO RECONSTITUTE FBI AS INDEPENDENT AGENCY

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

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Democratic leadership in the Senate introduced legislation to divorce the Federal Bureau of Investigation from the Department of Justice. Under the proposal offered by Senator ROBERT BYRD and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the FBI would be reconstituted as an independent agency within the executive branch of Government. Its Director and its Deputy Director would serve 7-year terms after confirmation by the Senate.

Although both Senator BYRD and Senator MANSFIELD are able and responsible men, their bill to establish an independent FBI is one of the most shortsighted and dangerous proposals ever introduced in the Congress of the United States.

It is a proposal that flies in the face of logic and experience.

It is a blueprint for an irresponsible national police force in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal may be an extreme overreaction to the relationship that developed between the FBI

and the White House staff during the Watergate investigation.

It may be the jaded inspiration of disgruntled FBI executives who were uncomfortable with the reformist tendencies of L. Patrick Gray.

It may be an attempt to embarrass the administration.

Whatever it is, it is a proposal that should be universally condemned as contrary to sound principles of American Government.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the proponents of this measure have learned anything from our recent history. The plain truth is that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in the last years of J. Edgar Hoover's administration, was sharply criticized for being high-handed and unresponsive to Executive leadership. It did not always come to grips with major problems in the country.

I admire the FBI. I believe it is a magnificent law enforcement organization. I am convinced that history will recognize J. Edgar Hoover as one of our Nation's greatest public servants. But I believe there is truth to the charge that the FBI failed to become actively involved in the fight against organized crime and the struggle for civil rights until strong Executive pressure was applied to it during the Kennedy administration.

In later years, the extreme tension that existed between the FBI and Attorney General Ramsey Clark was undesirable and contrary to the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I choose my words carefully when I say that the FBI has been known over a period of many years to willfully and deliberately mislead officials of the Department of Justice over things both great and small, and on occasion to be as unresponsive and independent of Executive direction as the most intransigent bureaucracy.

To establish the absolute autonomy of this massive investigative agency, with its millions of files and thousands of agents deployed across America, would be, in my judgment, to create a monster in our midst. This must not be permitted. The great organs of public opinion in our country must sound the alarm.

Senator BYRD contends—and I quote:

For the Director of the largest investigation and law enforcement agency in the world to remain responsible to a politically oriented Cabinet officer is to leave wide open the door for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to become an investigative and enforcement arm of a politically motivated Attorney General.

Perhaps. But a far greater danger would exist for America if the largest investigation and law enforcement agency in the world became the arm of a politically oriented and motivated FBI Director, who was responsible to no one. That is the danger of the Byrd bill.

A Director with a 7-year term of office could easily be the political adversary of the President—a political adversary on the most sensitive and delicate issues of our national life. If this hap-

pened, some of the security information most vitally needed by the President might be supplied to the Chief Executive only at the pleasure of the FBI Director. The President would lack the leverage and the power to remove a director who was plainly recalcitrant and working against the interests of his administration. This would be intolerable.

In another bill introduced last week by Senator JACKSON, the suggested term of the Director of the FBI is 15 years. This would provide the Director with even greater independence—and an even greater potential for abuse. Equally ominous is the provision in the Jackson bill that would limit and confine the directorship to persons with at least 10 years experience within the FBI. This provision would assure that new blood would never be infused into the organization. The FBI would remain closed to new ideas, closed to new leadership.

Mr. Speaker, responsible Members of Congress must stop the Byrd bill and the Jackson bill at the outset because they represent an alien reaction to our present situation.

Let us build the FBI into an organization that all Americans can trust and be proud of, not an organization that will threaten our freedom.

WARMAKING RESPONSIBILITIES OF CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT

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

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to define the war making responsibilities of the Congress and the President. This legislation and the other legislation that has already been introduced by my colleagues comes in response to the deep sense of frustration which we all experienced during the seemingly interminable Vietnam conflict. But underlying this sense of frustration was the apparent inability of the Congress to share responsibility in the direction of the hostilities. In short, Vietnam began as and continued to be throughout its course a President's war.

The continuation of the war, however, had the effect of reducing the Congress' range of options to only two viable alternatives: To simply approve that action of the President after the fact or attempt to seize the initiative by second-guessing the Commander in Chief. Neither choice was consonant with the design of the Constitution. While the Constitution conferred on the President the powers of the Commander in Chief, it explicitly reserved in the Congress the authority to declare war. It is implicit from this division of responsibility that the collective judgment of both the Congress and the President should prevail in the commitment of United States Armed Forces into hostilities. Any permanent imbalance between the powers could eventually bring this country to the threshold of one man rule—the very end which the framers of the Constitution so cautiously sought to avoid.

The Constitution, however, is a living document and it cannot be viewed in a vacuum. Therefore, in drafting legislation which attempts to restore the balance between the President and the Congress, I attempted to incorporate the so-called gloss of practice which is consistent with the intent of the framers. One such practice which I think that we all recognize as a legitimate gloss on the Constitution is the right of the President to take decisive action when our territories, possessions or citizens are directly endangered by a hostile nation. Historically this appears to be a necessary expedient. My bill is careful to recognize such authority. While I did not attempt to circumscribe this emergency authority, I have included a provision which requires the President to report promptly and periodically whenever he takes such action. This is one of the keystones of the legislation. In the past Congress has apparently lacked adequate information for action rather than lacking the resolve to act. Without sufficient intelligence data, the Congress can never fully shoulder the responsibility of war-making authority. Our partnership with the Executive under the Constitution must necessarily rest on the cooperation of the executive branch and on their ability to marshal adequate information for the Congress. This is a minimum first step; without the necessary facts about a hostility, Congress would again be placed in the position of trying to second-guess the President.

While recognizing the power of the President to act decisively in situations where national interests are directly threatened, my bill would circumscribe the authority of the President when he acts unilaterally in a situation where our national interests are not directly affected. The bill in effect grants only provisional authority to the President for carrying out such hostilities, and it provides the framework for revoking that authority by the passage of a joint resolution. Upon adoption of such resolution of disapproval, the President is directed to disengage from hostilities as quickly as possible with due regard for the safety of the troops involved.

I do not think this in any way confers powers that the President has not already assumed. Presidents in our history have taken unilateral action in situations where there was no direct national interest; however, there was no predefined framework for terminating such action by the Congress. My bill not only attempts to define more precisely the limits on the President in such unilateral actions, but it also provides the guidelines for congressional response to such action.

I am fully aware that many of my colleagues have drafted their own versions, very different from my own, and they all believe equally in the wisdom of their own approaches. I urge them, however, to carefully examine my resolution. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments, I had the benefit of participating in extensive hearings in which we closely examined the whole range of legislation

on the point. Under the able leadership of Chairman ZABLOCKI we all engaged in searching colloquies with an impressive list of witnesses. In my bill, I have tried to incorporate the teachings of those hearings.

My bill attempts to avoid the pitfalls of needless specificity and avoids the temptation of hamstringing the President. I do not think any bill could be drafted which would make adequate provision for every conceivable situation which might arise. At the same time I think it is sufficiently specific to define the powers of the Congress and the President so that collective wisdom and responsibility in warmaking situations will prevail.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and I welcome their comments. With the permission of the Speaker I would like to have the full text of my resolution printed at this point in the RECORD:

H.J. RES. 498

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this joint resolution may be cited as the "War Powers Resolution of 1973."

Sec. 2. It is the purpose of this joint resolution to fulfill the intent of the framers of the Constitution of the United States, and insure that the cumulative judgment of both the Congress and the President will apply to the initiation of hostilities involving the Armed Forces of the United States and the continuation of such hostilities. While Congress reaffirms its power under the Constitution to declare war, the Congress recognizes that, in certain extraordinary and emergency circumstances, the President has the authority to defend the United States and its citizens without specific prior authorization by the Congress.

Sec. 3. In the absence of a declaration of war or a specific authorization by the Congress, the President may take action to involve the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, or in situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated, to respond to any act or situation that directly endangers the United States, its territories or possessions, or its citizens or nationals, when he determines that extraordinary and emergency circumstances do not permit specific prior authorization by the Congress.

Sec. 4. In any case in which the President, in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress, takes any action to involve Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, or in any situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated, he promptly shall submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President pro tempore of the Senate a report setting forth—

(1) a full account of circumstances under which he took such action;

(2) his estimate of the scope of United States involvement in any such hostilities or situation;

(3) the constitutional, legislative, or treaty provisions, if any, under the authority of which he took such action; and

(4) his reasons, if any, for not seeking specific prior authorization by the Congress. The President shall, so long as Armed Forces of the United States continue to be involved in any such hostilities or situation, make periodic reports to the Congress on the status of any such hostilities or situation not less often than once every three months.

Sec. 5. In the absence of a declaration of

war by the Congress, whenever the President takes any action under section 3 of this joint resolution involving Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, or in any situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated, both Houses of the Congress immediately shall consider authorization for such involvement of Armed Forces of the United States and the expenditure of funds therefor. In the event the Congress is not in session, the President shall convene Congress in extraordinary session in order that it may take appropriate action.

Sec. 6. In any case in which, in the absence of a declaration of war or specific prior authorization by the Congress, the President takes any action resulting in involvement of Armed Forces of the United States in armed conflict outside the United States, its territories and possessions, to respond to any act or situation that does not directly endanger the United States, its territories or possessions, or its citizens or nationals, the Congress may, by joint resolution disapprove such action. Upon adoption of any such joint resolution of disapproval, the President shall proceed at once to effect the immediate disengagement of the Armed Forces of the United States involved, including whatever withdrawal is required, taking into consideration the need to protect such forces from attack while in the process of withdrawal.

H.R. 6767, THE TRADE REFORM ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, less than a month ago the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means presented a comprehensive blueprint on U.S. trade policy and legislation. He highlighted the urgency of charting a course in foreign trade and the fact that since neither Japan nor Europe has yet demonstrated the political capacity to take the lead, the United States must therefore do so.

The administration has shown the general objectives we must seek in sending to the Congress the Trade Reform Act of 1973, which I have today cosponsored with Chairman MILLS. Under our constitutional system, Congress must cooperate with the President by developing legislation that will enable the President to realize our goals. This, as in the past, must be a truly bipartisan effort.

The administration's bill responds to the trade and other economic problems we face in the world today. We live in a world of rapid change, a world where the amazing growth of world trade has brought far greater interdependence than anyone could have anticipated. In recognition of this central fact, the bill is designed to dampen and eliminate the frictions and tensions that have arisen in our international economic relations.

It requests tariff authority to promote free trade and to attack the problem of tariff discrimination. A basis would be provided for negotiating away the vast complex of government measures which are nontariff barriers. Agriculture, a sector of international trade greatly affected by nontariff barriers, will be foremost in our minds. On this area we enjoy a strong international competitive advantage.

The bill recognizes that labor and industry need better assurances than are now provided that serious injury or the threat thereof from imports will be dealt with more effectively and expeditiously. The President will be authorized to cope better with unfair trade practices and unfair competition confronting American firms and workers.

The bill would also provide a basis for the mutual expansion trade with communist countries through the extension of most favored nation treatment. Finally, the bill would fulfill this Government's promise to share, with our major trading partners, in a meaningful and mutually advantageous system of tariff preferences for developing countries.

I welcome the opportunity to share with my colleagues in the Congress this unique opportunity to cooperate with the Administration by fashioning a new vehicle to deal with the international trade problems we face in a way that is responsive to the needs of the next decade.

ROLE OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, our outstanding majority leader, THOMAS "Tip" O'NEILL, Senator CHARLES MATHIAS, of Maryland, and Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, Time correspondent Neil MacNeil, Dr. Kistiakowsky, and moderator Hedley Donovan, recently discussed how to get Members of Congress concerned enough about the institutional integrity of the Congress to act upon those convictions while attending a meeting of the Time, Inc., symposia on "The Role of Congress." I include their remarks in today's RECORD:

We must have some kind of a solution where we can bring into the mainstream of America the rights that truly belong to the House and Senate.

Sen. RIBICOFF. Tip, if I may add, you threw out a very good point. Today, The Office of Management and Budget is part of the Executive Branch of the Government and is not available to Congress. It treats Congress contemptuously.

Rep. O'NEILL. In the same vein, we put the GAO in as an arm of Congress and what kind of arm of Congress is it today?

Sen. RIBICOFF. I say the only way Congress can handle the problem is by having its own congressional Office of the Budget. The Office of Management and Budget does its job for the President and there must be a bureau that does a comparable job for the Congress so that the congressional Appropriations Committees have a complete analysis of problems, programs, cost, and justification.

So, therefore, when the President sends up his budget, Congress is armed with the material and the knowledge to know what it is talking about. In the last four or five budgets the difference between the presidential budget and the congressional budget has only been about 2%. Generally Congress has become a rubber stamp for the Executive with only an occasional debate in which we cut \$50 million here or add \$100 million there. The only way Congress is going to be able to deal on equal terms with the presidency is

if Congress has its own congressional Office of the Budget.

Prof. YARMOLINSKY. Adam Yarmolinsky. Mr. Chairman, there are, I believe some 2,000,000 civilian employees of the Executive Branch of the Government. Half of those 2,000,000 are blue-collar employees. Even if we assume that 90% of the remainder are not occupied in tasks that relate to formulation of the budget, it seems to me awfully difficult for Congress to match the remaining 10%, or 100,000 employees, on its own side in order to work out the details of the budget the Executive has promulgated.

Therefore, I would like to suggest that in order for the Congress to be effective in playing its role in the constitutional scheme, it will have to show the courage of its convictions in developing legislatively the kinds of general statements of legislative principle apart from the carefully worked out and staffed, overstaffed detail that emerges from the Executive Branch. This should still be possible in a society to some extent governed by reason.

And I would suggest also that as a first step towards moving into that kind of responsible role, Congress has got to take an overview of the federal budget. It must enunciate in the broadest categories the kind of statements of national priorities which cannot emerge from an appropriation committee necessarily concerned with matters of detail, but which have to emerge from a kind of national authorization committee. Such a committee would do in the authorization process what the appropriations committee does in the appropriations process.

Dr. PEABODY. I am Robert Peabody and I teach at Johns Hopkins in the State of Maryland. The question I have relates very much to the question posed earlier. I have been intrigued by this continual paradox that Congress has its lowest esteem in the eyes of the public when it is thwarting the will of the President or doing very little. Contrarily, when it is passing the President's program, as it was, for example, in the 89th Congress, in terms of public response it has its strongest marks.

My question is what are Congress and the mass media doing generally to counteract this paradox?

Sen. MATHIAS. Well, frankly I don't know what the answer to that is. It is a paradox. When Congress is really doing what the Constitution intended it to do, which is to act as a check and a balance, then it gets into trouble with the voters. And it is that kind of a problem which I think we have to address on a national educational basis. Now, this may not help Tip O'Neill or Father Drinan or Abe Ribicoff or any of us when we have to come up for election. But maybe it will help the next generation of Congressmen if people understand what the Congress is trying to do. Really it gets back to Neil MacNeil's original question, how do you institutionalize these questions, how do you make people understand that what you are doing is acting as a Congressman, that you are not fighting the President, that you are not being personally antagonistic to him, but you are trying to do your job and present a different point of view.

In the present climate, and let me say I have had a little experience in this, it is damn near impossible.

Mr. DONOVAN. Father Drinan, don't you want to use a little of your own time?

Rep. DRINAN. Thank you, Mr. Donovan. I am sort of disappointed in this meeting. I share Tip O'Neill's wonderment at your having two distinguished Senators on this panel. If you want to hear about the House, why don't you have a person from the House? Why don't you have Congressman O'Neill or someone else? I am the first one to criticize the House of Representatives. It has been

criticized here tonight, and rightly. But let's get to the source of why it is criticized.

We have a lot of tyranny in the House of Representatives, and if Time magazine wants to expose it, I will help them to expose it. Send me your people and I will tell you of the tyrannies to which I and other members of the House are subjected every single day. The giveaway of the power to the President of spending \$250 billion and having an item veto was passed in the House because we have a closed rule. It is the tyranny of the Rules Committee that allowed that. It is the tyranny of Wilbur Mills that says: "I want a closed rule. I decided, the Ways and Means committee decided, and you don't decide." I haven't a single way to remove Wilbur Mills or any of the other tyrants that dominate the House of Representatives.

We are told by Dr. Fenn, and quite rightly, that we are failing institutionally. And yet we have no way of getting the media to tell the people what the House of Representatives is. I feel this is the typical situation. I come, listen to two distinguished Senators and to a professor, and the House of Representatives is excoriated as perhaps it should be. But we are never heard, and the people are never told what the House of Representatives should be.

I don't know what Time is going to do after this. All I can say is it is a good idea. I spent four or five hours here tonight, I haven't learned much, but I know all these things, and I don't know what you are going to do with this distinguished group or with these people after this. But I say if the House of Representatives is going to be criticized as it should be, then we should have a voice and you should come to us and let the people know the severe problem.

It is totally undercover and this is the typical situation, to repeat, two Senators speak and the House of Representatives is never heard. It is a total distortion, total failure of knowledge. All I can say is that Time and all the media owe it to the House and owe it to the people to explain that this is the House of the people and if you want a good Congress, then you have to open the doors to the House and let the people in and let them understand. Thank you.

Mr. DONOVAN. Neil, would you like to be the mediator for a minute?

Mr. MACNEIL. I am inclined to agree with the Congressman on the neglect by the press generally over many, many years of the Congress totally, and especially the House of Representatives. It was partially this that brought me as a journalist to write a book on the House. I think in the pages of Time over the years we have actually paid special attention to the House. But I'd like to speak to some other points that have been made.

One suggested something I agree with, that Congressmen today are technological illiterates. They can't read or write the language of computers. They do have a number of computers, working, they work on payroll and salaries, they address envelopes to Congressmen's constituents, which is something far different from what the Executive Branch is using these machines for.

Congress can't function in a meaningful way in response to the Executive Branch or take initiatives of its own until it has that kind of equipment. Professor Yarmolinsky suggested that Congress show the courage of its convictions. Senator Mathias suggested that Congress has been a little timid. I don't agree with the Senator. He is very kind to his colleagues. Congress is scared to death to spend the money on these machines. It wouldn't cost all that much.

We talk about the size of the Executive Branch, 6,000,000, including 2.7 million people if just civilians are counted. Congress has a staff totaling about 32,000, and Congressmen are afraid to add to their staffs. They are afraid for two reasons. One is what

we in the press will suggest that if a Congressman adds another man to his payroll it is a wild extravagance meant to serve only his own personal political purposes.

The second fear is what this does to those people who read what we write. I think if the Congress came forward quite openly and made the case to equip itself with the professional staffs and the computers necessary to deal effectively with these public issues, a great part of the problem would be reduced.

But this requires something that Senator Ribicoff has mentioned, the will to so act and the courage to see Congress in terms of an assembly of constitutional integrity. Too many of its members do not see it today.

Mr. DONOVAN. Thank you, Neil. Professor Samuel Huntington wanted to make a comment, I believe.

Prof. HUNTINGTON. I'd like to take a slight exception to some of the language, if not to the substance and spirit, of what has been said here. It seems to me there is an American tendency, whichever side one is on, to over-emphasize the unity and coherence of the other side. And this was very clear, I think, in international relations in the 1950s when we talked about monolithic Communism, when in fact the Communist bloc was splitting apart, but we failed to recognize it.

And I have been somewhat concerned here about the phrase which has been used quite often, the Executive Branch, as if that were a monolithic unity. It seems to me quite clearly it isn't, and that we are really concerned with two different problems so far as the authority and power of Congress is concerned. One is the power of the presidency and the other is the power of the bureaucracy.

In fact, while our Constitution says that we have three separate branches of Government, in fact we have four separate branches of Government. In addition to the legislature and the Executive and the judiciary there is the bureaucracy. It is the power of the bureaucracy that has grown tremendously in recent years, in addition to that of the presidency.

It seems to me that one of the major problems of Congress is to exploit the power of the bureaucracy for its own purposes. And certainly if one looks at what people who have been in the White House and associated with Presidents say, they don't view the Congress as their main enemy; they think of the bureaucracy, those people downtown, as being the real center of opposition to what the President wants.

And one can see President Nixon reacting to this in terms of centralizing, trying to centralize more and more power in the White House. I would ask this question: If Congress thinks it is in the national interest and its own interest to curtail the power of the President, why can't it capitalize on the bureaucratic agencies which the President also thinks are his enemies?

If, on the other hand, Congress thinks that the bureaucrats are the enemy, the main threat, and it needs to curb the power of the bureaucracy, then why doesn't Congress cooperate with the President in that task? It seems to me Congress has to make up its mind which side it is on.

Mr. DONOVAN. Dr. Fenn, are you moved to comment?

Prof. FENNO. Well, I think the only thing I am moved to comment on is, I think, Congress does one and it does the other, and I am not sure it has to make up its mind which side it is on. I think over the long run it is likely to be one side or the other side. And I agree with Sam, I think there are ways in which the Congress can exploit this division.

While I have the microphone, I think I would like to make just one other comment as an educator viewing the problem. I

haven't known any Presidents, I have known a few members of the House, but Senator Ribicoff said that most Presidents considered Congress a pain in the neck. And I think most educators have looked upon Congress as a pain in the neck. I really want to applaud TIME for doing what they are doing, which is to try to educate us a little bit in this regard.

This has to do with Bob Peabody's question, too. I think for a long time that most of the books that most of you in this audience have read about the Congress have treated the Congress as a pain in the neck. We have had a love affair with the presidency, but we have found Congress to be very obstructionist over the past 30 years or so. And the problem, I think, is that most people who have written books on this subject have favored the President, have tended to look at the President as the strong point in the system, and have tended to look upon the Congress as obstructionist because for a long time the programs they favored were being sponsored by a President and obstructed by a Congress.

What I am saying is that there is a long legacy in the educational field and I think in the literature that you have read, and in the media as well. It is a long legacy of treating Congress as obstructionists and the President as the place where "liberal policies" are going to be produced.

Now, I think we have a change brought about by the Viet Nam War. I used to find that as a teacher teaching about Congress, I was regarded as teaching about the enemy. Now I am teaching about friends, a group that might have something to say after all. This is because we are concerned now about the power of the President. The problem that I raise is simply that it is very difficult for us to see the Congress and the President apart from what we happen to be favoring in the world of public policy at the moment.

I think we took one view of Congress from 1937 on up to about 1967, and now we have started taking another view of Congress. I don't have an answer for it, but I think one of our problems lies in the fact that we tend to favor that institution that agrees with us in terms of public policy. I think somehow or other we have got to get away from that and I think these sessions will be perhaps useful in that way.

Mr. DONOVAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Fenn. I think partly because Dr. Fenn spoke well of these proceedings, and since also it gets me out of any dilemma as to whether I should give the last word to a member of the House or Senate, we might regard that as the last word for the moment. But I do repeat that this is not a subject we just discovered yesterday or intend to drop tomorrow. We have been at it for quite a while, including coverage of a number of members of the House. We expect to go on doing that.

I do thank all of our panelists very much and all of our guests for spending the evening with us.

HEARINGS ON ADMINISTRATION TRADE PROPOSAL

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, as Members know, the President has sent his trade message to Congress with the request that it be considered immediately.

The Committee on Ways and Means has announced that public hearings will begin on this subject in early May, after we have completed testimony from the Secretary of the Treasury on tax reform.

I include in the RECORD a copy of the press release announcing the hearings beginning on May 7:

CHAIRMAN WILBUR D. MILLS (D., ARK.), COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ANNOUNCES PUBLIC HEARINGS TO BEGIN ON MONDAY, MAY 7, 1973, ON ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS RELATING TO FOREIGN TRADE AND TARIFF AND ON ALL OTHER PROPOSALS PENDING BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THESE SUBJECTS

Chairman Wilbur D. Mills (D., Ark.), Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, today announced that the Committee on Ways and Means would begin public hearings on Monday, May 7, 1973, on the Administration proposals, submitted to the Congress today, relating to foreign trade and tariff matters, and on all other legislative proposals pending before the Committee to amend the tariff and trade laws. The language of the Administration proposal ("The Trade Reform Act of 1973") as well as an analysis and summary thereof is attached to this press release.

The leadoff witnesses will be representatives of the Administration who will testify during the first several days of these public hearings and will include the Secretaries of Treasury, State, Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, Interior, Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Executive Director of Council on International Economic Policy, and Chairman of Council of Economic Advisers.

Testimony from the general public will begin on Monday, May 14, 1973.

DETAILS FOR SUBMISSION BY INTERESTED PUBLIC OF REQUESTS TO BE HEARD

Cutoff Date for Requests to be Heard.—Requests to be heard must be submitted by no later than the close of business Friday, April 27, 1973. All requests should be submitted to: John M. Martin, Jr., Chief Counsel, Committee on Ways and Means, 1102 Longworth House Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20515, Telephone: (202) 225-3625.

Notification will be made as promptly as possible after this cutoff date as to when witnesses have been scheduled to appear. Once the witness has been advised of his date of appearance, it is not possible for this date to be changed. If a witness finds that he cannot appear on that day, he may wish to either substitute another spokesman in his stead or file a written statement for the record of the hearing in lieu of a personal appearance, because under no circumstances will the date of an appearance be changed.

Coordination of Testimony.—In view of the overall heavy legislative schedule of the Committee for this session of the Congress and thus the limited amount of time that can be set aside by the Committee in which to complete this hearing, it is requested and it is most important that all persons and organizations with the same general interest designate one spokesman to represent them so as to conserve the time of the Committee and the other witnesses, prevent repetition and assure that all aspects of the subjects being discussed at these hearings can be given appropriate attention.

The Committee will be pleased to receive from any interested organization or person a written statement for consideration for inclusion in the printed record of the hearing in lieu of a personal appearance. These statements will be given the same full consideration as though the statements had been presented in person.

Allocation of Time of Witnesses.—Because of the heavy legislative schedule of the Committee, which will limit the total time available to the Committee in which to conduct these hearings, and to assure fairness to all witnesses and all points of view, it will be necessary to allocate time to witnesses for the presentation of their own direct oral testi-

mony. If the witness wishes to present a long and detailed statement to the Committee, it will be necessary for him to confine his oral presentation to a summary of his views while submitting a detailed written statement for the Committee members' consideration and review. Such additional written statements will be included in the record of these hearings.

Contents of Requests to be Heard.—The request to be heard must contain the following information, otherwise delay may result in the proper processing of a request:

(1) the name, full address and capacity in which the witness will appear;

(2) the list of persons or organizations the witness represents and in the case of associations and organizations their address or addresses, their total membership and where possible a membership list;

(3) if a witness wishes to make a statement on his own behalf, he must still nevertheless indicate whether he has any specific clients who have an interest in the subject, or in the alternative, he must indicate that he does not represent any clients having an interest in the subject he will be discussing;

(4) the amount of time the witness desires in which to present his own direct oral testimony (answers to questions of Committee members are, of course, not to be included in the time the witness may request);

(5) if the witness is testifying on any specific proposal or proposals, an indication of whether or not he is supporting or opposing such proposal or proposals; and

(6) a topical outline or summary of the comments and recommendations which the witness proposes to make.

Submission of Prepared Written Statements by Witnesses Making Personal Appearances.—With respect to oral testimony, the rules of the Committee require that prepared statements be submitted to the Committee office no later than 48 hours prior to the scheduled appearance of the witness. Seventy-five (75) copies of the written statements would be required in this instance; an additional seventy-five (75) may be submitted for distribution to the press and the interested public on the witness' date of appearance.

Submission of Written Statements for the Printed Record instead of Appearing in Person.—Any interested organization or person may submit a written statement in lieu of a personal appearance for consideration for inclusion in the printed record of these hearings. Such statements should be submitted by a date to be specified later, in triplicate. In any event, such written statements will be accepted by the Committee during the entire course of these hearings. An additional seventy-five (75) copies of written statements for the printed record will be accepted for distribution to the press and the interested public if submitted before the final day of the public hearings.

Format of All Written Statements.—It is very important that all prepared statements contain a summary of the testimony and recommendations and that throughout the statement itself pertinent subject headings be used.

Re-submission of Requests to be Heard Where Request Already Made.—If a prospective witness has already submitted a request to be heard on any of the subjects covered by this hearing, it is now at this time necessary to re-submit the request if the individual or organization is still interested in appearing in person, furnishing the above information and otherwise conforming to the rules set forth for conducting these hearings.

HEARINGS ON H.R. 981

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Pennsylvania (Mr. EILBERG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, this is to advise the House that continued hearings to consider H.R. 981 which were due to be held on Wednesday, April 11, and Thursday, April 12, 1973, have been rescheduled.

The April 11 hearing has been canceled, but the April 12 hearing will be held in room 2237, Rayburn Building and will commence at 10 a.m. On this date, testimony will be received from the Departments of State and Justice regarding the refugee—sections 203(a)(7), 243(h)—and parole—section 212(d)(5)—provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The views of the Department of State will be expressed by the Honorable Francis L. Kellogg, Special Assistant to the Secretary for Refugee and Migration Affairs. The Department of Justice will be represented by the Honorable James D. "Mike" McKevitt, Assistant Attorney General, Legislative Affairs.

ATROCITIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I have waited patiently for those of my colleagues who have expounded in great detail on the alleged atrocities in South Vietnamese prisons to come forth and show equal outrage over the torture to which our American prisoners of war have been subjected at the hands of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong. But they remain silent.

Mr. Speaker, I have also waited to hear these same Members who have been bawling our continued bombing of Communists troop buildups in Cambodia where no peace agreement or cease-fire has been reached to step forward with words of condemnation for the brutal shooting down of peace keeping helicopters by the Vietcong. But they remain silent.

I really cannot understand this silence since these same Members have always led me to believe that wrong is wrong no matter who commits a wrongful act. Are we now being led to believe that it is not wrong when the Communists torture their prisoners or shoot down unarmed helicopters; Mr. Speaker, such a double standard of justice is beyond my comprehension.

I wonder if any of these Members were listening to the televised interview of President Thieu this past Sunday when he offered a blanket invitation to the Red Cross or newsmen or really just about anyone to come to South Vietnam and inspect his country's prison camps. The Red Cross was never given such an opportunity by the government in Hanoi. The only newsclips we saw of our American prisoners during their confinement was shot by news media representatives of Communist-controlled nations—news clips of contrived and controlled situations.

Mr. Speaker, I do not deny the right

of any Member of the House to speak forth on any subject about which he or she might have very deep feelings. All I ask is that the other side of the coin be examined closely and given equal time, especially when the other side is the American side.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ARTISTIC AND LITERARY WORKS

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that would provide an incentive to artists and authors to contribute their valuable works of art and literature to our libraries, universities, and museums. I am pleased to say that a companion bill is also today being introduced in the other body by the distinguished senior Senator from New York, the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS.

Prior to the enactment of the Tax Reform Act of 1969, artists and authors who contributed their works to nonprofit institutions were permitted to deduct from their income the market value of their gifts. Experts agree that this special tax treatment was one of the chief reasons works of art and literature became available to the public rather than remaining in private collections.

However, during consideration of the Tax Reform Act of 1969, some concern was raised about possible abuses in connection with the treatment, including favorable tax advantages, for political figures who donated their public papers.

Congress, in the Tax Reform Act of 1969, amended the law dealing with certain charitable contributions and limited, for an artist or author who donates his own work, the allowable deduction to the cost of the raw materials used in producing the artistic or literary work. Curiously, the new law did not alter the tax treatment of contributions of works of art or literature by collectors, who are, therefore, still able to deduct the market value of their contributions.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of the 1969 change on libraries, museums, and universities has been serious and adverse, for it has led directly to a sharp curtailment of contributions of valuable works to these institutions.

And nowhere has the impact been more devastating than on our Library of Congress. In a letter to me, John J. Kominski, General Counsel, Library of Congress, reports that, since 1970, contributions have practically stopped.

I include the following:

LITERARY, MUSICAL, AND ARTISTIC DONATIONS TO THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

STATISTICS BEFORE AND AFTER THE TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

Prints and photographs division

In prior years and through calendar year 1969, cartoons from *New Yorker* magazine were received by the Library regularly. This practice stopped completely in January of 1970.

Along with its own acquisition efforts, and the assistance of the American Film Insti-

tute, the Library's Motion Picture Section would receive several films each year from individual contemporary film makers. Since 1970, hardly any such films have been received.

Manuscripts division

Prior to the enactment of the Tax Reform Act of 1969, the Manuscripts Division received an average of 15 to 20 manuscript gifts each calendar year from authors and literary artists. The following analysis indicates the change this division has experienced:

Calendar year:	Gifts
1968 -----	20
1969 -----	17
1970 -----	8
1971 -----	0
1972 -----	0

(Since each gift could include anywhere from a few to hundreds of thousands of manuscript pages, it is considered more accurate to identify such gifts by counting the donors and not the contents of the gifts.)

Music division

Each year through 1970, the Music Division would receive numerous music manuscript gifts from contemporary composers, both classical and popular. Since 1970, these gifts have practically stopped; some thirty-five well-known composers have ceased making gifts altogether.

COMMENT

In many cases, composers, authors, and artists, who formally have given outright gifts to the United States Government for addition to the collections of the Library of Congress are now merely placing these items on deposit at the Library for specific periods of time, usually 10 years. No title passes, and the depositors usually indicate an intention to make a later gift. Often the Library and users can get full benefits by access to such deposited material during the period of deposit, but there is no way to assure that these items will remain in the Library short of a later gift.

Perhaps the most notable example of the impact of the change was Igor Stravinsky's decision in 1970 to put his manuscripts of composition up for sale on the open market for \$3.5 million, rather than donate them to the Library of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the bill Senator JAVITS and I are introducing today would restore the incentive to artists and authors to contribute their valuable works by providing them with a deduction of nearly 75 percent of market value of the gift.

The measure also includes important provisions to guard against abuses and to assure that only bona fide artists and authors take advantage of the law.

For example, this bill would not allow political figures to take deductions for contributions of their public papers.

The measure would require the donee institution to certify that the donated property represents material of historical or artistic significance and that the use by the donee will be related to the purpose or function constituting the basis for the institution's special tax status.

And, most significantly, the bill would require that these contributions be deducted only from art-related income.

Mr. Speaker, these safeguards and the modest revenue loss to the Federal Government, which I understand is less than

\$10 million, assure, I believe, that this bill will meet many of the objections traditionally raised by the Department of Treasury to this type of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which Senator JAVITS and I have today introduced will provide the necessary incentives to artists and authors to contribute important works to our museums and libraries. I strongly urge my colleagues to join in supporting this measure.

ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED MEDICARE CHANGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. GRASSO), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, medicare has been a godsend to America's elderly, especially to those who must survive on only their meager social security retirement checks. They deserve and are entitled to full and complete medical care benefits under the medicare program. An older American covered by Medicare knows that, in the event of illness, he or she will be covered by its protection. Although medicare covers only 42 percent of the total health payment of the elderly, it means a great deal to a person who must live on \$175 a month.

Yet, in order to provide marginal budgetary savings and to reduce so-called abuses of the program, the administration proposes to cut medicare benefits, thereby retreating from our commitment to meet the health care needs of older Americans. Constituents have written to me that present medicare coverage relieves them of financial anxiety at a time when they are already anxious enough about their health. In a letter to me, one constituent wrote:

This proposal is shocking: Contemplate, if you will, the worry and anxiety an elderly hospital patient would have to lie helplessly in bed with the spectre of huge bills accumulating day by day, at a rate that could easily wipe out any hard-earned savings, and put him (or her) in line for public welfare.

Noting that his hospitalization and that of his wife had been covered by medicare, he observed:

In each instance, the assurance that we were protected by Medicare hastened our recovery, and enabled us to cooperate with the doctors and nurses in a relaxed and untroubled atmosphere.

Under the existing law, the elderly pay \$72 for the first day of hospitalization and nothing from the second through the 60th day. The proposed changes would have them pay the full room and board charges for the first day and 10 percent of the charges for each subsequent day of hospitalization.

Under part B of medicare, the patient now pays the first \$60 and 20 percent of the remaining bill for a doctor's services. The proposed changes would raise the deductible to \$85 and increase the coinsurance cost to 25 percent of the remainder. For example, a medicare beneficiary now pays \$188 on a \$700 physi-

cian's bill. Under the new proposals, the beneficiary would pay \$238.75, an increase of 27 percent. A 4-day hospital stay in a \$100-a-day room now costs a medicare beneficiary \$72. Under the new proposals, it would cost \$130, an increase of 80 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I do not deny that the proposed changes would benefit those people who have greatly extended hospital stays. Let us remember, however, that only an estimated 1 percent of the elderly are hospitalized for more than 60 days.

Administration officials admit that for the average medicare beneficiary who is hospitalized, the cost of part A charges would rise from \$84 to \$189, an increase of 125 percent.

The elderly do not enter hospitals because they want to. It is rare that a person spends any more time hospitalized than is considered necessary by his physician. If the administration's plan were adopted, the elderly in many cases would be forced to make a choice between needed medical care and doing without such care because of financial concerns.

Clearly, we must oppose attempts to increase the cost of medicare. In this area the administration has misread the opinion of the American people if it believes that these proposals will be adopted. A recent Harris poll shows that 92 percent of the people are against making the elderly pay more for medicare.

Many of my colleagues are opposed to these changes in the medicare payment system. To end any doubt about the true sentiment of the House on this subject, I am introducing today a concurrent resolution which is identical to one already introduced in the Senate. The concurrent resolution, if approved, would put Congress on record in opposition to cuts in the medicare program and in support of our older citizens who require medical care at reasonable cost.

I hope that we can quickly put to rest these ill-advised, unacceptable, and inconsiderate proposals. I believe that passage of my resolution will serve notice to the administration and to America's elderly that we will not place additional burdens on the backs of those people who have given so much to the growth and greatness of our land.

THE VOTER PROTECTION BILL

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

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation went to the polls last November 7, thousands of voters were inconvenienced and others found themselves unable to cast their ballots because of a massive breakdown of local election machinery. Innumerable cases of jammed and malfunctioning voting machinery, and long waiting lines were prevalent in many areas. Absentee ballots often failed to reach registered voters on time. These problems no doubt contributed to the

low national voter turnout rate of 54.5 percent.

Such local voting irregularities are the result of basic weaknesses in the local administration of elections. A legislative solution is possible and I attempted to outline such a solution in the bill I introduced on April 4—H.R. 6518.

One case in point is the situation faced by many registered voters when they discovered that election boards failed to process their registrations correctly. Those voters were faced with two options: They could allow themselves to be disenfranchised or they could go through the considerable inconvenience of obtaining a court order to permit them to vote.

For example, registration difficulties were particularly acute in Geneva, Ohio. Local Democratic Party workers had organized the registration of hundreds of Puerto Rican-Americans. When the registration rolls were published before the election, many new registrants found they were either not listed, assigned to the wrong precinct, or listed with an incorrect address, which assigned them to the wrong precinct. The incorrect voting assignments caused great inconvenience to these citizens—many of whom had difficulty in getting the corrections made—time and transportation being the major stumbling blocks. County board of elections, confronted with its errors, said there was nothing it could do. After considerable public pressure, several hearings, and threats of lawsuits, the board finally listed the voters correctly.

In St. Louis, many newly enfranchised as well as established voters had arbitrarily been stricken from the rolls and in effect barred from re-registering when the St. Louis board cleared more than 10,000 persons' names off the books in October. These voters had to obtain a Federal court order to extend voting hours because of the late purging of the rolls. The extension of the polling hours enabled over 2,000 voters to cast ballots.

Other instances of faulty registration practices include the following:

In New York City, new registrants holding voter registration cards arrived at the polls only to learn that necessary second cards were missing, requiring them to get reinstated by State courts.

Albuquerque residents receive a white slip of paper when they register, but cannot vote until they are mailed a yellow voting card. Many did not receive their yellow cards, and a State court ordered that people holding only white slips could vote.

Flood victims who re-registered in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. found their registration cards missing at the polls.

Administrative errors in Washington, D.C., produced many challenged ballots when the ballot cards for young voters and persons who changed their addresses could not be located at assigned polling places.

Voters in the northern parts of New Jersey's Hudson County, in Philadelphia, and in Butler County, Ohio, found voting machines inoperative and repairmen unavailable.

Jersey City voters were faced with over 120 jammed or unworkable voting machines on election morning. Some machines did not work until mid-afternoon. Those voters who could not wait for repairs obtained a court order extending voting hours until 11 p.m. and ordering the use of paper ballots where necessary.

In such college towns of Ann Arbor, Champaign-Urbana, Madison and Iowa City, heavy student voter registration increases caused long lines and a wait of up to 3 hours for some voters.

Machine malfunctions in some Philadelphia wards cancelled out Democratic Presidential votes cast on a straight party ticket without affecting votes for other offices.

Early closing hours of 4 p.m. and 6 or 6:30 p.m. handicapped working people and commuting suburbanites. Whether the fault was early closing hours, inoperative machines, or long delays, many local election boards and State election procedures simply turned away potential voters.

The absentee ballot voting procedure also includes obstacles and administrative pitfalls for the average voter. The varied and complex procedures for obtaining an absentee ballot undoubtedly confused many voters and discouraged others from voting at all. Many local election boards also experienced great difficulty in meeting the increased demand for absentee ballots. Backlogs existed in many large urban areas such as Brooklyn and Nassau County, N.Y.; Cook County, Ill.; St. Louis County; and Los Angeles. Local election boards received several thousand absentee ballots a day or two after the election as a result of backlogs and slowness of the mails. These ballots were disregarded despite the incredible citizen initiative involved and the fact that the fault lay with the postal system.

The absentee ballot, election machinery, and registration problems accounted in part for the disenfranchisement of thousands of voters. Local election boards are ill-equipped and underfinanced. Their work is seasonal, and consequently, they have often resisted professionalization. People usually pay no attention to registering or voting until the deadline is fast approaching or already past, and attention is not focused on the staffing or training of election personnel.

The bill I have introduced, H.R. 6518, addresses these problems. It provides a means for Federal regulation which would end the many irregularities that result from poor local election administration. Federal legislation appears to be the only vehicle available for the reform of the electoral process.

Specifically, my bill would establish the following guidelines and requirements:

First, each polling place would have adequate voting machinery and facilities to service every voter within 15 minutes of each voter's arrival at the polling place;

Second, in each case voting machines are utilized, backup paper ballots, and competent repairmen would be readily

available if the machines failed to operate correctly;

Third, each polling place would be kept open to voters from 6 o'clock antemeridian to 9 o'clock postmeridian;

Fourth, absentee ballots in blank would be made available within 7 days from the date of request to persons requesting them by letter or by post card forms, without further formalities. Post card absentee ballot applications would be available at every post office;

Fifth, the Attorney General would be authorized to make grants to election boards and officials of States and political subdivisions thereof in order to allow them to prepare through training and research for their responsibilities under this act; and

Sixth: the Attorney General would pay to each State on an annual reimbursement basis 25 per centum of the increased election operating costs directly resulting from the application of the standards imposed by this act, as determined by the Attorney General.

These measures would constitute a major step toward eliminating election day foulups caused by local administrative inefficiencies. They constitute a necessary program for enfranchising all eligible voters and making sure their votes are cast and counted.

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT EXTENSION

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, thousands of unemployed Americans will have the hope for a job and numerous local governmental agencies will have an opportunity to provide needed services if the Emergency Employment Act extension bill is approved by this body.

Just this morning the House Education and Labor Committee gave the measure its final approval. I applaud my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS), for his untiring efforts to steer this bill to a final vote on the House floor. I am pleased that I was able to work with him on this legislation both in the Select Labor Subcommittee and in the full committee.

The unemployment picture in the country has not improved. Almost four and a half million Americans are unemployed. Many others are either underemployed or have abandoned any hopes of getting a job and have stopped looking for employment. The national rate of unemployment is at 5 percent with many areas still experiencing rates in excess of 6 percent.

The bill as approved by the full committee this morning authorizes continuation of the nationwide public employment program as long as the unemployment rate is in excess of 4.5 percent. Special public employment programs are also authorized for local areas with unemployment rates in excess of 6 percent.

Other sections of the bill provide for increased authorizations for high unem-

ployment areas, assures fair treatment of education agencies in job allocations, and protects the promotional rights of regular employees.

Provisions are also made to assure that the money is spent for additional jobs and not as a replacement for the funding of existing jobs. The Secretary of Labor is also instructed to consider the comments of an affected labor union before approval of any application.

A special section earmarks funds to meet the particular needs of those Americans on Federal and State Indian reservations and provides the technical assistance necessary to assist the Indian tribes to carry out these programs.

The unemployment level which prompted this measure in 1971 has dropped by only 300,000, over half of which is directly attributable to the Emergency Employment Act itself. During the 7 days of hearings before the select subcommittee, near unanimous support was heard from all witnesses.

It would be unconscionable for Congress to eliminate this effective and essential program as long as unemployment is still a problem and local government still cannot fill the service needs of their communities. I strongly urge all my colleagues to approve this measure when it comes before the full House for a final vote.

THE POPE AND THIEU'S PRISONERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, when Pope Paul VI urges President Thieu to release political prisoners held in South Vietnam, we can be sure that the horror stories we have heard are not being made up by "Communist liars"—as Thieu recently called the two young Frenchmen whose moving personal experiences helped us to learn the truth. Most of the prisoners are not Communists; many are apolitical; many are women and children. And their stories by now are too well documented to be dismissed as propaganda.

Many of them are Roman Catholics, people of standing in their communities—feared by Thieu because they might help mobilize opinion against him, which is widespread throughout South Vietnam. Obviously the Pope has heard their stories and is moved by their plight.

The New York Times this morning carried the following story:

THIEU VISITS POPE, WHO BIDS HIM FREE POLITICAL PRISONERS

ROME, April 9.—While policemen and leftist demonstrators battled near St. Peter's Square, Pope Paul VI met President Nguyen Van Thieu of South Vietnam here today and urged him to release political prisoners.

The audience lasted an hour, and a Vatican communiqué issued later said that the Pope "wanted to call to the special attention of the guest the human problem of political prisoners of both sides in Vietnam" and that "the President gave detailed information and explanations on this subject."

What he told the Pope, Mr. Thieu said at a news conference later, was that there were no political prisoners in South Vietnam and that such reports were "only gross Communist propaganda."

"There are no political prisoners in South Vietnam," said Mr. Thieu, a Roman Catholic, in response to a question. "There are only two kinds of prisoners: 21,007 of common law and 5,081 Communist criminals."

The Communist prisoners, he said, are civilian terrorists.

Several hours before the papal audience leftist youths who have been demonstrating against Mr. Thieu since he arrived in Rome yesterday began assembling for another protest. They carried posters reading "Down with Thieu" and "Thieu Assassin."

Dozens fought to break through hundreds of policemen who cordoned off all entrances to the Vatican. Brief clashes erupted and four youths were arrested.

Mr. Thieu has avoided appearing in public here. He rode by helicopter between the Vatican and the villa where he is staying as a guest of the Italian Government. He also went by helicopter to meet President Giovanni Leone of Italy at Mr. Leone's summer residence.

CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN EXPRESSES DEMOCRATIC SENTIMENT ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S ECONOMIC POLICY

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the House will shortly be taking up for consideration the extension of the Economic Stabilization Act. The Committee on Banking and Currency, for the last 3 weeks, has been devoting all of its time to this important legislative matter.

I believe that we have reported out a bill which attempts to provide the President with the needed authority to deal with the inflation that we are experiencing today. I believe that most of the Democrats on our committee do not understand the administration's reluctance to adopt the provisions of our committee reported bill. Many of us feel a deep sense of frustration over attempts to understand the administration's economic policy decision process.

Our distinguished colleague, a gentlewoman from Missouri, LEONOR SULLIVAN, expressed what I believe to be the consensus of opportunity among committee Democrats during our hearing on the Economic Stabilization Act when Dr. Arthur Burns of the Federal Reserve System appeared before the committee. The American Banker of April 5, 1973, devotes its editorial to Mrs. SULLIVAN's discussion with Dr. Burns, which I direct the Members attention to.

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial of the American Banker of April 5, 1973, to be included in the RECORD following my remarks:

THE TROUBLE WITH TOO MANY WARNINGS

Clear insight into the thinking of an important segment of the Congress was provided this week by Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan, D., Mo., of the House Committee on Banking, Currency, and Urban Affairs, in remarks to Arthur Burns, chairman, Federal Reserve Board, and chairman, Committee on Interest and Dividends, during his appearance before the committee.

Mrs. Sullivan told him:

"Dr. Burns, after four years, I am finding it very difficult to take seriously at face value the warnings which come to us from this Administration about the terrible consequences of the legislation we happen to have under the consideration of this committee, which the majority on this committee feel is a solution to a serious national problem."

"Now, going back to 1969 when we were working on legislation which became the Interest Rate Control Act, giving the President the authority to have the Federal Reserve Board regulate materials and conditions of all types of credit as a means of combating inflation, the President warned that this was a very bad move on our part and that we shouldn't pass it. And we did pass it under circumstances that the President felt he could not veto the bill on which the bill was attached. And he denounced the Congress for irresponsibility for passing this kind of legislation. And then you came before us just a few months later in February of 1970 and said, in effect, that you were very happy this authority had been enacted by Congress and was on the books and was available to be used in case it should be necessary to use it, although you didn't think it would be necessary."

"And then to move forward. In 1971, after we had been complaining bitterly that the authority to regulate interest rates had not been used, the Administration came in and asked us to amend the Economic Stabilization Act to include interest rates through the Cost of Living Council rather than the Federal Reserve Board and we provided that authority, too, but it has never been used."

"Now we also have the story about the Economic Stabilization Act itself. When we proposed it in 1970, the Administration accused us of playing politics, of demagoguery, and said that if we got such legislation it would never be used and we were just grandstanding. Exactly a year after the measure became law again on a bill that the President did not feel he could veto, he put it into effect with a great flourish on Aug. 15, 1971, just a year after it had been enacted. . . .

"So, how can we believe the warnings that we receive from this Administration about the dire consequences of mandatory interest rate control? The Administration track record on such predictions is very bad because it has usually ended up doing exactly what it said it would never do and shouldn't be done."

"Now, let me tell you why I think the Administration's position on interest rate control rather than the things in the stabilization battle is wrong. I mean the Administration, I am sorry to say, doesn't seem to have any confidence in the economic morals of the American people. We all know about the food price fiasco, and it has taken a position that it cannot control agricultural prices because all of the farmers and all of the consumers are going to turn into black marketeers. And on this interest rate thing, the attitude seems to be if we hold down the interest rate in the United States, American capital is going to flee abroad to get a better return."

"Well, we are not asking anyone to forgo a reasonable rate of return on their capital, and we are not asking anyone to invest money at a loss, but I think there certainly is no lack of investment opportunity in the U.S. and I don't believe that the people who hold the money have absolutely no patriotism. It is something completely divorced from the character of the people who own the money and I don't think those who administer the economy of our country give the American businessman or the investor enough respect insofar as his consideration for his own money over his own country is concerned. And I just wonder what are we going to have as a policy that we can rely upon?"

RISING MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the disastrous economic policy being pursued by the Nixon administration is causing the worst inflation that this country has experienced in 50 years. The American family is paying the highest prices in history for food, and unless policies are changed, all prices across the board will be at record highs.

Lurking in the shadows of these recent record high increases in the grocery bills that the American family is paying will be a higher interest rate on mortgage loans, which will increase the cost of shelter for the American family. Economists and real estate experts around the country are now predicting that mortgage interest rates will begin to climb rapidly in the immediate future. This increase will be caused by the general inflationary conditions in the marketplace, tight money policies to be pursued by the Federal Reserve, and finally a decrease in the savings inflow into the savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. Since approximately 50 percent of mortgage loans are made by these two financial institutions, the American family can expect higher cost in the financing of their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the record following my remarks the column by Bernard C. Meltzer, real estate editor of the Evening Bulletin, on prospects for increased mortgage interest rates. This article appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on Friday, April 6, 1973.

The article follows:

A REAL ESTATE EXPERT'S VIEW: MORTGAGE INTEREST RATE HIKE IS LIKELY WITHIN A FEW MONTHS

(By Bernard C. Meltzer)

Signals have shifted rapidly during the past three months. The signs now point toward higher mortgage rates. If you have been holding off waiting for a lower mortgage rate, you had better act now. By the time summer rolls around, the mortgage rate will probably be about $\frac{1}{2}$ percent higher.

The cause of all this is the Federal Reserve. It's all very complicated, but it goes back to the fact that the Reserve has put a clamp on the money supply. It's being done in the name of fighting inflation and slowing down the economy. It's being done by restricting the amount of new money.

A RAPID RUN-UP

The result has been a rapid run-up in short term interest rates. There are strong indications, however, that neither the Administration nor the Congress will allow the interest rates to rise too rapidly. If they take off, we are almost certain to see a lid clamped on interest.

The problem was brought into the open and reached a crescendo two weeks ago when nine commercial banks tried to boost their prime rate from $6\frac{1}{4}$ to $6\frac{3}{4}$ percent. Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, hailed the bankers down to Washington. After much arm twisting, the banks agreed to compromise, and the prime rate was rolled back to $6\frac{1}{4}$ percent.

OUT OF KILTER

The commercial banks justified their action by pointing out that the prime rate has

gotten out of kilter compared with other money rates. They point to the fact that it has moved up only one percentage point since last Fall. By way of comparison, the 91-day treasury bill rate has moved up 1.453 percent in one year. This is the most sensitive short term indicator we have. Another sensitive indicator is the Federal funds rate (the rate banks charge each other on day-to-day funds). This has shot up 2 percent since the Fall.

Certificates of deposit are now paying about 7 percent. This is another important indicator. These are some of the reasons banks cite to prove that the prime rate is out of kilter. They allege that if the prime rate were free to move to its own level, it would now be at 7 percent.

All this has come about because the Federal Reserve has slowed the expansion of the nation's money supply. Last year money grew at an 8-percent rate. This year the Federal Reserve cut the growth rate in half. Since the beginning of the year, it is down to 4 percent.

In contrast, the Gross National Product for the first quarter of 1973 increased an estimated \$36 billion. This indicates a real growth rate in G.N.P. of 7 percent. The annual price rise rate of 5.5 percent must be added on. One does not have to be an economist to fathom that a 4 percent growth rate in money is not enough to meet the needs of the expanding economy.

ARTIFICIAL RATES

The commercial banks, accordingly, allege that because their prime rate is artificially low compared with other short term money rates, it encourages borrowing from banks. Commercial banks are reporting a sharp increase in demand for their funds. One way that these banks are meeting the greater demand for money from them is to go after savings accounts. Both locally and nationally, commercial banks have launched intensive efforts to attract the savings dollar.

These efforts have raised warning signals on the mortgage front. There has been a substantial decrease in the flow of new money into savings institutions. For example, for February, savings and loans nationally report a 40-percent drop compared with a year ago. Mutual savings banks are also reporting less new money. In fact, all savings institutions report that their inflow of money is off.

The same is happening in Delaware Valley. Savings institutions almost without exception, report that the inflow of new money has slowed down. Few report a net outflow of money—it's just that the rate of growth has slowed down.

The decrease of new money flowing into our savings institutions is a cause of concern. This is where most of the home and apartment mortgages come from.

However, it is not anticipated that a mortgage crunch will develop or that mortgage rates will rise steeply. There are a number of reasons for this conclusion.

In the first instance, the long term interest rates have remained rather stable. They have not shown the wide swing of short term money rates. Currently, the yield of high grade corporate bonds is 7.53 percent. A year ago it was 7.48. The change is small.

IMPORTANT FACTOR

There is another important factor to consider. There is little chance now that the usury rate in Pennsylvania will be raised above the current rate of 8 percent. In New Jersey, the $7\frac{1}{2}$ percent rate will probably also remain. Governor Shapp has indicated, in strong terms, that he will veto any bill that raises the 8-percent rate. Governor Cahill has indicated he would do the same if attempts were made to raise the $7\frac{1}{2}$ -percent rate.

Thus, the action of the Federal Reserve in slowing the amount of new money fed into the economy has resulted in a climate where

the outlook for mortgage interest rates is up. By the time the dog days of summer arrive, home buyers in Delaware Valley will probably be paying about $\frac{1}{2}$ percent more.

OIL: THE VULNERABLE JUGULAR

(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 April 9, 1973, the Washington Post carried a very lucid and sobering article by columnist Joe Alsop on a matter of growing concern to all of us. That is, of course, oil and its relationship to geopolitics. The gravity of our problem is emphasized by Mr. Alsop's reference to the effects of the fuel problem to our future as a great nation.

Mr. Alsop plans a series of articles on the energy matter. I am sure we all will benefit from reading them.

Without objection I am submitting the first of Mr. Alsop's articles for inclusion in the RECORD:

OIL: THE VULNERABLE JUGULAR

(By Joseph Alsop)

This is an invitation to join a voyage of discovery. It has been a strange voyage, always enlightening, but always cruelly and bitterly enlightening. Those who wish to join had better know, too, that the end of the voyage will be unpleasant—although it will tell volumes about the American future.

Hence the start of the voyage will be well to explain. Some weeks ago, the former Israeli ambassador, who was also one of the two chief minds behind Israel's victory in the Six-Day War, went home for good after a long experience in Washington. Itzhak Rabin is not merely a brave man, a good companion and a good friend. He also has one of the most far-thinking yet down-to-earth strategic minds this city has known in many years.

So it was a matter of pride that the house where these words are written was the last in Washington where he came to say goodbye and to have his final meal in America. In the talk at supper, the voyage in question really began with a fairly idle question:

"Now that it's all over, what impressions do you take home with you from your embassy here?"

Rabin answered that he had a wonderful time here, and in one way, was going home much encouraged. When he came to Washington, he had found the city wholly preoccupied with Vietnam, and dealing with all the more important matters in the world by a method of fumble, muddle and last minute improvisation. Now, he added, "your policy has a clear, well thought out direction, and is bold and adroit, too. All that is very good."

Why then, he was asked, did he so carefully say, "in one way." Your oil problem, he answered shortly. You mean you think the Arabs will blackmail the United States into an anti-Israeli policy, was the natural reply. Not at all, he came back energetically. Israel can take care of herself "unless the United States joins with other nations to destroy Israel—and the United States will never do that."

"But why the oil problem, then?" was the next question.

"Because of its direct effects on you," he answered, "and because those direct effects will turn into indirect effects on Israel and so many other nations."

Begin with Israel and the other nations, he was asked. Oh, he replied a bit grimly, Israel is lucky. Israel has the will and wits

to defend Israel. Besides China and one or two more, there are not many nations friendly to America that you can say so much about today. But neither Israel, nor China, nor any of the other nations now in the circle of America's friends can possibly achieve successful self-defense, in a new kind of world in which America has ceased to be a great power.

"Ceased to be a great power! My God, I thought you were talking about the oil problem," was the fairly horrified comment.

It was a natural comment, too, for how do most of us, as yet, think about the oil problem? In terms of greater costs, of possible fuel shortages, of our current difficulties with the balance of payments, and also of the Arab political blackmail—which the departing ambassador had dismissed. That, surely, is an honest summary of the way we now think about the oil problem. Perhaps sensing all this, Rabin went on, much more sternly and more earnestly:

"You do not think enough about the oil problem. I have been looking into it for months. It is much worse than you suppose—10 times worse. Your jugular, Western Europe's jugular, Japan's jugular, all run through the Persian Gulf nowadays. Yet you have no means to defend your jugular.

"This is why your country must cease to be a great power, unless you can find means to solve this terrible problem, which everyone has overlooked for too long. No nation can remain a great power, that has a wholly undefended jugular, waiting to be cut by anyone with a willing knife. No nation can be a great power, either, that has an ever more worthless currency—unless it is a totalitarian state like Hitler's Germany or the Soviet Union, which the United States will never be.

"Look into the facts that the future will force you to face. Look into what those facts will do to your dollar. Look into the new strategic situation those facts will do to your dollar. You. Then you will see that I am right."

The evening did not end there, but with affectionate farewells. Yet the terrible words thus spoken, by so wise and warm a friend of our country, could not be forgotten. So "looking into the facts" was the voyage of discovery, to be described in further reports in this space.

A RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR DYSAUTONOMIA

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill with 18 cosponsors to establish in the Public Health Service an institute for research on dysautonomia.

This tragic genetic affliction, more explicitly known as the Riley-Day syndrome, appears almost exclusively in children of Jewish ancestry. Dysautonomia is a rare disorder of the central nervous system which controls the autonomic processes of the body.

The children who are victims of this disease suffer from impaired sensory perceptions and automatic functions involving such vital body processes as heart and lung action, digestion, blood pressure, and body temperature. These dysautonomic children are indifferent to pain, cannot distinguish between hot and cold, have no taste buds, and their reflexes such as tearing, perspiration, and salivating are affected.

The disease is carried by a recessive

gene, which is passed on to the child if both parents are carriers, and then, the chances are only one in four that the child will be born with the disease. Less than 1,000 cases are known to exist, but in all probability hundreds go unreported because the disease is so rare, the symptoms are not recognized.

It is necessary that research be done on this disease so that it might be detected in a fetus. For children who are born with the disease, it appears that the basic problem seems to be a lack of an enzyme necessary to the smooth functioning of the nervous system. Research must be undertaken to find a way of replacing the substance, and the Federal Government should assist in this effort.

THAT HANOI PROPAGANDA: TRUTH REFUTES LIES

(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, as the poet has said, "Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again." And so it is with the truth concerning U.S. bombing of Hanoi—a truth brought to light as a by-product of the release of the last American prisoners of war.

In an editorial published April 3, the Detroit News points out the truth about our bombing of Hanoi—the fact that it was precision bombing as the U.S. Defense Department insisted it was and not the indiscriminate bombing reported by Hanoi.

The tragic aspect of the propaganda war in which we engaged with Hanoi—a war that Hanoi won—is that so many Americans were willing to believe the "big lies" told by the North Vietnamese.

Now the record has been set straight, as borne out by the Detroit News editorial:

THAT HANOI PROPAGANDA: TRUTH REFUTES LIES

No winner has been declared in the war of arms in Vietnam. But in the war of propaganda, Hanoi won hands down demonstrating great finesse in the technique of the big lie. The truth is now beginning to come out but will have a hard time catching up.

Although North Vietnam supported Viet Cong efforts to destroy the government of South Vietnam and sent aggressive troops of its own into the South, Hanoi somehow managed to cast itself in the role of the aggrieved.

When American planes dropped bombs on North Vietnamese targets, Hanoi cried for world sympathy and got it, despite the fact that Hanoi could have brought an end to the bombing at any moment simply by ceasing its own assaults upon the South.

The United States insisted that its attacks were aimed at military targets and that its planes had achieved considerable success in confining bomb hits to such targets. Nevertheless, many governments and individuals preferred to believe the horrifying stories from Hanoi about the destruction of civilian populations and buildings.

Anti-war marches lamented North Vietnamese children being torn apart by bombs and burned by napalm. Newspapers around the world picked up an account from a Japanese Communist newspaper describing how Joan Baez sang Christmas carols during a blackout in a Hanoi hotel while the noise of American bombs echoed through the

building. In Stockholm, Prime Minister Olof Palme compared the bombing of North Vietnam with the Nazi massacres of World War II. The North Vietnamese foreign ministry complained regularly of "extermination" raids against densely populated areas, including Hanoi.

Now for the story from another point of view. Last week, 28 newsmen visited Hanoi to witness the release of the last of the American prisoners of war. While there, the newsmen had an opportunity to check on some of the reports of indiscriminate bombing by U.S. planes.

Tammy Arbuckle of the Washington Star-News reported: "Pictures and some press reports had given the impression that Hanoi had suffered badly in the war—but in fact the city is hardly touched."

The newsmen found some extraordinary examples of precision bombing. American bombs had produced "utter devastation" in a locomotive repair yard, while 25 yards away civilian houses remained intact.

The South Vietnamese guides showed the reporters small areas where, the guides asserted, homes had been hit by American bombs. They complained about the destruction of Bach Mai Hospital in south Hanoi but did not take the reporters there.

That omission might be credited to the fact that, according to other reports, only one building of the huge Bach Mai Hospital complex suffered damage, having been hit inadvertently when bombers struck at a machine factory which the North Vietnamese had placed right beside the hospital.

No doubt other U.S. mistakes were made, some Vietnamese civilians were killed and some nonmilitary targets were hit. But if the United States had been bent on "extermination" in North Vietnam, this nation possessed the power many times over to achieve that end quickly and efficiently. Obviously, however, "extermination" is not a part of American policy.

As the evidence shows, our bombers threaded the needle, striking at military targets while leaving civilian areas largely untouched. How unfortunate that political leaders and protest groups around the world were not as meticulous in distinguishing between proven facts and sheer propaganda.

GEORGE WILSON WELSH TURNS 90

(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, now and then there is born an individual who proves to be so unmistakably dynamic and colorful that he stands out far above the pack. George W. Welsh of my hometown of Grand Rapids, Mich., is just such an individual.

George Welsh recently turned 90, an event that was noted by President Nixon as well as others, for Mr. Welsh is a truly remarkable man. Mr. Welsh is a "personality," a man who has always made his presence felt. Most importantly, he is a man whose foremost concern has always been for "the little fellow"—for the taxpayer.

It is difficult to do justice to George Welsh with words, but Robert Pisor, a Detroit News writer, has done an excellent job. With the permission of my colleagues in the House, I would like to include at this point in the Record an article written by Mr. Pisor on the occasion of Mr. Welsh's 90th birthday. The article,

published in the Detroit News on March 28, 1973, follows:

GEORGE WILSON WELSH TURNS 90: SCRAPPY STATE POLITICIAN SALUTED

(By Robert L. Pisor)

George Wilson Welsh, an immigrant from Scotland who became one of Michigan's most extraordinary political figures, was honored on his 90th birthday yesterday in the town that once bounced him from public office.

When Grand Rapids voters rose against him a quarter century ago and forced him to resign after six terms as mayor, Welsh declared:

"In this fight as in all others, I came out with a clean apron. I don't have to blush for anything I have ever done. My public services will be remembered long after my traducers are forgotten."

Welsh's services were remembered last night with messages from President Nixon and former Michigan Supreme Court Justice Eugene Black and visits from U.S. Rep. Gerald R. Ford and others.

"The wily little Scotsman has outlived both his friends and his enemies," said former Grand Rapids Mayor Robert Boelens, who organized the party.

Welsh was born in Glasgow in 1883, and came to America when he was eight. He dropped out of school in the 5th grade to work for a newspaper and went on to found his own publication.

In 1912, Welsh put down a trombone he was playing at a political rally to make a fiery, unscheduled speech. The citizens at the meeting drafted Welsh—and he served two terms as alderman.

His career took him to the mayor's office, the State Legislature where he served as house speaker, the lieutenant governor's office and two campaigns for governor—one as a Republican, one as a Democrat.

But it was Welsh's eloquence and his sturdy defense of constitutional rights that carved out a place for him in the history of Michigan politics.

Welsh was the founder with Detroit Mayor Frank Murphy of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, which was organized to plead with President Hoover for federal aid to cities during the Depression.

"We were damned in those days as traitors to the American way of life," Welsh once recalled.

"All we were trying to do," he went on, "was feed the hungry, help the helpless, and relieve city taxpayers of an unfair burden."

Welsh was once derided as "the gentleman from Utah" because he battled—successfully—to establish the right of a Mormon preacher to speak in the streets of Grand Rapids.

In 1921 he won House approval of a bill designed to prohibit Henry Ford's newspaper, the Dearborn Independent, from printing anti-Jewish articles.

At the height of Prohibition, Welsh enraged the anti-booze forces by denouncing them for supporting candidates "whose only qualification for public office is one dry cell."

Such a policy, he declared, "is gnawing at the very foundations of good government."

The peak of his career came in 1923 when the Legislature met in special session to deal with a reapportionment bill that would have increased Wayne County's voice in Lansing.

The bill was defeated and Welsh, then House speaker, gave an interview to The Detroit News in which he charged that 57 state representatives had "openly, brazenly and criminally violated their oaths to support the Michigan Constitution" by voting "No."

"If they were justified," Welsh said in the interview, "the bootlegger and the highway robber are justified."

The next day, angry members of the House demanded that Welsh be impeached.

Welsh put down his gavel and left the speaker's rostrum to defend himself on the floor of the House of Representatives. He confirmed the truth of The News' article, defended his charges and concluded:

"The action of this House in openly defying—brazenly defying—the Constitution of the State of Michigan is the most tragic action that has ever taken place within these four walls."

A writer who covered that legislative session a half century ago gave this account of the clash:

"Welsh then took his seat once more amid a thunder of cheers and pounding of desks that made the portraits of Michigan's governors quiver in their gilded frames."

The impeachment motion failed by a vote of 80-9.

Welsh won the first of two terms as Grand Rapids alderman in 1912, then moved to the State House of Representatives for four terms, the last as House speaker.

In 1924, he was elected lieutenant governor, only to lose the office two years later when he was refused a recount after a narrow defeat.

After several terms as city manager in Grand Rapids, Welsh returned to statewide politics as a candidate for governor in the 1932 Republican primaries. When he lost, he refused to support the GOP nominee.

In 1936, Welsh stunned Michigan Republicans—and Democrats—by calling a press conference to announce:

"I can no longer conscientiously support the policies of the Republican Party."

He ran as a Democratic candidate for governor, but lost in the primary to Frank Murphy, the former mayor of Detroit.

He returned once more to the city manager's job in Grand Rapids and in 1938 won the first of six consecutive terms as mayor of the growing city.

In 1949, a citizens' reform movement forced an election to recall Welsh on the grounds that his city political machine had been touched with corruption and indifference to city problems.

Three weeks before the election, Welsh—who was touring Italian cities as a delegate of the U.S. Conference of Mayors—cabled his resignation from Rome.

"I will retain my interest in public affairs and express my view on public questions," he said after his defeat in a 1950 comeback try.

His "views," carried in a small newspaper he published in Grand Rapids, have kept him in the center of controversy for 70 years.

Just a few years ago, when Boelens was mayor, the city commission refused to approve a resolution of praise for Welsh.

"He's still pretty spry for 90," said Boelens. "He can still take it—and still dish it out—with sharp wit."

Welsh himself put it this way when asked some years ago about his life in politics:

"Win or lose, the game's the thing. I still get a kick out of it."

CHILD CARE: HELPING THOSE WHO HELP THEMSELVES

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, working mothers across America are today, April 10, observing National Working Mothers Day. Many of them will be bringing their children to work to demonstrate the need for comprehensive child care in America.

The HEW regulations proposed for funding of social service programs are so stringent that they fall well below the \$2.5 billion ceiling imposed by Congress last October.

Mr. Speaker, there are more than 7 million single parent households in this country, and beyond that 50 percent of all wives work. The truth is that most women work, because they have to. Any reduction in the availability of publicly assisted child care would mean an even greater reduction in the American family's ability to remain economically independent.

As Americans we pride ourselves on our business know-how. No country in the world has produced the wealth and the high standard of living that we have. But somehow when we determine social policy for the country we forget all that we have learned.

A businessman who did not figure in the long-range return on his investment or the alternative costs when he was considering a new expenditure would not last very long. That is the situation right now for the funding of child development programs and day-care centers. The administration does not want to spend the money. They say the budget is too tight. I could talk about national priorities and how with only so much money to spend we have to decide whether to spend it on guns or on children; how it all depends on which you care more about, the guns or the children. I could talk for hours about children with handicaps and mothers, ashamed, because they are forced to live on welfare.

But we have all heard that so often that today I am going to talk to purse strings rather than to the heart strings. This is an argument for Federal aid in terms of costs, cash costs, and maybe the administration will be able to understand that.

There are over 6 million children under 6 whose mothers work. Less than a million are in licensed day-care centers. There are 17 million children who are educationally deprived. What will become of these children without proper help and guidance? Many of them will be the "social problems" of the next generation. Many of them will be the drug addicts plaguing society 10 years from now. The Government will have to spend untold billions on drug programs; billions more will be lost as the crime rate zooms.

The largest cost may be in lost production. Skills which children never learn are never put to use. Future welfare rolls are right now in the making. Children who grow up without proper education and health care not only suffer themselves; they cause society to suffer with them. The untrained handicapped are a money cost as well as a moral cost and there are over 3½ million handicapped children who are not receiving adequate services.

Finally, if we do not break into the poverty cycle now, there will be many more children in the next generation needing attention and demanding funds. Day-care centers, providing early attention to the problems of children are a necessary capital investment to keep the country growing and solvent.

What of the price we pay right now? We are constantly discussing the cost of welfare. There are over 1 million women who could be working, providing for themselves and their families, but they must stay home or their children will be alone or out on the streets. Not only the poor must pay this price. Many lower- and middle-income wives must work to help support their families. These women need help; they cannot afford private centers. There are millions more who would like to be working, adding to the wealth of the country but who simply cannot leave their children.

It should be clear to the most hard-headed money manager that the longer we stall on paying for child development programs the more it will cost us. That is why I have cosponsored a Comprehensive Child Development Act. This bill will provide for a family-oriented program of early childhood development and preschool education for the children of lower- and middle-income families. The program will be voluntary and closely involve the parents in its operation; tailoring services to different home situations.

It will provide for the training of professional staff and the establishment of explicit standards for the development programs and day-care centers. The bill authorizes the expenditure of \$150 million in fiscal 1974 for planning and \$2 billion in fiscal 1975 for operations. This large sum is truly quite small compared to what we shall have to pay, now and in the future, if we fail to act.

SOVIET JEWS SEEK RIGHT TO EMIGRATE

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, recent reports of a change in Soviet policy with regard to the imposition of heavy taxes on individuals wishing to emigrate is a promising and gratifying development. It does not, however, in my judgment, remove the need to include a provision along the lines of the Jackson-Mills-Vanik amendment, of which I am a co-sponsor, in any legislation granting trade concessions to the Soviet Union and other East European nations. If the Soviets genuinely intend to stick to their decision to do away with the tax, then any provision making future trade concessions contingent on open emigration policies would only serve to endorse that policy. That, in my judgment, is a small concession for the Soviets to make in return for the very substantial benefits they stand to reap from large-scale trade with the United States.

The American public-at-large, on the other hand, stands to gain little from expanded trade with the Soviet Union. If anything, it is likely to contribute to rising food costs that are already making life miserable for millions of Americans. Assurance that freedom of Soviet citizens to emigrate will accompany any increased U.S.S.R.-American trade would at least give the American public the sat-

isfaction of knowing that the cause of human freedom had been advanced.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, there continues to be many cases of persecution and refusal of requests of Soviet citizens to emigrate which call into serious question the sincerity and good intentions of the Soviets on this matter. The following are four examples of cases which have come to my attention in recent weeks:

First. Mr. Youra Berkovsky, an engineer, his wife, Anna, a teacher of English, and their 3-year-old daughter Rina have applied to emigrate to Israel, but so far have been denied permission to leave. As is so often the case, these individuals were immediately dismissed from their jobs when they announced their intention to emigrate in August of 1972. They have committed no crime, and they should be permitted to join their people in Israel. The Berkovskys live at Novogodnee 36, room 40, Novosibirsk 87, U.S.S.R.

Second. The wife, 5-year-old son, and ailing mother of Soviet Cellist Victor Yoran, now a resident of Israel, have been refused permission to join Mr. Yoran. Stella Goldberg, Mr. Yoran's wife, is a noted concert pianist, and I join in the appeals that have been made by many of the world's professional musicians that these three innocent members of the Yoran family be allowed to leave the Soviet Union and to be reunited with their husband, son, and father—Victor Yoran. Stella Goldberg resides at Bol'shaya Cherkizovskaya Street No. 8-7-72, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

Third. The 21-year-old son of Mr. Julius Krylsky, Jan Krylsky, has been confined by Soviet authorities to a mental institution for a year on charges of "militant Zionism." He is reported to be kept in a ward for the criminally insane, where he has been given injections that leave him delirious. He has been allowed only rare visits with his mother. When the Krylsky family applied for permission to emigrate to Israel early in 1972, a court case in which Jan had been involved and was acquitted was reopened and he was institutionalized as a "schizophrenic." The brutal treatment given this young man ought to be stopped and he and his mother permitted to emigrate to Israel. Jan Krylsky is institutionalized at Bolnetza Ya 0 100/5, Specealnaya Psychiatricheskaya, Sechovka Smolenskoy Oblast, U.S.S.R.

Fourth. Finally, there is the case of Isai and Grigory Goldshtain and Elizabet Bikova, who have been refused permission to emigrate. Isai and Grigory are both scientists. After they applied for permission to emigrate, their apartment was searched, documents—including a copy of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—were confiscated, and Soviet officials charged them with slandering the Soviet Union. Gen. Alexi Nicolichevitch Inauri, Chairman of the KGB of the Republic of Georgia, has jurisdiction over their emigration request, and has so far refused to grant them permission to leave.

Grigory and Isai Goldshtain and Elizabet Bikova have written to Soviet President Podgorny explaining their rea-

sons for giving up their Soviet citizenship and have sent a letter to U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim appealing for help. Copies of those letters follow:

The reasons for renouncing Soviet citizenship. I, Goldstein, Isai Abramovitch, a citizen of U.S.S.R., a Jew, would like to unite with my people in our historical fatherland, Israel. Up to this date, I have been denied this possibility. I am forced to be a citizen of a country that is helping the enemies of my fatherland. This became clear in September of 1972 at the time when the whole world was shocked by the Munich tragedy. The people of Israel and its leaders received numerous telegrams of condolence and sympathy and condemnation of the bandits. The great Socialistic power did not condemn the Black Septemberists. It is even not refuted that the murders were committed with Soviet arms. The heads of the terrorists from different organizations are accepted in Moscow with honor, and they receive moral and material support. At the same time, in the camps of Potma and other places, no less severe and under inhuman conditions, Jews are imprisoned, their only crime being their strong desire to remain Jews and to repatriate to Israel. It is very difficult to live in a country which keeps you as a hostage and a vassal. How can one rid himself of the feeling that, on top of the illegal refusals to grant exit permits, taxes are added for education, if one is lucky enough to get an exit permit in the future.

One does not have to be an economic specialist to understand that a professional who has worked for a few years in the U.S.S.R. does not owe the government anything. The new tax does not depend on how long one has worked—even pensioners with a higher education are assessed if they want to leave the U.S.S.R. One does not have to comment on the moral issue of the academic tax.

I, a Jew, am writing about the reasons for renouncing my Soviet citizenship in Russian. I would have preferred to do it in Hebrew; but, unfortunately, Hebrew does not exist, officially in the Soviet Union. I did not have the good fortune to learn to speak, write and think in my native tongue. I barely know the national traditions, culture, history and literature of my ancient people, a people who have gone through great suffering but still remain strong in spirit, because in the U.S.S.R. there is no possibility to live a national Jewish life. This kind of life is indispensable for me. I want, and am obligated to have, children who will not owe the Soviet Union at least 500 rubles a piece for the renunciation of their citizenship, but who will be proud of their people on their own soil.

These are my reasons for renouncing my Soviet citizenship. I do not wish to elaborate on the incidents of antisemitism.

The above letter was sent to Podgorny on October 11, 1972. On the same date, the same letter was also sent to Podgorny by Grigory Goldstein and Elizabeth Bikova.

On November 7th we are declaring a hunger strike. On October 28th we sent a letter to Podgorny, Chairman of the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. I am dictating the letter:

"We Jews of the city of Tbilisi, having renounced our Soviet citizenship, are declaring, on the 7th of November, a 24-hour hunger strike in our homes. On this day we will pray for the Jews of Israel, the Jews in the Arab countries and for those Jews who, in spite of harassment and persecution, will not cease their lawful struggle for the repatriation to Israel and for the fulfillment of their holy aims."

GRIGORY GOLDSTEIN,
ISAI GOLDSTEIN,
ELIZABETH BIKOVA.

All this was sent to President Podgorny on October 28th.

TRANSLATION OF THE APPEAL BY GRIGORY GOLDSHTEIN, ISAI GOLDSHTEIN, AND ELIZABETH BIKOVA WRITTEN IN RUSSIAN
THE APPEAL, SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Honorable Senators, we and many other Jews from different cities of the USSR wishing to repatriate to Israel are not only lacking the opportunity to carry out our inalienable rights, but are also persecuted in various ways: shadowing, arresting, threatening interrogations and etc. Tens of Jews are imprisoned for their desire to live in Israel. Among them is Sylva Salmanson who's health is in jeopardy. All Jews with higher education and academic degrees who are permitted to leave the USSR are required to pay a large sum of money. The amendment to the law concerning the educational levy does not change our situation.

We appeal to You with the request that you do all that You possibly can to attain free emigration of Jews from the USSR, and bring about cancellation of the unfair payment. Do not be led astray by the few cases of individuals obtaining permission to leave without paying ransom. You have the facility to influence those upon whom our fate depends. We are hopeful of receiving Your help. This will be a manifestation of the free will on part of all freedom loving people.

With Respect,

GRIGORY GOLDSHTEIN,
ISAI GOLDSHTEIN,
ELIZABETH BIKOVA.

P.S. The copies of this letter—the appeal—are sent to Secretary General K. Waldheim of the United Nations and to the Chairman of the Committee of Human Rights, of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the supposed changes in Soviet emigration policies and the declared termination of the emigration tax has so far not changed anything for these Soviet citizens of the Jewish faith. I shall be looking for action on their cases, and the cases of many others like them, in the days ahead as an indicator of Soviet intentions and policies, and I hope and trust that you, Mr. Speaker, and every Member of this Congress and reader of the RECORD will be doing likewise.

THE ATLANTIC UNION DELEGATION

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the rule which we had up today which would have allowed the House to consider House Joint Resolution 205, authorizing a delegation of 18 eminent citizens of the United States to meet in a convention with representatives of the NATO Treaty countries and such other nations as the convention might invite, I should like to add in the body of the RECORD following my remarks one of the Marfleet Lectures I delivered on February 27, 1942, at the University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, on the subject of the postwar world. In this lecture I traced the development of organizations of nations to keep the peace and to promote the well-being of the member nations and their people. And I pointed out the imperative need that we continue the effort to bring together the peace-

loving, freedom-loving nations and peoples of the world in an effective international organization.

Since that time the United Nations has been formed and has been in operation. It has not achieved all that many of us who are strong supporters of it had hoped. But its successes have been many and no wise person, in my opinion, would propose that it be destroyed. NATO, which I supported in the Senate and in the signing of which I participated, has probably saved Western Europe from Communist aggression and has been an immeasurable safeguard to our own country. The Council of Europe is gaining in strength and significance. The Common Market in Western Europe is bringing together Western European nations which with us and Canada are the bulwark of freedom and peace in the world. But we must not stop in bringing freedom-loving and peace-loving nations together in still closer unity. That is the challenge and the task of the future.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my Marfleet Lecture of February 27, 1942, to follow these remarks:

THE SECOND OF THE MARFLEET LECTURES DELIVERED BY SENATOR CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, TORONTO, CANADA, FEBRUARY 27, 1942

Your friend and our President Roosevelt in his first address to the Nation after Pearl Harbor said, "We are going to win the war, and we are going to win the peace that follows." Earlier the President had said, "The cooperation which we seek is the cooperation of free countries working together in a friendly, civilized society."

In addressing the American Congress in December you remember those pathetic and prophetic words of that great soldier of freedom, Prime Minister Churchill: "If we had kept together after the last war, if we had taken common measures for our safety, this renewal of the curse need never have fallen upon us. Do we not owe it to ourselves, to our children, to tormented mankind to make sure that these catastrophes do not engulf us for the third time? * * * Duty and prudence alike command that the germ centers of hatred and revenge should be constantly and vigilantly curbed and treated in good time and that an adequate organization should be set up to make sure that the pestilence can be controlled at its earliest beginning before it spreads and rages throughout the entire earth."

The whole world was thrilled by those declarations made, no doubt, close to your country, and we have some satisfaction in saying, in the new world, known as the Atlantic Charter, even in the dark summer of 1941. It is worthy of note that whereas the 14 points of another great prophet and soldier of freedom and democracy, President Wilson, spoke of nations and peoples principally, the Atlantic Charter left no doubt that the emphasis of its authors was upon the safety and the welfare of individual men, women, and children as well. Where in any other such document have you seen so much concern for ordinary men having jobs, ordinary families having homes, ordinary children having an education, ordinary old people having security, ordinary people having freedom of movement, speech, press, thought, conscience?

Where was there ever such a document as that drawn up in Washington on the 1st day of this momentous year by the 26 United Nations, coming from every hemisphere and continent, representing altogether three-

April 10, 1973

quarters of the people of the earth, where the Atlantic Charter was definitely adopted and all the resources of those mighty peoples dedicated to the unshoring of tyranny and the triumph of men, even over man's inhumanity to man?

Pope Pius XII, in pleading for a peace which would be just, in December of 1940, saw the necessity of every state insuring "the proper standards of living for its own citizens of every rank." Everyone will recall an earlier utterance of President Roosevelt laying down the "four freedoms" for which we must, without ceasing, strive: Freedom of speech and expression, everywhere in the world; freedom of worship, everywhere in the world; freedom from want, everywhere in the world; freedom from fear, everywhere in the world.

In the 10 proposals for peace which were drawn up by the highest authorities of the Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Free Churches in England in 1940, it was declared that "a peace settlement must be dictated by a sense of acute responsibility"; "that extreme inequality of wealth should be abolished"; and that "the resources of the earth should be used as God's gift to the whole human race and used with due consideration for the present and future generations."

Another statement from England adopted at the Malvern conference representing liberal Church of England clergy and laymen in January 1941, supported the 10 proposals for peace and made additional recommendations. "The only true end of production," asserted this conference, "is the satisfaction of human needs." Lord Halifax has said that the system to follow the war must "bring some real security into the daily life of our humblest citizen."

It is interesting to note that Mr. Brian Penton, able editor of the Sidney Daily Telegraph of Australia, has said that after the war "something must be done to rescue nine tenths of the human race from the bread line." "Social justice at home depends upon social justice abroad."

These are just a few of those sentiments which in your own country everywhere are finding vigorous expression as to what kind of an order there must be in the post-war world. It is from the sources of such sentiments that are being drawn out so many plans and so much planning for that world which we must rescue from the holocaust of war.

That is the thing that makes this war endurable, that and the conviction that we can and shall make these dreams come true. Ours is a much sadder and wiser world than was that easy-going world which found itself suddenly plunged into the maelstrom of war in 1914. That war started as this one started, as all recent major wars in Europe have started, by ruthless German assault.

The motive behind those who fought against the Hitlerism of that day was first to hurl back the criminal attack, to regain that security and independence which had been snatched away. But before that struggle ended at least (Whatever the critics or the cynics may say) it was to the people of my country just what our President, who saw so far, said it was—a war to make the world safe for democracy.

At the end of that war President Wilson could say, as he did say, that the world had been made safe for democracy. But what a price had been paid! Our freedom so dearly bought should have been cherished and nurtured and guarded. Rather into the camp of those who had gained the victory came confusion in aim and purpose. We were not on guard enough against the temptation, natural enough to believe that the victory having been won, the enemy defeated, the danger avoided, God was in his heaven and all was well with the world.

My country morally, as we Baptists say, "fell from grace." It lapsed back into what was called normalcy, but was, in fact moral apathy. We tired of restraint, shunned the call of duty, spurned obligations afar off, and pretty well fell to—

"The good old rule,
The simple plan,
That they should take, who have the power,
And they should keep who can."

among ourselves. In public and in private life moral standards fell sadly low. Almost repenting of our crusade, we retreated into what we believed to be the impregnable fastness of our oceanic isolation. A few brave spirits, of course, did keep alive the flame of those great days, but few of the multitude, passing with the abandon of a circus crowd, cared to notice. We sowed the wind. We are reaping the whirlwind.

The fault, of course, is not all ours. There were others who "saw as through a glass darkly." The world had not learned to know itself well enough. It did not realize that the industrial revolution, science, business, transportation, commerce, travel had woven a tight web around the whole earth and made it all one. We had not learned that there was a practical basis also for the moral principle of brotherhood, and that well-being anywhere was directly related to well-being everywhere. It was too soon in the history of man for those who ordered the earth in that day to see that fate had given them an opportunity to build better than men had ever built before; each people to have its part in building a magnificent edifice in the city of man, bearing its own craftsman's mark.

I remember hearing Dr. Brüning, formerly German Chancellor, say that Hitler came to power for three principal reasons:

First, the failure of the people of Europe to keep their governments in power long enough to solve the challenging post-war problems.

Second, the inability of the governments of Europe to remove the obstructions of trade barriers so that there might have been in Europe that exchange of goods and services which would have brought stability, maybe prosperity.

Third, the failure of the governments of Europe to solve the problem of currency stabilization, without which there could be no economic stability.

But nations asking the old question: "What have I to do with this nation?" failed to appreciate that the dictate of necessity was the assured well-being of all other peoples in a world so interdependent. It was too soon for nations to understand that nations, like individuals, had to curb their rights, to exercise less than their whole power to live as good citizens in the world community. For example, my country in 1930 took full advantage of its legal prerogative in passing a tariff act. Only later did we see that we had drawn a noose around our own neck, and that the principal of live and let live is just as good business as it is ethics. Of course, hard-pressed nations would seek the temporary advantage of currency devaluation when there was no more substantial alternative. Hence, hindsight now reveals that the peace after the First World War was destined to collapse because the structure which was designed to support it had too few pillars. Without a solid economic foundation there could be no stable world system.

But who of us is not proud that it was our own generation that saw the culmination of a long and uphill trail in the creation of the League of Nations, to which, at one time or another, almost every country but my

own had belonged. It was a magnificent beginning. To me and to many in my country it will be an enduring satisfaction which shall partially obscure, we hope, our abandonment of this child, that we once nobly gave it birth. Do not underestimate the League. The pages of history set apart for its records will be far from blank. There were some great years during which the heart and the hope of mankind were centered upon the League. On the shores of the crystal-pure waters of the Lake of Geneva there stands an edifice in the chambers of which there were once men and women from 56 nations of many tongues, many colors, many creeds, all working for a better world, former friend and foe together. Not in all history was there a counterpart. The world, one might have hoped, had shrunk to a community. It seemed that we were at last in the presence of a courthouse and a sheriff.

Lest we might to much despair over the eclipse of this majestic dream and that we might view the panorama of man's struggle toward an ordered world, let us look back over the records.

In the dim past of western civilization, those great prophets of the Old Testament, Isaiah and Micah, set the goal of a world united in peace, justice and the fear of God. Ever since, by slow stages, thinkers have been preparing blue prints of a world wholly or in part organized, and governments, from time to time, have been experimenting with certain forms of international organization.

In the world of ancient Greece, from the seventh to the fourth centuries B. C., Amphyctionic leagues and other stable confederations attempted to bring together several sovereign states, organizing them for peaceful cooperation. Most significant among them were the Achaean League of some 12 city-states, based on perfect equality of the member states, without domination of one over the others; and the great Delphic Amphyctony, which, supported by the authority of common worship, brought together almost the entire Greek race.

Even in ancient Italy, before Rome began its ascent toward world empire, there existed, in the seventh to fourth centuries B. C., the Latin League of about 30 city-states, with whom Rome, too, was associated, and which functioned as a true federation.

After centuries of peace imposed by force upon a large part of the western world by the Roman Empire, that power broke asunder, and for a long time people lost touch with one another, restricted within their local units. Gradually, western and central Europe awoke from stupor. Though divided in innumerable units, the people of that part of the world were aware of their spiritual unity symbolized by the Roman Catholic Church, and developed a pull after temporal unity as well. Pope and Emperor—an Emperor usually chosen by vote of princes representing different countries—assured a kind of international organization from the eighth till the fifteenth century.

But this vague organization did not suffice to the best minds of Europe, still nurturing Isaiah's ancient dream, and we find Pierre Dubois, a French scholar, proposing in 1305 that all Christian powers ally themselves for the maintenance of peace and institute a permanent court of arbitration.

Even more interesting was the plan suggested in 1461 by King Podiebrad of Bohemia, a precursor of the Czechoslovaks (noble ideas of a Masaryk and a Benes) in our days, to organize a Federal union composed of all Christian states, with a permanent council in the city of Basle as the supreme body.

When Reformation disrupted the former unity of the western world, reducing in con-

sequence the part played by Pope and Emperor as centers of a precarious international order, individuals and governments were driven to feel doubly the need for a world union. Individuals, some of them heads of states and responsible statesmen, indulged freely in far-reaching projects of a full-fledged federation of Europe or even of the world.

First in point of time and most amazing in many respects was the plan submitted in 1603 by King Henry IV of France and his minister, Sully, to other governments with a view to establishing a European federation composed of 15 member states of equal strength and equal status, with a general council to administer the federation's affairs.

There followed in 1623 the project of Emeric Cruce, a learned Frenchman, of a world union of states. With a broad-mindedness far in advance of his time, Cruce wanted to include the non-Christian states into the world union on an equal footing with the states professing various Christian creeds, and proposed the city of Venice as seat of the general council of the union.

There followed in quick succession the projects of the German philosopher Leibnitz in 1676; of the Count of Hesse-Rheinfels in 1673; of Charles Duke of Lorraine, in 1688; of one of America's earliest and greatest statesmen, William Penn, in 1693; of the English Quaker, John Bellers, in 1710; of the French Abbé de St. Pierre in 1712 (with his *Abbrégé* published in 1729) of Cardinal Alberoni in 1735, of the Frenchman D'Argenson in the 1740's; of Jeremy Bentham of England, in 1789; of the German Schleitwein in 1791; of the philosopher Kant in 1795; and of the Frenchman St. Simon and Thierry, in 1814. This array of names includes only the most outstanding ones belonging to many nations. It indicates that courageous and inquisitive minds could not rest while the world remained an arena of selfish strife. In a way, Kant's contribution will interest us more particularly. This great German inspired by the French Revolution was one of the first who insisted that the world union could not be securely built unless it is based on democratic principles, representing a union of peoples rather than a union of rulers.

After 1814, the idea of organizing the world made rapid progress. With pride I may point out the leadership of my countrymen in this movement. Peace societies were founded in 1815 in Massachusetts, New York, and Ohio. Similar societies in other States followed, and in 1828 they consolidated in the American Peace Society, led by that apostle of world peace, William Ladd. The Advocate of Peace, the organ of this movement, started appearing in 1834, and still continues its good work.

A similar movement of peace societies developed in England beginning 1816. The English economists, Cobden and Richard, were among its leaders. It spread to other countries, and international peace congresses were held annually between 1848 and 1853. After a brief interval, further international peace congresses were held in Switzerland under the auspices of another international group, the "League de la paix et de la liberté," founded by the Frenchman Charles Lemonnier. This peace movement of the nineteenth century, while mainly pacifist in character, went beyond propaganda for disarmament and arbitration. A volume published in 1840 and edited by William Ladd dealt with the core of the problem—it was a collection of essays on a congress of nations. The "League de la paix et de la liberté" raised prominently the issue of a united states of Europe. Victor Hugo presided over the peace congress of 1849 in Paris; Garibaldi took active part in the peace congress of 1867 in Geneva; and the English-speaking world was stirred in 1842 by Tennyson's inspired vision, in his *Locksley Hall*:

"For I dip into the future, far as human eye could see.
Saw the vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;
Saw the heaven fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rain'd a ghastly dew
From the nation's airy navies grappling in the central blue,
Far along the world-wide whisper of the south wind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples plunging thro' the thunderstorm;
Till the war drum throb'd no longer, and the battle flags were furl'd
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world.
There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law."

In the meantime, preparatory work was being accomplished in many directions. Pacifists led by Baroness Bertha von Suttner led the struggle for disarmament. Lawyers, combining in the "Institut de droit international" and the "international law association", began laying the foundations of a future universal law. Two of Europe's lawyers, the Scot Lorimer and the Swiss Bluntschli, came out with proposals of an international federation. Members of legislatures from many countries formed the Interparliamentary Union and strongly urged the substitution of arbitration for war. The best and most enlightened elements of the world's public opinion were getting ready, by stages, for the great idea of an international federation. On May 5, 1910, Theodore Roosevelt, former President of the United States, in an address before the Nobel Committee in Christiania, Norway, bluntly declared as goal "the establishment of some sort of international, police power, competent and willing to prevent violence as between nations." The United States Congress added its authoritative voice of approval. On April 5, 1910, a resolution was introduced into the House of Representatives of the United States by Representative Bartholdt, of Missouri, "to authorize the appointment of a commission to draft articles of international-federation, and for other purposes." The resolution, as modified by a proposal by Representative Bennett, of New York, authorized "a commission of five members *** to consider the expedience *** of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace."

The resolution in this form was adopted—unanimously, mark you—by the House on June 20, 1910, by the Senate on June 24, 1910, and became law the next day as Public Resolution No. 47, Sixty-first Congress. It can be found, a monument to the real sentiments of America, in Volume 36 of the United States Statutes at Large, on page 885.

While far-reaching projects were thus being prepared by individuals, groups, and single countries, the governments of the world, too, were driven to recognize the unsatisfactory state of a divided and disorganized world. Clinging jealously to their cherished independence they were afraid to adopt with determination a world federation scheme and relied for preservation of peace on the inadequate instrument of defensive alliances and the artificial device of balance of power. But the methods were plainly insufficient, and time after time the great powers of the world—those with most stakes in the affairs of the world—had to invent some machinery for organizing this planet. To do this, they resorted to international congresses

and conferences which decided at least the most urgent questions of the time, leaving other questions in abeyance. This conference method had numerous drawbacks; it lacked permanence; it depended on a sufficient number of great powers being willing to resort to it; it required unanimity and therefore could always be broken up by any power sufficiently obstinate; it placed the decisions on the fate of countries and nations in the hands of a group of great powers which were free to invite other, smaller countries to the conference table or not.

In spite of all these drawbacks, it is most significant that the decisive powers of the world, at critical times in history, after wars and at important points in times of peace, again and again assembled in conference to obviate at least temporarily the deplorable lack of the sorely needed permanent organization of mankind.

To name but the most important ones of these international congresses, we have the Congress of Westphalia in 1648, the Congress of Utrecht in 1713, the Congress of Aix-La-Chapelle in 1748, the Congress of Vienna in 1814, in which was born the semi-permanent organization of the "Concert of Europe"—including England, France, Prussia, Russia, Austria-Hungary, with Italy later added—and the smaller and briefer "Holy Alliance." The next important congresses of the "Concert of Europe" were the Congress of Paris in 1856, and the two congresses of Berlin in 1878 and 1885.

In addition to these occasional political congresses, piecemeal organization of the world was progressing since the middle of the last century. International conferences, more or less universal in character, were convened to deal with the treatment of prisoners, with communications, with various technical and humanitarian questions. Conventions were drafted and international bodies were set up to administer the agreed rules. It was a mesh which bound the countries of the world together, always closer and closer, but a mesh made of thin and weak threads, with every government retaining the right to kick out, start a war and destroy—for a time, at least—all the patient work that was built up so carefully.

But both the great political congresses and the international administrative conventions demonstrated the universally felt need of a thorough federalization of the world, and the trend toward this federalization was unmistakable.

The dawn of the future rose in 1899 when an almost universal conference assembled at The Hague to consider disarmament and the substitution of arbitration and conciliation for war. Neither the first nor the Second Hague Conference, in 1907 succeeded in these tasks, and on the eve of the third conference the war of 1914 broke out.

But in 1919 the world was determined to continue pulling the long up-hill trail toward world organization. The Paris Peace Conference, an assembly of many nations, wrote five peace treaties—Versailles, St. Germain, Trianon, Neuilly, Seizes—not particularly good nor particularly bad they were, as peace treaties go—and left a conference of ambassadors, representing the major allies, to supervise the carrying out of the treaty provisions. But the eyes of the world were glued with hope on the other child of the Peace Conference—the League of Nations, with its two associated bodies of the World Court and the International Labor Organization.

An attempt was made in 1924 to strengthen the League by the Geneva protocol. Here, then, are the footprints of our faltering course up the long trail. What of the path ahead? What sort of an order shall we set up when at last the joyous bells of peace shall ring out? I wonder if we appreciate just what we are doing now; I mean those of

us who are members of the United Nations in working together.

Remember that three-fourths of the human race are together against tyranny in this war. There is already much planning together, working together, fighting together. The controls are becoming more effective, tighter and more completely in harmony all over our vast lands. This process will so much grow we all hope, I know, that by the time we hit our stride we shall all who are together in this fight, move each in its orbit with precision and sureness. Or to put it another way, let us like the many elements of a modern army, move each in its appointed manner, with complete unison and efficiency. What valuable experience in working together that will afford and at a time when the serious issue is life and death, too? What understanding will it give us all of one another? What confidence and trustworthiness can it give rise to?

How mighty may it allay those suspicions which rise in the minds of nations as in the minds of men? What lessons will it teach us in helping one another to help the whole cause? What may it do to teach us that we gain by giving? Surely we will have learned what each has to give and what each lacks and what there is may be distributed all around where it is needed. Can you imagine anything more valuable than the lessons we already know and will know much better before it is over of how little the question of money matters? We see now how it is just another one of the essential materials to be shifted around where the front demands it. We who are a people addicted to sports know especially what it means to have played on a team with some other fellows and to have been battered in hard games against bitter rivals.

Out of the long experience, therefore, which we will get from the conduct of this war, we shall already have rubbed off the rough edges of one another and got to getting along smoothly as men do who depend upon each other for life.

These are very real reasons why the utmost of collaboration among us all in the conduct of this war is so very essential besides winning the war. If we are doing that, it should not be so difficult to keep on doing it when the war is over. Indeed, the necessity then will hardly be less than it is now, for those, too, will be hard days. Peace will not bring the end of famine and disease and poverty and wounds and disorder and confusion. It will not automatically solve anything. All it will do is to release the mighty energies of man for the wholesome work of building up instead of tearing down.

It may strike you as strange to hear me say, "I hope the end of the war will bring no immediate peace." I mean, of course, I want to see no peace arranged of the sort we think of as ending wars, when the wounds of war are yet open and running and it is too early to see what the whole course of treatment must be. When hostilities actually stop, when the enemy has been forced into the corner of his own land, when his weapons have been stricken from his hands and he is powerless to go on fighting, then our first task is to be sure that there is a guard over him, that he cannot strike at us while our backs are turned. Our next task is to get things straightened out; to get our soldiers and sailors and airmen home.

Then we must size up the situation, examine the state of things, see what there is to be done. And then just keep on working together to get it done; continue the same co-ordination and cooperation among the United Nations which made them win the war. Supplies will still be needed to be transferred across the oceans and the lands to where they are most needed. Surely, in the other hemisphere they must have food everywhere, and there must be money, money

to bind up the wounds of the injured, to house the weak, to provide homes for the homeless, to rebuild every kind of edifice, to restore the harvests, and to bring light into the dark places where hope is dormant.

Of course, there will be adjustments and understandings and give and take, and at times gentle suggestions will accompany responses as in our own time we have seen freedom of religion the handmaiden of land-lease. The personnel of the conferences will, of course, change, but politicians must not be the only ones to displace the generals and the admirals. In fact there must be fewer politicians—maybe no politicians at all; rather those who are statesmen in economics, in health, in jobs in housing, in working conditions, in a world currency, in world trade, in world freedom, in a world bill of rights, in a world order.

With the fighting stopped it will be possible for the planners to meet at a convenient place and to meet constantly there and to have adequate facilities for their convenience and comfort and for their work. I do not know of any building better adapted for such meeting than those spacious buildings at Geneva which were once so well used. And a lot of people who have once worked there and have had a great experience in getting along with people from all over the world and handling things which come in from everywhere and speaking different languages could well be brought back there to serve new masters.

If all of the representatives of the United Nations fighting the war of reconstruction together should choose to have their meetings there and call themselves, or if it should be arranged that they should be called the continuing Congress of the United Nations, it would let people everywhere see that we were determined to stand together for peace as we had stood together for war. And to this Congress would be at once invited all nations whether they had been active or not in the war, whether they had been friend or foe. Obviously if the mistakes of the past are not to be repeated, the work of reconstruction must go on in the vanquished nations as well as in the hurt lands of the victors. Those who shall have fallen have their honorable part to play in the scheme of the world.

Arrangements will be made effectively to disarm those whose record of lawlessness has made them always suspect. There must be no possible chance left that any such disturber of the world's peace, or any other who might do so, shall have the power to run amuck again.

Yet, by continuing concert of action by all working together for the common world good, by intelligent and enlightened economic planning and collaboration, by assuring all nations and peoples a square deal in access to raw materials, to markets, to money, to skills, by a new spirit on the part of many like ourselves who have been singularly blessed, much can be done to break down the impulse for any nation to burn brigand.

In this collaboration stage certain techniques will be adopted for handling international problems, and hence institutions will naturally arise to meet varying world demands. For example, international banks will arise in which will be housed, no doubt, for the stabilization of world currency, the major part of the world gold, which is now in the United States. There will be an institution for the settlement of international disputes which are juridical in nature. Certain boards and commissions will be provided which will effectuate the policy of the Congress with respect to all those multiple factors which enter into a healthy world economy. Committees will be constantly at work unearthing facts, accumulating knowledge, working out solu-

tions, harmonizing differences, carrying on the work of a workaday world.

Of course, there will be assurances on the part of those who participate that they will enter into no arrangements privately with any other power affecting any matter of world concern without bringing the matter fully to the attention of the Congress and obtaining its approval. But in the stage of which I am thinking membership in the Congress should not be compulsory, or in any formal way, binding. One does not have to rope and drag traders to the market place. They come there eagerly to do business. There is gain in being there. That is because no doubt each trader feels he has a fair chance and that he will get fair treatment.

It is essential that such a congress be so constituted that it shall be truly representative of those peoples whom it joins together, not only of their governments, and each country must have a feeling that it has fair hearing. It will probably be further necessary, therefore, to have a bicameral body with such a compromise as we have in the United States, where representation, according to population, is the rule in the House and equality the rule in the Senate. Of course the chambers of the congress will be an open forum which can reach the world's ear, and, it is to be hoped, the world's mind.

These suggestions have grown largely out of the working of your commonwealth system and our pan-American system, and in anticipation of what our experience in international collaboration will have been by the end of the war. It seems to me the most natural beginning, the easiest order to set up since it is essentially only a variation of the method of conferring together about common problems and toward common ends in which we shall have engaged in winning the war.

Of course, this is only the antechamber of a structure we all visualize and work for. This makeshift arrangement would impress everybody with its inadequacy and the common judgment of the world would sooner or later demand the building of an edifice which would adequately house the machinery which alone can reasonably and safely order all the world.

I have referred to the struggles and dreams toward a world system. I have mentioned the intimacy of the contact being experienced day by day by the members of the United Nations. I wonder if we are fully aware of just what remarkable cohesion and unity has already been attained in putting together the peoples of our earth.

In the United States one hundred and thirty millions of people live under the same government, the same laws, and the same flag, of many races, colors, religions, even languages, and yet they are a nation with a body, mind, and soul.

Look at your case—a great nation and a vast land, inhabited by men and women of many lands, and springing in the main from two great civilizations—the English-speaking civilization and the civilization of France. In wise appreciation of these historical differences, you have not attempted to submerge them through artificial centralization. But neither have you decided to sow the seeds of future discord by complete separation along linguistic or religious lines—as so many groups in Europe have been separating. You have adopted a federal system, you have given full self-government to your provinces, you have assured the survival of French culture among the descendants of French colonists, and the survival of British culture among those who hail from Britain, but you stand as a united family facing together common problems and external dangers, working jointly for a better future.

We in my country are a part of a Pan American Union which is a functioning organization which embraces in a very effec-

tive way all of that immeasurable land and those many people to the South of us in this whole hemisphere. That Pan American Union has a magnificent edifice in Washington which houses its work and its workers. It has a structure which is very definite and real. It has background, specially defined objectives, diligent functioning committees, truly a spirit. It is one of the very real and dynamic forces of the world, speaking altogether for nearly an eighth of the world's people. In spite of the divergence in language, original conditions, cultural and economic interests, this great union has grown greater and every part more interdependent upon each other part until it is beginning to be the realization of Simon Bolivar's dream for this hemisphere one and a quarter centuries ago.

You likewise are a part of a vast commonwealth of nations, stretching around the world. A part of a total system one-quarter of all the world's people. In your great commonwealth constellation each moves in its own orbit, while maintaining to the outside world a marvelous harmony. You, too, are one from many. You, of that commonwealth, are not bound together by force, or the pull of any power save the affinity of a common origin, or common interest and common ends. Such attraction is stronger than the pull of a magnet on steel, or the swaying of the tides by the silvery moon.

Look at Russia—so vast a land that it challenges the imagination. It has 60 nationalities and 140 languages, multiplicitous varieties in its whole pattern, yet all of its parts find their places in one of the 11 autonomous republics under their constitutional system. Each of these republics has by the constitution its own power and prerogatives which even includes the right of secession. Yet all of these vast lands, all these many peoples, all this colossal power move in an invariable unity and today these heroic people like a legion of angry giants, are hurling back the Frankensteins of Hitler. These nearly two hundred millions of people are opening their eyes to the light of a new day and to new and fuller lives, which bodes so much good for themselves and the world.

And see great China aroused from its long sleep, today catching the passion of a new life, 400,000,000 of people, from vast areas, divergent experiences, and what appear to be unbridgeable gulfs between them now finding a new unity, a new power, and a new destiny. There are other vast areas and many other great peoples who have honorable places in the family of United Nations. We see then that neither mountains nor rivers nor oceans nor distances nor differences can keep apart men of good will who would work together.

Now all these mighty systems and many others equally worthy are interwoven with one another, working, fighting and dying together, again out of common interest and for common ends. All these great unities, except my country, have been members of the League of Nations, have had to do with its experience, seen the occasion of its failure, and no doubt is sadder and wiser than ever before. Is there not good reason then to be confident about the future? And we must not forget that we still have the very real force and pattern of the League of Nations, the World Court, the International Labor Office, and many units of the League functioning when the war will let them against traffic in women and narcotics and in alleviating economic and social conditions.

Compare what our generation has accomplished or bids fair to gain for a world order and world justice with anything in the past from the Amphictyony League through the Hague Conventions, and you will see that we have much to console us and to give us hope.

It is suggested that we might start by some sort of regional arrangement our post-

war collaboration with the hope that thereafter the regional units might be put together into a larger frame. I do not favor this approach, although family unity, of course, never prevented any separate members of the family from being very close together. My view is enforced by the feeling that the problems with which we are struggling today are not regional problems but world problems, and they must all be approached with a world perspective. We are today collaborating upon a world basis; even our people think in terms of world affairs. We look at world maps and fight around the world. If the world is to be saved, it is to be saved together. If it sinks, it will sink not in parts but as a whole. We will all admit that the day when nations may build up a colossal armament and threatening power like the day of pistol "toting" in most of our countries must go. There must be effective disarmament and a force centrally directed which can put down lawlessness in any part of the world community. There must be an adequate machinery for the adjustment of conflicts, in a judicial atmosphere. There must be a forum in which a claimant may be heard and in which just redress may be afforded. There must be encouraged and established everywhere a bill of rights to insure to all men in all lands those safeguards and privileges to which man has a natural right and which will make where he lives less important as to the kind of life he can live.

There must be the pushing down of those barriers which break the natural and necessary flow of goods and services among the peoples of the earth. No one will be expected to give up his country any more than in your country one is expected to give up his province, or in mine, his state, but we will all understand what we determined in my country by a sad Civil War, that one's whole allegiance is not to the immediate place of his birth, or his residence.

The lines of national boundaries will be softened and lose their sharpness. As the economic level rises in all the world, there will be more travel and hence better understanding amongst people. The means of travel will exceed anything we now can think of. Methods of communication even will be vastly improved. We will all be rubbing elbows most all of the time. And each nation will be enriched by more intimate contact with the culture of every other people, while under a universal urge science, always akin everywhere, will gain a new unity and greater achievement.

Of course, some of us are going to have to take the initiative in getting things going and in keeping them going, just as men of good will and vision have had to do in every movement. There must be some whose faith never falters, who keep steadily ahead toward the goal. There must be some who will stand steadfast together, no matter what comes. There must be some to bear the brunt and shock of discouragement, or even failure. This is our role—the role primarily of your people and mine. Everyone expects us to assume that role. We are richly endowed for it. We can succeed.

One of the peculiarities of our civilization is our way of plodding along by trial and error, by improvisation, by devising instruments adapted to the occasion. I have preferred to rely upon that genius of our people rather than to make a blueprint of what we should do. Here again I draw upon the analogy of my country in the formation of its Federal Constitution. The prime impulse from that Constitution came from George Washington, who brought a small group together, as you remember, at Mount Vernon, ostensibly to sign a compact for the regulation of a river between Virginia and Maryland. Shortly, Pennsylvania and Delaware were brought in because of relevant interests. Then the Legislature of Virginia, beginning

to get a vision, suggested a general convention of commissioners from the several States to consider the trade of the Union and "how far a uniform system in their commercial relations may be necessary to their common interests and as a matter of harmony." This led to a convention at Annapolis in 1786, attended by five States. One State, New Jersey, it was noted in the report of the convention made by Alexander Hamilton to the legislatures of the States represented and to the Congress, had authorized its delegates to consider not only commercial regulations but "other important matters" necessary to the common interest and permanent harmony of the several States. This report also suggested the calling of another convention with larger powers because, said the report, framed by the far-seeing Hamilton, the "power of regulating trade is of such comprehensive extent, and will enter so far into the general system of the Federal Government, that to give it efficacy, and to obviate questions and doubts concerning its precise nature and limitation, may require a corresponding adjustment of other parts of the Federal System."

This report moved the Federal Congress in February of 1787 to resolve that there should be a convention to consider the means of "establishing in these states a firm national government," and to "render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of the government and the preservation of the Union."

I have dwelt upon this well-known history of the formation of the Federal Union in the United States for two reasons.

First, the cloth was woven upon the loom of commerce and the concept of an adequate government was thought of as inevitably necessary to provide satisfactory commercial conditions.

Secondly, it illustrates our characteristic method of approach to such problems for the delegates to the Constitutional Convention went there with no particular plan, pattern, or precedent. Out of necessity and broad experience and we believe divine guidance they evolved a system which has endured with some strength for more than a century and a half and its greatest days may lie ahead.

We know that men of good will in the world can still build magnificent mansions and dream great dreams. We shall feel and find our way on up the hill, moved, as were the framers of our Constitution, by the necessity of preserving what we have gained, of atonement to those who have died that others might live, and under that divine guidance which is ever man's strength and hope.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON CONDUCT OF FISHING OPERATIONS IN THE ATLANTIC

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing by request a bill to give effect to the International Convention on Conduct of Fishing Operations in the North Atlantic, signed at London on June 1, 1967, and for other purposes.

A hearing on this bill and a bill giving effect to the International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas will be held April 17 at 10 a.m.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of the Executive communications on the measure from the Secretary of Transportation, the text of

the bill, and a section-by-section analysis which has been prepared by the Department of Transportation:

SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill.

"To give effect to the International Convention on Conduct of Fishing Operations in the North Atlantic, signed at London under date of June 1, 1967, and for other purposes."

The proposed bill would provide implementing legislation for the International Convention on the Conduct of Fishing Operations in the North Atlantic, signed at London under date of June 1, 1967, and approved by the Senate on October 22, 1969. The Convention would establish a generally uniform system of identification, marking, light signals, conduct, and enforcement for fishing vessels and support vessels in a large part of the North Atlantic for the United States and sixteen other countries which represent the great majority of the vessels engaged in fisheries in that area. This bill would implement the Convention and enforce it as to United States fishermen. The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating would be charged with responsibility to administer and enforce the provisions of the bill consistent with the terms of the Convention.

In recent years the increased concentration of foreign fishermen operating close to our Atlantic Coast has resulted in a substantial increase in complaints of harassment or impaired operating freedom due to congestion on the fishing grounds. The Convention on the Conduct of Fishing Operations in the North Atlantic is responsive in large part to our, and other countries, needs in this regard throughout the designated area of the North Atlantic.

The Convention establishes a system for marking and identifying fishing vessels which will be useful not only for the purposes of the Convention but for other purposes as well, such as search and rescue. It also establishes a uniform system of fishing signals to supplement the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, and a system of marking fixed and drifting fishing gear. It sets forth a principle of non-interference with other fishing vessels and gear and lays down some basic rules for the good order and conduct of fishing operations in areas frequented by vessels of several nations. A prohibition is imposed by the Convention on dumping into the sea any article or substance which may interfere with fishing or obstruct or cause damage to fish, fishing gear or fishing vessels. The broad regulatory authority of the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating would encompass these matters under the bill. The Convention and the bill also provide for simplified methods of settling claims among fishermen of various nations for damage to fishing gear or vessels.

Enforcement of the Convention is primarily the responsibility of each Contracting Party with respect to its vessels and gear. Within the area of a coastal state's territorial sea and fisheries zone, the coastal state exercises jurisdiction to enforce the Convention which applies from shore to shore; a coastal state may make limited exemptions within its areas of jurisdiction. Outside national fisheries limits enforcement is supplemented by a system of mutual inspection similar to but distinct from enforcement of conservation regulations of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. These responsibilities are recognized and the distinctions preserved in the proposed bill.

Article 16 of the Convention provides that the Convention will enter into force on the

ninetieth day following the date of deposit of the tenth instrument of ratification or approval. We have been advised that the State Department will deposit the United States ratification consequent to passage of implementing legislation. While only six of the necessary ten countries have deposited instruments in accordance with Article 16, it is our hope that the deposit of the United States ratification will spur other countries to act similarly. The bill, if enacted, would not be effective until the Convention enters into force.

Enactment of the proposal would incur costs dependent upon the degree of implementation.

A section-by-section analysis and a list comparing provisions of the Convention with their treatment in provisions of the bill are enclosed.

It would be appreciated if you would lay this proposal before the House of Representatives. A similar proposal has been submitted to the President of the Senate.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE S. BRINEGAR.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Short title.

This section provides that the Act may be cited as "The North Atlantic Fishing Operations Act of 1973."

Section 2. Definitions.

This section contains the definition of various terms used in the Act. The Convention Area is defined by incorporating Annex I of the Convention. Contracting Parties specifically provided for the Annexes to be flexible and amended more easily than the Articles in Article 11 of the Convention. Materials included in the Annex are, then, more easily revised and in the case of the Convention Area this could be used to increase the area included in appropriate circumstances. The limited definitions of the terms "Fishing Vessel" and "Vessel" are provided to parallel that same distinction made initially in Article 1 of the Convention and carried throughout the Convention's terms.

Section 3. Administration and regulation; enforcement; applicability; exemptions.

Subsection 3(a) designates the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating as the administering authority for this Act in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce. Traditionally in the area of fisheries regulation, the Department of Commerce (and previously Interior) has been given the responsibility for administering and enforcing the conservation aspects of the fisheries laws, while the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating has been charged with enforcement of those laws at sea. This Convention is unique to other fisheries conventions in that its primary thrust is towards vessel conduct without reference to conservation measures otherwise in force through international agreement. In this context then, this Convention is properly viewed as one designed to enforce certain standards of conduct in the fisheries.

Assignment of primary responsibility to the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating preserves this traditional pattern, making provision for input in the administration of the Act by the Department of Commerce with their considerable expertise in fisheries conservation matters. Similar treatment is given the regulation writing authority under the Act. Finally, subsection 3(a) provides that certain regulatory functions must be performed by the Secretary subject to the preceding provisions so as to insure implementation of the Convention Articles and Annexes and to es-

tablish notification procedures. Those regulations may provide rules for distribution of vessels and gear on and in the ocean.

Subsection 3(b), consistent with other fisheries laws, designates the role of enforcement to the Coast Guard in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce.

Subsection 3(c) provides that the regulations shall apply to all United States vessels, as defined in subsection 2(h), anywhere within the Convention Area.

Subsection 3(d) implements paragraph 3 of Article 8 of the Convention. That provision permits a Contracting Party to make special rules and exemptions in its coastal waters provided that there is no discrimination in form or fact against vessels of other Contracting Parties entitled to fish in those waters. Consultation with those other Contracting Parties is necessary if they express a wish for same.

Section 4. Designation of Fisheries Conduct Officers; duties; scope of authority to board and investigate; availability as witnesses to other Contracting Parties.

Subsection 4(a) provides for the designation of United States Authorized Officers, to be known as Fisheries Conduct Officers. The Secretary is given broad powers of designation in this subsection, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, to insure flexible administration of the Act in the broad spectrum of area, activities and conditions included within its scope. Limiting the designation of United States Fisheries Conduct Officers to Coast Guard and Department of Commerce personnel is overly restrictive. The Convention Area is so large as to make Coast Guard presence everywhere a virtual impossibility. Although such designation is not presently planned, this section would permit the Secretary to utilize, with the concurrence of the appropriate Secretary, a commissioned officer aboard any vessel or other surface craft of an agency of the United States Government where those craft might be operating in an area of potential fisheries conduct incidents in which no Coast Guard ships are immediately available. Additionally, the Secretary would be authorized to designate as Fisheries Conduct Officers the officers and employees of the States of the United States, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and of any territory or possession of the United States. Those designations must be published to another Contracting Party upon request in accordance with paragraph (3) of Article 9 of the Convention.

Subsection 4(b) sets out the general duties of the Fisheries Conduct Officer as provided in paragraphs (5) and (6) of Article 9 of the Convention.

Subsections 4(c) through 4(h) define the scope of authority of the Fisheries Conduct Officer to board and investigate as set out in paragraphs (5) through (9) and (12) of Article 9 of the Convention. Upon reasonable cause, he may board a vessel to investigate a sufficiently serious incident. Subsection 4(d) indicates that damage to a vessel or its gear which is apparently due to a violation of the Convention is generally sufficient cause to board. Subsection 4(h) prescribes limitations on the authority of the Fisheries Conduct Officer consistent with the terms of the Convention.

Subsection 4(i) provides for the availability of a Fisheries Conduct Officer, when properly requested, as a witness for the prosecution of a violation of the Convention or the requesting Contracting Party's laws where the officer has conducted the investigation.

Section 5. Scope of authority of Fisheries Conduct Officers over United States and foreign Contracting Parties vessels and of foreign Authorized Officers over United States vessels; liability of Authorized Officers; evidentiary value of foreign Authorized Officers' reports in United States courts.

Subsection 5(a) provides that for the purposes of enforcing the provisions of the Convention, this Act, and regulations issued pursuant thereto the authority set out in subsections 4(c) through 4(g), subject to the limitations of subsection 4(h) and Article 9 of the Convention, may be exercised by a Fisheries Conduct Officer in relation to a United States vessel or any foreign Contracting Party's vessel anywhere within the Convention Area and outside the territorial sea and fisheries zone of any other Contracting Party, and by a foreign Authorized Officer in relation to a United States vessel anywhere within the Convention Area and outside the territorial sea and fisheries zone of the United States or of another Contracting Party.

Subsection 5(b) makes it clear that no Authorized Officer, including Fisheries Conduct Officers, may exceed the terms of the Convention under authority granted by section 5, nor may any Authorized Officer exercise any power against the vessels of a Contracting Party which power that Contracting Party has specifically made reservations regarding in accordance with Article 14 of the Convention.

Subsection 5(c) authorizes the Secretary to indemnify an Authorized Officer for penalties or actions for damages assessed because of any action done in the exercise of the authority under the Convention, this Act, or regulations issued pursuant thereto. Included would be penalties or damages assessed Fisheries Conduct Officers and foreign Authorized Officers acting aboard a United States vessel.

Subsection 5(d) accords the report of a foreign Authorized Officer an evidential value in any State or Federal court of the United States equivalent to the evidential value accorded a similar report by a Fisheries Conduct Officer pursuant to this Act except that the report need not be accorded a higher evidential value than that foreign Authorized Officer's country would accord it. This implements paragraph (11) of Article 9 of the Convention and is intended to apply to any judicial proceeding.

Section 6. Unlawful acts and omissions; applicability.

This section provides for unlawful acts and omissions under this Act. The broad, general provisions of subsections (a) and (b) are supplemented in subsection (c). Subsection (c) specifically deals with Fisheries Conduct Officers acting under authority vested by the Convention and sections 4 and 5 of this Act. By its terms, subsection (c) is made applicable to the conduct of foreign Authorized Officers aboard United States vessels in the Convention Area pursuant to the Authority granted in the Convention and section 5 of this Act. The authority of the Fisheries Conduct Officer and the foreign Authorized Officer in the proper exercise of their duties under the Convention and this Act is considered of fundamental importance to the integrity of the mutual inspection scheme of the Convention as implemented by this Act. Accordingly that authority is given special consideration in this section and in section 7.

Section 7. Civil penalties, fines, or imprisonment for violations; forfeiture of fishing gear; liability of vessels.

Subsection 7(a) provides a civil penalty assessed by the Secretary for violations of subsection 6(a) or 6(b). Additionally, fishing gear involved in subsequent violations may be ordered forfeit.

Subsection 7(b) makes violation of subsection 6(c) a criminal act subject to fine or imprisonment or both. Provision is made for forfeiture of fishing gear involved in a subsequent violation in a separate civil action.

Subsection 7(c) provides that a vessel involved in a violation of section 6 is liable for penalties or fines assessed under section

7 and for damages done, including damages adjudged under section 9, which vessel may be seized and proceeded against summarily or by way of nonjury action in Rem.

Section 8. Power to arrest and search, to execute warrant or process, to issue warrants, to seize and dispose of property; stay of execution in rem or discharge of property on bond or stipulation and breach of conditions thereof.

Subsection 8(a) provides for arrest and search without warrant, for execution of warrant or process, for issuance of warrants, and for seizure of fishing gear involved and disposition of property so seized.

Subsection 8(b) provides that with property subject to in rem process the marshal or other officer may stay execution or discharge property if process has been already levied where the claimant puts up a bond or stipulation for double the value of the property with sufficient surety to be approved by a judge of the district court with jurisdiction of the offense. The value of the property would be established by an independent appraisal acquired by the marshal or other officer. Provision is made for any breach of required conditions.

Section 9. Assessment of damages to injured parties in same proceedings; procedure for and effect of; authority of the United States Attorney; effect on subsequent actions.

Subsection 9(a) provides that in a proceeding under section 7 where a person is found to have violated section 6, and where there remains uncompensated damage which resulted from that violation the value of which does not substantially exceed \$2,500, the court may, subject to subsection 9(b), give an additional judgment in an amount not to exceed \$2,500 as compensation to be paid to the injured party. If the United States does not recover any sum so adjudged, the court's decision shall constitute an enforceable judgment for the injured person or persons on which suit might be brought in any court of competent jurisdiction. The remedy provided by this section is intended to be limited to claims not substantially in excess of \$2,500 so that an injured party with a significantly greater claim will be required to bring a separate civil action at his own expense to obtain recovery. This section is specifically intended to provide a less-expensive means of recovery of compensation for an injured party, including an injured party who is a national of a foreign Contracting Party, where the violation of section 6 has been proven to the satisfaction of the court. Any claim filed under this section is unaffected by the decision of the court unless procedures provided under subsection 9(b) have been complied with and unless the defendant or respondent has been found by the court to have violated section 6.

Subsection 9(b) implements the procedures for the remedy provided for in this section, defines the broad, discretionary authority of the United States Attorney as to the inclusion and prosecution of the claim in the section 7 proceeding, and limits the scope and effect of a proceeding under this section. Participation in the proceedings by the injured person or persons is entirely voluntary and a notice of claim may be withdrawn by the injured person or persons at any time prior to judgment. Further, participation initially is subject to the discretionary judgment of the United States Attorney and subsequently requires the continuing cooperation and assistance of the claimant as the United States Attorney might direct. If an injured person or persons participate in proceedings under this section until a judgment is rendered by the court on the merits of the United States proceeding under section 7, which judgment is in favor of the United States, then they and the defendant or respondent shall be bound by the decision of the court on the issues relating to the claims

on file with the United States Attorney. No additional claims other than those claims arising directly from a violation of section 6 may be raised in a proceeding under this section. The burden of proof for the claim is unaffected by the nature of the proceedings under section 7. The section does not effect the application of any statute of limitations.

Subsection 9(c) indicates that except as otherwise provided, the remedy under this section is without effect on any cause of action, if any, between the parties except that any compensation adjudged and recovered by the injured party shall be credited to the defendant or respondent in a subsequent civil action by the injured party on that claim. This subsection is not intended to derogate from the mandate of subsection (a) since no claim should initially be included under this section where it reasonably appears the value of that claim will substantially exceed \$2,500.

Section 10. Appointment of a review board and prescribing procedures therefor; designation of board members; duties of board; authority of the review board to act; requests to convene foreign review boards.

This section implements the provisions of the Convention in Article 7 which establishes a system of review boards for damage dispute without the trouble and expense of ordinary legal procedures. The review boards are an alternative to legal procedure. Authority is provided in this section for the United States review board to act, with the consent of all interested parties and with the consent and cooperation of the foreign Contracting Party's review board, as the binding arbitrator of the claim submitted. In those cases, the decision of the review board will constitute a binding agreement between the parties which shall be enforceable in any court of competent jurisdiction. The cooperation of the foreign Contracting Party's review board is considered necessary to facilitate in an appropriate case the transmission of evidential and other related matters to the United States review board when it is acting as arbitrator under this section.

Section 11. Notification of competent authorities of Contracting Parties.

This section implements Article 12 of the Convention which provides for mutual notification by Contracting Parties, through the depositary government, of the competent authorities designated for relevant portions of the Convention.

Section 12. Amendment of Articles and Annexes of the Convention.

The amendment to the Articles which constitute the basic Convention is provided for in Article 10 requiring unanimous acceptance by the Contracting Parties. Those amendments would take effect only after the acceptance of the President following the advice and consent of the Senate. This procedure is provided for in subsection 12(a).

Subsection 12(b) provides for more expeditious handling of proposed amendments to the Annexes, reflecting the intent of Article 11 of the Convention. The Annexes contain technical and procedural rules which do not affect the substantive policy statements of the basic Convention. Those amendments to Annexes would be treated under this Act by Executive action and implemented, where necessary, by regulation under subsection 3(a).

Section 13. Effective date; effective on other laws and regulations.

Subsection 13(a) provides that this Act and regulations issued pursuant thereto shall not take effect until the Convention is in force for the United States as provided for by Article 16 of the Convention.

Subsection 13(b) provides that this Act and the regulations issued pursuant thereto are in addition to other Acts and regulations issued pursuant thereto and this Act shall not derogate from such other Acts or regu-

lations except that a minor amendment is made to section 4 of the Act of May 20, 1964, (78 Stat. 196; 16 U.S.C. 1084), to provide for consistency of regulatory authority in the fisheries zone as it relates to this Act.

Section 14. Authorization of monies.

This section authorizes monies necessary to carry out this Act.

Section 15. Saving clause.

This section provides a saving clause in the event any provision of the Act or application of any provision to any circumstance or person shall be held invalid.

Comparative listing; where Articles, Annexes, and paragraphs of the Convention are treated in the draft legislation:

CONVENTION AND LEGISLATION

Title. Section 1.

Article 1, par. (1); Annex I. Subsection 2(b).

Article 1, para. (2). Subsections 2(g) & (h).

Article 2. Subsection 3(d).

Articles 3 through 6; Annexes II to VI. Subsection 3(a).

Article 7, para. (1). Section 10.

Article 7, para. (2). Section 9.

Article 8, para. (1). Total proposal.

Article 8, paras. (2) & (3). Subsections 3(d) & 5(a).

Article 9, para. (1). Subsection 3(a).

Article 9, paras. (2) & (3). Subsection 4(a).

Article 9, para. (4). Subsection 4(b).

Article 9, para. (5). Subsections 4(b) & (c).

Article 9, para. (6). Subsection 4(d).

Article 9, paras. (7) & (8). Subsections 4(h) (i) & (ii).

Article 9, para. (9). Subsection 4(g).

Article 9, para. (10). Subsections 5(a) & 6(c).

Article 9, para. (11). Subsection 5(d).

Article 9, para. (12). Subsection 4(h) (iii).

Article 10. Subsection 12(a).

Article 11. Subsection 12(b).

Article 12. Section 11.

Article 13. None.

Articles 14 & 17, para. (3). Subsection 5(b).

Article 15. None.

Article 16. Subsection 13(a).

Articles 17 to 20 (except para. (3) of Article 17). None.

A 33-YEAR-OLD ARTICLE ON RANGE-LAND MERITS READING TODAY

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of this RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a superb article published some 33 years ago in March of 1940 by Mr. Charles C. Parsell, then employed by the Grazing Service in Burns, Oreg., regarding range forage in eastern Oregon. The article, about an apparently pedestrian subject, reads like poetry and merits the careful reading of anyone concerned with the well-being of this magnificent, but despoiled, land of ours:

RANGE FORAGE IN EASTERN OREGON

(By Charles C. Parsell)

Seventy-five years ago Nature produced on the lands in the Eastern Part of the State of Oregon, a vast amount of palatable forage, consisting of weeds, grasses and browse. This forage was the food supply for the wild life and the few domestic animals of the period. They grazed on a year long basis, both during the growing season and after the forage had cured on the stalk. Areas of forage had their

proper seasonal use grazing periods but no area of forage was used for the full twelve months.

Nature had control of this grazing area, which was ideal for her operation of a huge cafeteria, serving palatable and well-balanced rations of forage. She had, during the course of thousands of years, built up an ever normal granary. Her lands were divided and subdivided into small cafeteria areas by the rivers, the mountains, the deserts, the different soils and by the variation of moisture fall. With such a division there was no need for long animal migrations to reach seasonal forage because the areas within an area supplied the needs of her customers on a year long basis. The wild animal life during the early period of settlement had only one aim in life which was to rear young and lead a happy and contented life while doing so. The young were not raised for the fat market and the numbers slaughtered were for domestic use (Indians and early settlers) during this period. The young were the replacements needed to keep the numbers of the herds intact, for many died of old age and there were other casualties brought about by disease, poisonous plants, severe storms, predatory animals, hunters, and also by starvation due to excessive snowfall or sustained drought.

Nature operated as any good stockman of today. She had a crew of assistants, mainly heat, cold, rain, snow, soils, rocks, flies, plant insects, disease, predatory animals, poisonous plants and unpalatable plants. This crew regulated and controlled the numbers of animals and the use of the forage. The plant food stored in the soil, with the aid of air, sunlight, and moisture produced the volume and the quality of the forage. The rain and the snow supplied the underground and surface waters, the creeks, rivers, springs, and lakes. The cold, heat and snow were fence barriers which closed areas of forage to grazing by making them inaccessible because of bodily discomfort or lack of procurable forages. These fence barriers were assisted by the flies and insects and by the unpalatability of the forage at different stages of growth. There were also years of light moisture fall resulting in scant stock waters giving areas rest periods from grazing. Nature herded her customers, the animals, from forage table to forage table supplying palatable rations for the particular seasonal need.

Nature conducted her cafeteria with stern supervision. She was exact in her requirements of conservation and use. She wanted her forages used at the proper season. Her punishment for disobedience was the decimation of numbers due to starvation when caught in the deep snows, due to the forced grazing of poisonous plants or due to a small percentage of young in areas which had become depleted of forage by over-use. Her customers were not dependent on habits taught or enforced by man, they were guided by instincts taught by Nature. These instincts guided the animals from place to place grazing the palatable forage necessary for their well being.

Let me illustrate. In the northeast corner of the State of Oregon there is a mountain range called the Wallowa Mountains. Many creeks and rivers head in these mountains. One of these creeks is Big Sheep Creek. It flows nearly ten miles through the higher elevations and thirty miles through timber and bunch grass lands before it empties into the Imnaha River. There is a difference of about seven thousand feet elevation between the head and the mouth of the creek, also a decided difference in the amount of yearly rain and snowfall. The watershed area of Big Sheep Creek at one time was considered the best range in Oregon. About sixty years ago thousands of mountain sheep inhabited the watershed of Big Sheep Creek. During the

winter months they inhabited the lower growth as a supplement. In this area they had protection from the cold and deep snows along the many rims and on the warm open south slopes where they obtained full rations of palatable forage. During the early spring the ewes dropped their young in the numerous caves in the rims where they had protection against the inclement weather and predatory animals. As soon as the snows receded and the green forage was abundant they migrated from the winter quarters and followed the snow line up to the higher elevations living on the green succulent forage, replenishing the bodily vigor which had been lost during the winter months. During the summer months they lived in the higher elevations grazing on the green weeds, grasses and browse. When the first snows fell in the late fall they migrated down the watershed until they reached their winter quarters. The old settlers relate that the last ten or more miles of the fall migration was more or less of a single file march, the sheep following a certain rim level winding in and out of the numerous side canyons of Big Sheep Creek. This migration—and it is a very important factor in grass, weed and browse utilization and conservation—was taking place during the early growing season and each seasonal use area was left before all the plant growth occurred on the stalk. Deferred grazing was practiced by wild life long before the white man arrived.

As the years went by the white men came with the rifles. They ambushed the mountain sheep as they migrated along the rim levels to their winter quarters. The hunters would locate a single file of mountain sheep approaching then hide a mile or so ahead and await their coming knowing that the sheep would follow the same rim unless warned of danger. Hundreds were killed and fear drove the rest of them from their winter quarters. They lost their winter grazing grounds, their protected lambing grounds, and in the course of a few years became practically extinct, because they were forced to stay in the high elevations. Many matured sheep starved during the winter months the change of forage and seasons was too severe and the few young were either unable to endure the cold or else starved from want of milk. Today there are but a few dozen mountain sheep left in the area simply because fear of man forced them to disobey the regulations of Nature. Since that time the same area of former winter grazing grounds has witnessed the death of thousands of sheep, cattle and horses unable to survive on the forage left open for winter use and mind you—they were the domestic animals of man who has not been able to grasp and abide by the rules that Nature uses for self protection and conservation.

Nature controlled wild life and I include the Indians because they were migrators. The Indians cooperated with Nature and obeyed her regulations. They depended on products of the soil, directly on the forage for their horses feed and for their own vegetative food and indirectly on the forage for their meat supplies. They followed the same migration trails that the wild animal life used. I might say the same system of grazing.

With the advent of the white man came the domestic livestock in numbers. The white man was not primitive when he came to Oregon. He had already become dependent on money, the dollar. The simple pioneer life was gone, purchaseable luxuries had crept into the picture plus debts, its interest and heavy taxation. He used every means to acquire the dollar without regard to plant life, soil, wild life, moisture and the well-being of his domestic livestock. It was with him the survival of the fittest and the more stock numbers that he owned, the more survivors and the greater the profits. Such a

method of operation was successful for many years until the Range became depleted and then there was no profit for there were no survivors. Following the large operators with a twelve month range operation came the transient operators who operated on the theory that the early bird gets the worm (range) and they were more or less successful until the National Forest was created and the Taylor Act came along.

The white man practically exterminated the beavers which were conservators of moisture. He destroyed the native forage by breaking up the instinctive habits of wildlife and by wintering through his domestic animals with range forage on the stalk. He encroached on Nature's spring, summer, fall, and winter ranges during wrong seasonal use periods. He overstocked the same areas during the proper seasonal use periods. He forced the acquisition of new habits by the wild animal life and his own domestic livestock. He forced them to eat forage which primarily had as its purpose, emergency and conservation use, the prevention of erosion, the maintenance of soil foods and water table levels. He increased the size of his domestic animals by better breeding methods and the percentages of young by the use of green feeds during the breeding season. He changed the length and the seasonal use of the Range by winter calving and lambing. Everything that the white man did in changing his livestock operations tended to overcrowd the Range during the early spring months when the plant life itself was trying to rear a family of its own.

He inadvertently brought in noxious plants and less valuable annual grasses, which stole the moisture and soil foods from the native forage. He fenced thousands of acres of native meadows, he plowed thousands of native grass acres to get the dollar by raising grain, and as his herds grew and the range became depleted, thousands of acres more to raise crops which replaced the native forage destroyed. In the main all these plowed acres were winter use acres. The plowed and fenced areas formerly balanced the use of the spring and summer areas by maintaining one animal unit per two or three acres per winter grazing month. The stockman made the same two or three acres produce feed (hay and aftermath) for the winter maintenance of nine to fifty animal units per winter month. Approximately a thousand to five thousand per cent increase of winter animal units and the same increase of animal units turned on the Range which had decreased in size twenty to fifty percent and fully fifty percent in carrying capacity on the unfenced open range. The Range changed from a spring, summer, fall, and winter area to a spring and early summer area. The Range forage could not support the vast numbers of livestock and wild animal life and combat improper use, old age, plant insects, plant disease and also survive the deficiencies of moisture fall in certain spans of years. In later years too there was the influx of animal units from distant areas which used range forage that was a complement of the winter forage belonging to the domestic animals and the wildlife of the area. Nature always a balanced operator was changed to an unbalanced operator. She lost her reserves and she became bankrupt.

Nature when bankrupt was not equal to the task of supplying forage for these hordes of animal units. She was forced to watch her best forage disappear from her menu. She did her best, scattering the poorer forages over wide areas. She adopted the less valuable plants brought in from foreign areas. She wanted to protect plant life so that she could take care of her customers and protect her soils. For years after Meeker (1845) led the wagon train of the early settlers across the range lands of Lost Creek near Beulah, Oregon, the route could be followed by two distinct lines of sage brush growing in the

wagon tracks where the grass had been destroyed by the rough locks. The same area in 1906 overstocked by cattle, sheep and horses during the summer months, the formation of a dust bed and the resultant brush climax type, which today is slowly being replaced by the native grasses again in the better used areas. These are but illustrations of the habits of Nature, the methods which she uses for the protection of soil and plant life. All worthless plants are enemies of valuable plants, they lay in ambush in scattered areas, ready to spread out, and usurp the territory of the valuable plants when they are weakened and defenseless. The valuable plants become slaves of the rogues, and can only be freed by scores of years of struggle.

The cycle of operations that Nature had built over a period of centuries, and which she had followed during the lean (dry) and fat (wet) years with the greatest of success, was torn apart and rebuilt by the stockmen into a cycle of operation used by excessive livestock numbers with no forage or stock water available for certain seasons of the year. Nature had always operated a rounded out setup, she balanced her operations. She held a reserve for the needs of the plants and the soil yet she supplied forage for her customers, the wild animal life, on a year long basis.

Nature knew that her grasses, the climax forage, could only be used during the proper season. That the weeds she grew were there to be consumed in order that the grass would not be wantonly used during its early stage of growth. That the browse was primarily for the same purpose, a supplement to the late summer and winter feed. It was also green feed when there were no weeds and after the grasses had cured on the stalk. The weeds and browse supplied the variations of the diet just as our pie, cake and other luxury foods are to our meat and potatoes. They supplied the feeling of contentment to the grazing animal unit. They also supplied humus to the soil and prevented or utilized evaporation and lessened erosion.

Nature also knew that the perennials, the fall and winter forage, the grass such as: rye grass, *Elymus* spp; blue bunch-grass, *Agropyron* spp; needlegrass, *Stipa* spp; the browse such as bitterbrush, *Purshia tridentata*; winter far, *Eurotia lanata*; could only be used in adverse proportion to its height during the growing season. The greater the height of the grass or browse, the more luxuriant the growth, the less the use during the growing season.

The deep rooted grasses, such as blue bunchgrass, *Agropyron* spp; needlegrass, *Stipa* spp; or the browse such as winter far, *Eurotia lanata*; have a cycle of growth making slowly during the early spring and maturing rather late during the summer months, with a retention of life and green coloring in its foliage, which enables the plant to store food in its root system after the top growth has ceased. All these plants seed late in the summer and a few of them late in the fall.

There is a cycle of growth for each type of Range forage directly dependent on the depth of the plant's root system. A shallow or surface rooted grass such as: june grass, *Keleria cristata*; squirrel tail grass, *Sitanion* spp; bluegrass, *Poa* spp; fescue, *Festuca* spp; or a browse such as bud sage, *Artemisia spinescens*; and nearly all of the weeds, start a cycle of growth usually visual green shoots during the fall months, remaining practically dormant during the winter months and then completing their cycle of growth during the early spring months or at least during the early summer months by reaching full maturity and the production of seed.

In the years past all these plants, at least the majority of them, completed their cycle of growth yearly. The remaining plants, and perhaps all the plants in areas short of moisture, completed their cycle of growth inter-

mittently, but at no time during the life span of the plant was the storage of food in its root system prevented because of the total use of the plants foliage by the grazing animals. Old age took its toll and other plants died from insect injury, other plants were weakened by the dry periods and of course during those dry periods there were few young plants that survived.

The moisture-fall, rain and snow, during a series of wet years or even one wet year, saturates the soil many feet below the surface, springs, creeks, and lakes become permanent stock waters if the soil is in a receptive condition to absorb the moisture and has a plant cover to prevent undue runoff. The over-abundance of rainfall or moisture from melting snows raises the water table level and there is no dead space of dry soil between the surface and the water table. Capillary action is at its maximum and the plants are able to withstand dry periods during the growing season. During these periods of above normal rainfall deep rooted grasses, weeds and browse successfully compete with the annual and perennial shallow rooted grasses weeds and browse. The deep rooted plants are enabled to complete their growth cycle after the surface moisture is used by the other plants or taken by evaporation, by reason of their deep roots which extend down into the soil where moisture still abounds. These deep-rooted plants retain life, green coloring, food values, and palatability in their year's growth long after the perennial surface rooted plants have become dormant or died as is the case of the annual weeds and grasses.

As the grazing season advances towards the winter months, the burden of grazing use falls on the forage with green coloring and no matter how hard we try to provide proper control of a grazing area we cannot prevent those plants which are green and palatable from being overgrazed during certain seasons. That is why the density of certain species change from year to year on an area with season long use. That is why we must gather and sow seed of our best grasses.

It is a fact that during wet years the deep rooted plants retain their green coloring until the new green shoots appear in the fall or spring making a balanced ration when the old and the new growth are eaten by the grazing animal. The shallow rooted perennial plants also make a fall growth but the old growth of these plants is shunned by the grazing animal. A short grass (shallow rooted) area should be utilized during the early grazing season and then rested until the next spring. The deep rooted plants should be lightly grazed during the spring and fully utilized during the late summer and fall.

A series of years with deficient rainfall or years with normal rainfall with undue runoff, result in a very sub-soil and a very low water table level. The upper soil is only wet during periods of rainfall and snowfall. These dry years (and they are not drought years) are the periods which have weakened and destroyed the deep rooted grasses, weeds, and browse. But the plants would not have died if they had not been subjected to severe grazing. The plants are comparable to an eight cylinder engine. It would be very inefficient if half of the cylinders did not have spark plugs. Plants cannot stand the grazing load while striving to complete their cycle of growth with only fifty percent of their root system functioning. Also we must remember that the grazing animal unit is taking all or part of the top which is the other half of the plant's food factory machinery. So we find many dead stumps of grasses and browse, many more than the natural death loss, thin stands of plants, poor seed crops, an increase in the density of unpalatable plants, few young palatable plants and an increase of plant injury by insects. The insect damage

more noticeable because of plant scarcity and weakened condition. Quite often a series of dry years or of dry spring seasons will cause severe damage to the shallow rooted plants especially if grazed too heavily. It is interesting to note the changes in types of an area brought about by improper use of that area. It follows very closely the following four steps:

1. Virgin Areas—Tall grasses (deep-rooted). Short grasses (shallow rooted). Weeds, Browse. *Artemesia* spp. *Chrysothamnus* spp.

2. Over stocked Areas—Short grasses. Weeds. *Artemesia* spp. *Chrysothamnus* spp. Browse. Tall grasses.

3. Severely used areas—Annual short grasses. *Artemesia* spp. *Chrysothamnus* spp. Weeds. Short grasses, Browse, Tall grasses.

4. Depleted Areas—*Artemesia* spp. *Chrysothamnus* spp. Annual short grasses. Weeds, Short grasses, Browse, Tall grasses.

(In the above the first type in each period is the climax type.)

We must bear in mind, however, that very little loss will result during dry years or seasons if grazing is regulated to moisture depth and to a season of use when we are sure that fifty percent of the more palatable plants have the opportunity to complete their cycle of growth. Late in the grazing season the tops may be eaten, without injury to the plants and with profit to the operator.

It is very important for us to realize and understand that there is no native grass, weed, or browse, especially of the perennials, that can successfully withstand the irregularities of moisture fall and consumption of the early growth, year after year, thereby forcing the plant to produce aftermath to complete its cycle. Once we understand that one fact and abide by it our native grasses will be our climax forage again supplemented by our native browse and weeds. A deep rooted grass, weed, or browse under normal conditions must be grazed judiciously. Such forage is of no value without livestock to eat it and livestock cannot be profitably owned without the use of forage on the stalk. Practically all of our deep rooted plants have great height and a very luxuriant growth of leaves.

A perennial deep rooted grass or browse has its life cycle to complete. It strives to produce seed and in order to do so must gather minerals from the soil and with the aid of sunlight, air and moisture changes the minerals into plant foods which the plant uses to grow roots, stems, leaves, and seeds. Each of the various parts of the plant has a purpose and also a bearing on the health and vigor of the plant. They are all essential for its cycle of growth and for the reproduction of other plants. If the tops of the native grasses, weeds, or browse are removed every two weeks in the fields or on the Range the plants have become weakened and eventually will die. No more plants will grow because there was no seed produced. Range plants cannot survive if the tops are continually cropped by the grazing animal unit.

One can work a horse abusively every day and by taking care of the animal, he will stand up under the abuse and probably be none the worse because of it. But the horse must be fed and watered well. When Range plants are continually cropped they receive no food or water from the animal that eats the tops.

If water is available the plant produces tops again and if the conditions continue favorable the plant will complete its cycle of growth. If no moisture is available, as is the case at the beginning of the dry season, the plant makes little growth and has become weakened. It has failed to store food in its root system for the next season's growth, part of the roots will die and the next season's growth will be below normal even if there is sufficient moisture. A plant needs a food storage in its root system beyond the needs of current year's growth. There must be a surplus for emergency just as a stockman has

when he holds over a stack of hay for a severe winter or late spring. A continuation of close cropping will kill the unirrigated plant, it must have leaf surfaces to manufacture its food when moisture is available. The leaves of the plant are comparable to the lungs of an animal. If one removes the lungs the animal will die for it cannot breathe and if the leaves of a plant are continually grazed or removed the plant will die for it cannot breathe.

The rye grasses, *Elymus* spp; in the area known as the Drewsey Unit of Grazing District No. 3 in Oregon demonstrates very clearly the damage which has been done during the past fifty years. About the year 1890 if all the rye grasses of the Drewsey Unit exclusive of the area now farmed had been cut and stacked in September there would have been twenty thousand tons of hay, one third more than the tonnage of hay put up in the farming area of the Unit today. Today if all the rye grasses in the same area were left ungrazed until September and then cut and stacked for hay there would be a scant one thousand tons. The nineteen thousand tons have disappeared because the rye grasses had been used for grazing during the early stage growth, the tons were lost because the rye grass plants starved to death. They could not feed themselves and take care of the bodily needs of the animal units which ate its tops. The animal units themselves were forced to eat the rye grass at an unpalatable stage of growth in order that they themselves could exist. There was not enough palatable forage to take care of all the Range animal units. The Range was over stocked.

The vast areas of bunchgrass, the perennials such as the *Agropyron* spp; the *Stipa* spp; the *Elymus* spp; the *Poa* spp; *Oryzopsis* spp; and the *Festuca* spp at one time in the Drewsey Unit would have produced in the fall as hay, three hundred thousand tons, exclusive of the range areas now farmed. Today there would be a scant thirty thousand tons of hay cut from the same area. The loss resulting not so much from overstocking as from wrong seasonal grazing use.

The short rooted grasses, such as june grass, *Koeleria cristata*; blue grasses, *Poa* spp; cheat, *Bromus tectorum*; squirrel tail, *Sitanion* spp; and other annual weeds and grasses plus a vast increase of unpalatable browse, *Artemesia* spp; *Chrysothamnus* spp; have all increased in density since the year 1900 in the areas vacated by the perennial deep rooted grasses, weeds and browse. As the types of forage in the areas changed the forage value was always on the down grade, until finally we have vast areas today practically worthless for grazing purposes. Areas eroded by rains and winds and only drastic cuts and prohibitive expense will restore them to their former value. It is worthy to note that during the change of climax forage in an area that the good forage gave way to the bad forage because the animal units ate the good forage. There was an increase of poisonous plants which would point to the fact that Nature uses them to prevent early and severe grazing. The poison loss in Malheur and Harney Counties during the year 1937 approximated one hundred thousand dollars. Every summer discloses stockmen, whose losses from forage poisoning exceed the purchase price of cultivated forage for their range animal units. And it even extends to winter grazing for those stockmen who are scanty feeders and animals units are lost by eating poisonous water hemlock.

The majority of the stockmen admit overstocking and wrong seasonal use of the Range, both on public and private ranges, either by their own stock or by livestock alien to their commensurate area of Range. They have operated on margins both on winter set-ups and summer ranges. A few of the stockmen maintain that the dry seasons have caused the drastic change in the carrying capacity of the Range. However it must be remembered that the Range had been main-

taining its density through all the past dry seasons when the livestock were not numerous. One need only investigate a few of the protected areas of the Range which have had proper use and compare them to the areas which have had improper use. One will find that these areas approach the carrying capacity of the virgin areas. On the protected areas we find everything of value, on the unprotected area everything worthless. There are also rock areas and inaccessible areas of native range forage (winter areas) which have a maximum density of grasses, weeds, and browse with many young plants growing. During the dry seasons these areas do not have the volume of forage which the wet season produces, but the plants are strong, healthy and vigorous, with a minimum stand of black sage and other unpalatable and noxious plants. When the wet season arrives the area is a paradise, but the depleted area becomes more worthless than ever.

The areas of Range land serviced by permanent stock waters and having continuous grazing use have had the palatable forage reduced to ten percent of their former density. The destroyed plants have been replaced by worthless plants of no forage value, poisonous plants and by inferior species of palatable plants. The areas have necessarily been changed to spring and fall grazing areas. Areas not for the production of beef and mutton but areas for bare maintenance of about twenty percent of the former carrying capacity with resultant low percentages of young, a tremendous increase in poisonous losses and an enormous (ruinous) increase of livestock operation cost and heavy indebtedness.

There is a solution for the stockmen and their range problems. It is true that the withdrawal of crop lands and fenced range and pasture lands from the open range together with excessive numbers of livestock have depleted the ranges. The solution is only a reverse of the past operation, in that the crop land fenced range lands must bear their former share of the grazing burden until the native forages have approached their former density and after that, proper grazing use of the Range.

The grazing use of the depleted range must be restricted to a short spring use to utilize a proportion (sixty to seventy-five percent) of the short grasses and weeds and a late fall or early winter grazing use to utilize the cured forage (tall and short grasses, weeds, browse) the use at the same time helping to cover the fallen seeds. There are areas of course which can be used for summer forage on the proper carrying basis and other areas used strictly for late fall or early winter forage, especially in those areas where it is impracticable to develop water, and snow must be used as stock water. The length of the spring season depends on the length of the growing season. It should not exceed two-thirds of the growing cycle of the climax palatable short grasses and weeds, with such use the tall forage will the... regain its former standing of fifty-fifty in relation to the short forage.

The age old facts, known but not recognized, that moisture begets moisture; that winds increase as moisture decreases; that years of plenty are not for 100% utilization but years to build up forage, soil and moisture reserves; that a green wet fall is indicative of good forage the following summer and vice versa a greenless, dry, cold fall is indicative of scant forage the following summer (stock number must be provided for); that grasses, weeds, browse are crops which need to be sown (by Nature) cultivated and harvested with as much study and care as wheat, barley, corn, and oats; that the aftermath (second growth) of Range plants in light rain fall areas is only a life saving effort of the plant and as such should not be grazed until it has fulfilled its mission and cured on the stalk; that grasses, weeds,

browse, of different species and types have their proper season for use, and these seasons are not interchangeable; that ninety-five percent of the former winter range areas have been converted into commensurate and non-commensurate owned property and there is a negligible amount of winter range left; that there is sufficient range forage for the present numbers of livestock and wild life but to utilize the forage necessitates cooperation of livestock operators, sportsman, Tax Commissions, Forest Service, Grazing Service and the Public, it entails shifting of livestock, development of water, and absolute control of grazing seasons, there must be authority and observance; that Class 3 property not utilized as a winter set-up; that flood control is a result of depleted forage; that we cannot grow two straws, where one grew before with Nature's nursing, without extra moisture and prohibitive expense; that native forage is naturalized and ready to open shop and feed their customers if protected and grazed judiciously; that the livestock operation is not a means to get rich quickly but only a means of obtaining an ordinary livelihood; that debts are never paid by the returns from excessive livestock numbers; that taxes on range lands must be based on carrying capacities not on acre values; that the past fifty years have witnessed the operations of the worst Wall Street operators, the calloused buttocked horsemen and cattlemen and the calloused footed sheepmen, all operating not in the futures on their own lands but in the futures on open range and forage values.

In conclusion: the happy thought about it all is that the sunshine blooms all around some day, and that thing which has been torn down is finally rebuilt better than it was before and henceforth receives better care. Conditions are rapidly improving so that the existing rounded out stockmen begin to see their way out and many young men are acquiring ranches with the purchase price based on returns, who will pay for them from earnings and live comfortably while doing so. Cooperation among these operators and cooperation if you please, between the grazing use of fenced and unfenced lands will solve the problem of range improvement and stabilization of livestock numbers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), from Thursday, April 5, through Thursday, April 19, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. CLEVELAND, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. FROELICH, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON of New York, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. DU PONT, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHNEEBELL, today, for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MCFALL, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. EILBERG, today, for 5 minutes.
Mr. MONTGOMERY, today, for 5 minutes.
Mr. BRADEMAS, today, for 5 minutes.
Mr. CLAY, today, for 5 minutes.
Mr. GRASSO, today, for 10 minutes.
Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 5 minutes.
Mr. HARRINGTON, today, for 5 minutes.
Mr. BIAGGI, today, for 5 minutes.
Ms. ABZUG, today, for 10 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. FINDLEY, during debate on House Joint Resolution 205, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL, and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$552.50.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. PEYSER in five instances.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. KETCHUM.

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. HUBER in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. RAILSBACK in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. STEELE in three instances.

Mr. RHODES in five instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. NELSEN in four instances.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. ABDOR.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE in 10 instances.

Mr. BADILLO.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. CLAY in two instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA in six instances.

Mr. CLARK.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. CHAPPELL in three instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. RANGEL in 10 instances.

Mr. FULTON.

Miss HOLTZMAN in 10 instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. ALEXANDER in five instances.

Mr. WALDIE in five instances.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. PEPPER in three instances.
Mr. DONOHUE.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 11, 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:

746. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report on the dispute between the Penn Central Transportation Co. and its employees represented by the United Transportation Union, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 93-5; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

747. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the financial statements of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, for fiscal year 1972, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 841 (H. Doc. No. 93-81); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

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. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 6168. A bill to amend and extend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 349. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 3180. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to clarify the proper use of the franking privilege by Members of Congress, and for other purposes (Rept. 93-115). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 351. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 3932. A bill to provide that appointments to the offices of Director and Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall be subject to confirmation by the Senate, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-116). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 352. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 982. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-117). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 502. An act to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 6760. A bill to implement the constitutional prerogative and responsibilities of the legislative branch; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 6761. A bill to provide for annual authorization of appropriations to the U.S. Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6762. A bill providing for a feasibility study of certain highways for the purpose of including such highways in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. VANIK, Mr. GUDA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 6763. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue rights-of-way and special land use permits for the construction of pipelines in the State of Alaska under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 6764. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to modify the restrictions contained in section 170(e) in the case of certain charitable contributions of ordinary income property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 6765. A bill to amend the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 to provide for the payment of additional funds to units of local government in urbanized areas for public mass transportation purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas (for himself and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 6766. 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, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. BROTMAN, Mr. PETTIS, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 6767. A bill to promote the development of an open, nondiscriminatory and fair world economic system, to stimulate the economic growth of the United States, and to provide the President with additional negotiating authority therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. MATTHIAS of California, Mr. REID, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 6768. A bill to provide for participation by the United States in the United Nations Environment Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 6769. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pension of \$125 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a \$2,400 and \$3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; to provide that such pension shall be increased by 10 percent where the veteran served overseas during World War I; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6770. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to provide a comprehensive program of healthcare by strengthening the organization and delivery of healthcare nationwide and by making comprehensive healthcare insurance (including coverage for medical catastrophes) available to all Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 6771. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the

parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6772. A bill to encourage earlier retirement by permitting Federal employees to purchase into the civil service retirement system benefits unduplicated in any other retirement system based on employment in Federal programs operated by State and local governments under Federal funding and supervision; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CRONIN:

H.R. 6773. A bill to provide a group life insurance program for State and local government public safety officers and to provide benefits for survivors of officers who are killed in line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6774. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 of compensation paid to law enforcement officers and firemen shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LUGO (for himself and Mr. WOON PAT):

H.R. 6775. A bill to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Illinois):

H.R. 6776. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, to freeze food prices at levels prevailing on January 2, 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 6777. A bill to increase the supply of railroad rolling stock and to improve its utilization to meet the needs of commerce, users, shippers, national defense, and the consuming public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 6778. A bill to give effect to the International Convention on Conduct of Fishing Operations in the North Atlantic, signed at London under date of June 1, 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 6779. A bill to provide for repayment of certain sums advanced to providers of services under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GINN:

H.R. 6780. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself and Mr. SYMMS):

H.R. 6781. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a replacement dam for the existing American Falls Dam of the Upper Snake River Basin project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6782. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with non-Federal agencies for the replacement of the existing American Falls Dam, Upper Snake River project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.R. 6783. A bill to authorize financial assistance for opportunities industrialization centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUNGATE (for himself and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 6784. A bill to preserve the right of Government employees to credits or refunds for overpayment of income taxes resulting from the failure to exclude, in returns for certain prior years, amounts withheld for retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 6785. A bill to limit the authority of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to impose, by regulations, certain additional restrictions upon the availability and use of Federal funds authorized for social services under the public assistance programs established by the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 6786. A bill to establish in the Public Health Service an institute for research on dysautonomia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BAKER, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 6787. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOTT:

H.R. 6788. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to provide a comprehensive program of healthcare by strengthening the organization and delivery of healthcare nationwide and by making comprehensive healthcare insurance (including coverage for medical catastrophes) available to all Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKAY:

H.R. 6789. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to assure confidentiality of information furnished in response to questionnaires, inquiries, and other requests of the Bureau of the Census, to provide for a mid-decade sample survey of population, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARAZITI:

H.R. 6790. A bill to prohibit most-favored-nation treatment and commercial and guarantee agreements with respect to any non-market economy country which denies to its citizens the right to emigrate or which imposes more than nominal fees upon its citizens as a condition to emigration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 6791. A bill to provide equity in the 1973 feed grain set-aside program by increasing the payment rate for participants in plan B; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 6792. A bill to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, known as the "Freedom of Information Act"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BELL, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NIX, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, and Mr. RIEGLE):

H.R. 6793. A bill for the relief of certain orphans in Vietnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. SAR-BANES, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WARE, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. JOHNSON of California):

H.R. 6794. A bill for the relief of certain orphans in Vietnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. KEMP, Mr. Mazzoli, Mr. ROE, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 6795. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to encourage persons to join and remain in the Reserves and National Guard by providing full-time coverage under Servicemen's Group Life Insurance for such members and certain members of the Retired Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 6796. A bill to amend section 709(g) (1) of title 32 of the United States Code to permit certain National Guard technicians to be absent from work on legal holidays; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6797. A bill to allow a credit against Federal income tax or payment from the U.S. Treasury for State and local real property taxes or an equivalent portion of rent paid on their residences by individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself, Mr. BRAY, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. HUDD-NUT, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. ZION):

H.R. 6798. A bill to provide that Mansfield Lake, Ind., shall be known as Cecil M. Harden Lake; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 6799. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6800. 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. PEPPER:

H.R. 6801. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the survivorship reduction during periods of non-marriage of certain annuitants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6802. A bill to increase the contribution of the Federal Government to the costs of employees' health benefits insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6803. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6804. A bill to provide for continual application of current basic pay scales to Federal civil service annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6805. A bill to insure the separation of Federal powers and to protect the legislative function by requiring the President to notify the Congress whenever he, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the head of any department or agency of the United States, or any officer or employee of the United States, impounds, orders the impounding, or permits the impounding of budget authority, and to provide a procedure under which the Senate and the House of Representatives may approve the impounding action, in whole or in part, or require the President, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the department or agency of the United States, or the officer or employee of the United States, to

cease such action, in whole or in part, as directed by Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 6806. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit an exemption of the first \$5,000 of retirement income received by a taxpayer under a public retirement system or any other system if the taxpayer is at least 65 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6807. A bill to amend section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6808. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6809. A bill authorizing the construction, repair and preservation of certain public works on rivers for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6810. A bill to amend section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6811. A bill to provide for the addition of approximately 4,000 acres of land to the Kehoe Lake project on Little Sandy River and Tygart Creek, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6812. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6813. A bill to amend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to increase the mileage of the development highway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6814. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs requiring a doctor's prescription among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the voluntary program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 6815. A bill to require congressional approval for any assistance provided to North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York:

H.R. 6816. A bill to grant a Federal Charter to the Italian American War Veterans of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 6817. A bill to establish rational criteria for the mandatory imposition of the sentence of death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. Mazzoli, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 6818. A bill to provide for the establishment within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of a National Center on Child Development and Abuse Prevention, to provide financial assistance for a demonstration program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Mr. BENITEZ, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. DIGGS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, and Mr. LITTON):

H.R. 6819. A bill to provide for the establishment within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of a National Center on Child Development and Abuse Prevention, to provide financial assistance for a demonstration program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 6820. A bill to protect the freedom of choice of Federal employees in employee-management relations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 6821. A bill to provide for the registration and regulation of oil and gas programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ULLMAN (for himself, Mr. McCORMACK, and Mr. MCKAY):

H.R. 6822. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow Federal income tax returns to be inspected by a common tax auditing agent utilized by the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H.R. 6823. A bill to enlarge the Sequoia National Park in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

H.R. 6824. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for more effective control of aircraft noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WON PAT:

H.R. 6825. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interstate and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 496. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.J. Res. 497. Joint resolution to retain May 30 as Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. du PONT:

H.J. Res. 498. Joint resolution concerning the war powers of the Congress and the President; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California (for himself and Mr. WIGGINS):

H.J. Res. 499. Joint resolution providing for an extension of the term of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. DRINAN):

H.J. Res. 500. Joint resolution to terminate American military activity in Laos and Cambodia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REID:

H.J. Res. 501. Joint resolution to bestow U.S. citizenship upon Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 502. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the continuance in office of Judges of the Supreme Court and of inferior courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H. Con. Res. 181. Concurrent resolution expressing the opposition of the Congress to certain measures for the curtailment of benefits under the medicare and medicaid programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ABZUG:

H. Res. 350. Resolution requiring certain information on social service regulations from the Secretary of Health, Education,

and Welfare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 6826. A bill for the relief of Viviana Giovannetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 6827. A bill for the relief of Arle Aviv (also known as Arle Abramovich); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 6828. A bill for the relief of Edith E. Carrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 6829. A bill for the relief of Mr. Jose

Antonio Trias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

149. Petition of the county council, county of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii, relative to Federal subsidized housing and community development programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

150. Also, petition of Tommy Brack, Scottsboro, Ala., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

151. Also, petition of Leslie A. Bates and other members of the Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge No. 70, Anne Arundel County, Md., relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ment officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

152. Also, petition of Harold Shea, Vineland, N.J., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

153. Also, petition of Thomas M. Maioli, Bridgeville, Pa., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

154. Also, petition of Jim Drake and others, Claremore, Pa., relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

155. Also, petition of S. A. Hill, Palmerton, Pa., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

156. Also, petition of George P. Stack, Williamsport, Pa., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DR. RAYMOND PAZ OF LAS CRUCES,
N. MEX.

HON. PETE V. DOMENICI
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have on several occasions risen to speak before this distinguished body in praise of our fine New Mexico citizens. Today, I again stand to commend the work of one such man, Dr. Raymond Paz of Las Cruces, N. Mex. Dr. Paz was born in New Mexico, as was his father; he has a true love for the outdoors. By profession he is an optometrist, but he has given many years of his life to promoting outdoor recreation in our State. He has served on the Las Cruces Park and Recreation Board for the past 18 years and presently serves on two State committees—the Recreation Priorities Advisory Committee and the special ad hoc Committee on Solidad Canyon. He is chairman of the Recreation and Open Space Committee of the Southern Rio Grande Council of Governments and serves on the executive committee of the commissioners and board members branch of the National Parks and Recreation Association. I believe he serves as a fine example to millions of Americans who enjoy the outdoors; not only does he enjoy the environment, but he has given many years of his life to its preservation and development.

Dr. Paz recently was asked to participate in the dedication ceremony of the Aguirre Spring Recreation Site in the Organ Mountains 12 miles east of Las Cruces. Dr. Paz' love for the mountain, that has for years been part of the cultural heritage of his city, prompted him to write an inspiring poem about Organ Mountain. I think it reflects his deep love and respect for the earth and I request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CALL OF THE MOUNTAIN
(By Dr. Raymond Paz)

I was created long before you,
To prepare this haven for your coming.
My mission is to serve you.
I need you to justify my being.
My friends—the Sun and Moon,
The Clouds, the Rain and the Snow,
All favor me with their graces,
And adorn me to delight you.
My gifts to you I offer.
And beg you to accept them.
And for your gracious, kindness,
I shall give you lasting peace.
I offer you Adventure,
To challenge the spirit of youth,
And exhaust the youthful energy.
I offer you Beauty,
To delight the human senses
With reflections of our Creator.
I offer you Inspiration,
To liven your weary spirit,
And dissipate the worries of life.
I offer you Peace,
To make the image of God
Glow with celestial splendor.
So come, come to me joyfully,
And drink deeply of the sweet refreshment
That I have for you
And your joys will be without ending.

WAYNE, N.J., SEEKS FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

HON. ROBERT A. ROE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the ever-mounting threat and crisis proportion potential of flooding in many areas of the United States hang like a "sword of Damocles" over our people. We have witnessed billions of dollars of property damage and untold misery in loss of life and personal possessions that have taken place over the years throughout our country. Congressional authorizations that have been written into our Nation's law books have been successful in many instances in bringing flood control measures to the people. In some instances, however, in seeking to implement these laws there is a long drawn out process of

study after study prompted by tremendous growth and development in the area where exploding populations have caused ever-changing patterns of consideration between each study, and finally we are faced with a problem of such magnitude in some of our regions that the community and the State can no longer afford the fiscal resources to provide the remedial action at hand.

This has occurred in the State of New Jersey, and particularly in the Passaic River Basin. A catastrophic flood in 1903 commenced the beginning of over a half-century of studies in this river basin and we have continued to experience heavy flooding and property damage, particularly since 1968 when on several occasions it became necessary to declare states of emergency in this region of our State through the exercise of the offices of the Governor and the President.

Prior to my coming to Congress in 1969, when I served in the Governor's Cabinet of New Jersey as Commissioner of Conservation and Economic Development, we were successful in securing the State's approval of the Army Corps of Engineers Comprehensive Plan for Flood Control-Water Resources Management and Development in the Passaic River Basin known as plan III or plan C. The State Legislature had adopted a resolution attesting to this plan as "the best plan" for the State of New Jersey and the Governor, on behalf of the State, had certified approval of the plan to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

This week the corps is planning another public meeting to discuss still another alternative plan for the Passaic River Basin relating to the flood control aspects only and having as one of its major variations the use of dry detention basins for the water supply reservoirs recommended by Comprehensive Plan III.

Meanwhile, the flooding problems persist and on February 23, 1973, in an effort to apply the Army Engineers and Public Works Committee's authorizations under sections 201 and 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 the Subcommittee on Investigations and Review of the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, held hearings at the