sales tax on gasoline which again was backed by a massive campaign effort on the part of the Chamber and it passed. However, SB 925 funds will not afford enough money for mass transit especially since they are currently devoted to improving the roads. 

At long last the climate is changing. Both Federal and State governments are feeling the marked growth in Washington. This week in face-to-face talks with our California delegation and Claude S. Brinigar, Secretary of Transportation, we are finding Mr. Shorenstein’s ideas to the environment. It is the Chamber’s objective to deliver a balanced mobility system for the Los Angeles area and it has taken the courageous action of legislators at all levels of government, the interest and support of business leaders and the voting public, all of whom stand to benefit.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to enter into the Record an article written by Mr. Walter H. Shorenstein and published in the Los Angeles Times on March 25, 1973. I hope that my colleagues will find Mr. Shorenstein’s ideas on the direction of the environmental movement both helpful and informative.

The ENVIRONMENT: CHANGE CAN BE GUIDED
(By Walter H. Shorenstein)

Scoff a day goes by that we in California do not have to stop new construction in the name of preserving the environment.

It may be an initiative to limit the height of all buildings in San Francisco. It may be a drive to halt a freeway connection in Los Angeles.

It may be an effort to halt resort development in a mountain area. Whatever the merits of the various causes, there is in all of them the general belief that man-made structures are automatically inimical to the environment.

Obviously that is a damaging oversimplification created out of the rising concern over the quality of the environment coupled with the lack of knowledge of some facts of demography.

We cannot—any more than King Canute—hold back the tides of growth and change by refusing to acknowledge their existence. We can best enjoy their benefits and best remove or limit unpleasant side effects by directing growth and change in wisely controlled courses.

The demographic facts should demonstrate why absolute no-growth policies are bound to fail in urban areas. Our rising national population alone points to the need for more housing, more office space, more schools and factories. Americans are not only becoming more numerous, they are moving west in large numbers. And, they are moving to cities.

At the beginning of the 19th century, only 55% of our national population lived in urban areas; today it is more than 75%. By 2000, demographers agree, nine out of 10 Americans will be city dwellers. An inexorable tide of urban population growth is changing our way. We must be prepared for it.

At home or at work, these people must have shelter. The modern high-rise is scatteredly in endless chains of suburbs, with consequent sacrifice of open space and the necessity to commute great distances, or they can be accommodated vertically in high-rise towers. From an environmental point of view, the choice would seem obvious.

The modern high-rise building is one of the great engineering miracles of our age, ranking in its time with the pyramids of ancient Egypt and the Gothic cathedrals of the Middle Ages. It is an extraordinarily efficient means of comfortably housing a maximum number of humans on a minimum of precious ground. High-rise buildings conserve rather than consume open space.

It must be remembered too that the urban real estate developer has a strong interest in improving the urban environment. His edifices represent a large and longterm personal investment.

Urban builders face rising costs and declining income. So for economic as well as civic-minded motives, the developer has a vested interest in the future preservation and growth of his city.

For perhaps different reasons, the average citizen is also interested in encouraging planned improvement and growth of his urban environment.

If he built, he will build high, he will prefer a modern, centrally located high-rise office building because it is convenient, comfortable and close to transportation. And, of the monthly rent his company pays to occupy this building more than 20% of it is returned to the community in the form of taxes which pay for schools and hospitals and fire departments.

The modern high-rise building is one of the great engineering miracles of our age, ranking in its time with the pyramids of ancient Egypt and the Gothic cathedrals of the Middle Ages. It is an extraordinarily efficient means of comfortably housing a maximum number of humans on a minimum of precious ground. High-rise buildings conserve rather than consume open space.

It must be remembered too that the urban real estate developer has a strong interest in improving the urban environment. His edifices represent a large and long-term personal investment.

Urban builders face rising costs and declining income. So for economic as well as civic-minded motives, the developer has a vested interest in the future preservation and growth of his city.

For perhaps different reasons, the average citizen is also interested in encouraging planned improvement and growth of his urban environment.

If he built, he will build high, he will prefer a modern, centrally located high-rise office building because it is convenient, comfortable and close to transportation. And, of the monthly rent his company pays to occupy this building more than 20% of it is returned to the community in the form of taxes which pay for schools and hospitals and fire departments.

Another 30% of the rent is returned to the community in wages and fees for building services. The building itself represents another 20% of the construction cost of a modern office building. The average office building in cities continues to concentrate in urban centers, and the need for new power facilities near the centers of population becomes an ever greater economic factor.

Although both face serious problems, Los Angeles and San Francisco are cities with distinctive histories, perhaps the brightest of any two cities in the United States.

Complementary rather than competitive, each offering differing advantages, opportunities, and life styles, they stand in supremely strategic market positions as America’s gateway to the West, to the Pacific Basin with their rapidly growing new markets for U.S. goods and services. If we in California are to remain competitive, if we are to grow without unpleasant and even dangerous side effects, we must face our problems realistically.

It will take effort to fully recognize our problems and place them in a logical scheme of priorities. It will take imagination to find the best solutions. It will take great energy and resources to implement these solutions. But these solutions, which are so much more imagined, the resources never implemented, if we sit by the sea and order the tide to come no closer.

The House met at 12 o’clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O taste and see that the Lord is good;
blessed is the man that trusteth in Him.—Psalm 34: 8.

Eternal God of all the ages, whose glory the heavens declare and whose throne the planets real, we come to Thee in this splendid season of spring when Thy life-giving spirit stirs the quiet Earth and our slumbering world is born anew with the rising splendor of fragrant flowers, budding trees, and growing grass.

Help us, we pray Thee, to find a rebirth of hope and a renewal of love in our hearts that life for us may be born again and our flowering faith make us more than a match for the mood and movements of our modern world.

Grant, O God, that we may work to preserve our American way of life and reap the rich rewards of those who serve Thee and our fellow creatures in honesty and truth, with friendliness and good will.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.
MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of the following:
Fifty-three percent of the people continue to feel that Mr. Nixon is doing a poor job of handling relations with the Congress. To which I may add—amend. Clearly, on issues that are closest to them, the people are looking to the Congress for leadership.

MAJORITY OF AMERICAN PEOPLE THINK PRESIDENT IS DOING A GOOD JOB—RESULT OF POLL

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate and proper to respond to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts. I saw that poll that he referred to. Of course, he forgot the most important part of it, which pointed out that 58 percent of the American people think that the President is doing a good job overall, and this is the most important aspect of a President's responsibility.

Furthermore, the American people do support, as reflected in the vote in the House yesterday and the Senate last week, the fact that the President is doing a good job in holding down spending. The Members of the House did not approve of a budget-busting effort by the Democratic leadership yesterday, and the Members of the Senate did not approve of a budget-busting effort on the part of the Democratic leadership last week. Since Members of Congress do reflect the public opinion, this is a more accurate reflection of the attitude of the American people than the figures the gentleman referred to.

Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma. Half of his party only 44 members of his party voted against this legislation when it came before the House, I believe, earlier in the month, and yesterday we reversed their position. He did a great job of twisting the tales of his members.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am grateful for the kind compliment paid by the distinguished majority leader. I can assure him that we will have the same high degree of party unity as we face these various budget-busting efforts by the Democratic leadership.

AMENDMENT TO GENERAL REVENUE-SHARING ACT TO REQUIRE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation which has been cosponsored by 25 of our colleagues here in the House, which would amend the 1972 General Revenue Sharing Act. And very simply, this amendment says that no general revenue sharing funds shall be spent unless they are included by the President as part of a balanced or surplus budget.

We hear a lot of talk about budget-busting and about fiscal responsibility. Last year when Congress appropriated $90.2 billion, they took away all of our power for the next 5 years to control $6 billion of this, this fiscal spending each year. I think the time for Congress to exercise this responsibility is now. This particular legislation does not repeal general revenue sharing. It does not disapprove the concept, but it says the Congress wants fiscal responsibility, and they want to force the administration to perform on the subject of fiscal responsibility.

There can be no revenue sharing when there is no revenue to share at the Federal level. When we look at the statistics, 31 of our States are having surplus budgets, and if anyone is solvent it is the States and not the Federal Government. I hope that the House, and particularly the Republican Members of this body who have talked about fiscal responsibility, will get behind this kind of legislation and put forth efforts to get this general revenue sharing through this body and through the other body. We owe it to the taxpayers of this country.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION, 1972—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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 Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of title I, section 3, of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752), I hereby transmit the annual report of the National Credit Union Administration for the calendar year 1972.

RICHARD NIXON.

PRIVATE PENSION PLANS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93-82)

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 of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

A dynamic economic system in a democracy must not only provide plentiful jobs, good working conditions, and a decent living wage for the people it employs; it should also help working men and women to set aside enough of the earnings of their most productive years to assure them of a secure and comfortable income in their retirement years. This fundamental concept of prudent savings for retirement came under direct public sponsorship in the United States more than a generation ago, with the establishment of the Social Security System. Today, Social Security is the largest...
system of its kind in the world, and one of the most effective and progressive. Numerous significant improvements have been made in it during the past four years by this Administration in cooperation with the Congress.

In addition, public policy has long given active encouragement to the growth of a second form of retirement income—private pension plans which are tailored to the needs of particular groups of workers and help to supplement the Social Security floor. Private pension plans now cover over 30 million workers and over 3 million retired persons.

But there is still room for substantial improvement in Federal laws dealing with private retirement. Those workers who are covered by pension plans—about half the total private work force—presently lack certain important types of Government protection and support. The other half of the labor force, those who are not participants in private plans, are not receiving sufficient encouragement from the Government to save for their own retirement. Self-reliance, prudence, and independence—basic strengths of our system which are reinforced by private retirement savings and plans—should be fostered. And we have refined our proposals.

Sixteen months ago I asked the Congress to enact pension reform legislation to remedy these deficiencies. Since then committees of both the House and the Senate have held useful hearings on reform, and the issue has received wide public discussion. The Administration has also completed studies on some additional facets of the pension question, and we have refined our proposals.

I believe that the time is now ripe for action on those proposals. They will be reenacted in the form of two bills, the Retirement Benefits Tax Act and the Employee Benefits Protection Act. This message outlines the specific reforms contained in the legislation.

The Retirement Benefits Tax Act

If the working men and women are to have a genuine incentive to set aside some of their earnings today for a more secure retirement tomorrow, they need solid assurances that such savings will not be eroded late in their career by the loss of a job, wiped out by insufficient financing and an uncertain benefit, nor penalized by the tax laws. To this end, the Retirement Benefits Tax Act would embody the following five major principles:

1. A minimum standard should be established in law for preserving the retirement rights of employees who leave their jobs before retirement.

Protection of retirement rights, which is essential to a growing and healthy pension system, is ordinarily defined in terms of "vesting." A pension vests when an employee becomes legally entitled upon retirement to the benefits he has earned up to a certain date, regardless of whether he leaves or loses his job before retirement.

Despite some recent movement toward earlier vesting, many private plans still carry overly restrictive requirements for age or length of service or participation before vesting occurs. Thus, the pensions of more than two-thirds of all full-time workers who have vested in private pension plans are not now vested. All too frequently, the worker who resigns or is discharged late in his career finds that the retirement income on which he has been counting has not vested and hence is not due him.

The legislation this Administration is proposing will meet this problem by requiring that pension plans become vested at an appropriate specified point in a worker's career. That point should not be set too early: If a great many younger, short-term workers acquired vested rights, pension plans would be burdened with considerable extra costs and the level of benefits for retiring workers could be reduced. But neither should too long a vesting period be set, since many older workers would then receive little if any assistance. To strike the right balance, I urge the Congress to adopt the "Rule of 50" vesting formula, which is not too costly and works well to protect older workers.

Under this standard, all pension benefits which have been earned would be considered half vested when an employ­ee's age plus the number of years he has participated in the pension plan equals 50. From this half-vested starting point, an additional ten percent of all of the benefits earned would be vested each year, so that the pension would be fully vested five years later. For example, someone joining a plan at age 30 would find that his pension would become 50 percent vested at age 40—when his years of participation (10) plus his age (40) would equal 50. Similarly, the pension of an employee joining a plan at age 40 would become 50 percent vested at age 45, and that of an em­ployee joining a plan at age 50 would begin to vest immediately. And in each case, the pension would increase from 50 percent to 100 percent over the subsequent five-year period of the worker's continued employment.

So that older workers who do not discourage employers from hiring older workers, who would have an advantage of more rapid vesting, the legislation would permit a waiting period of up to three years before a new employee must be allowed to join a pension plan, and it would also permit employees hired within five years of normal retirement age to be excluded from participation in a plan.

Under the "Rule of 50," the proportion of full-time workers in private retirement plans with vested pension benefits would increase from 32 percent to 61 percent. Among participants age 40 and older the percentage with vested pension benefits would rise from 40 percent to about 90 percent.

To avoid excessive pension cost increases which might lead to reduction of benefits, this new law would apply only to benefits earned after the bill becomes effective, and then only for years in which a worker participated in a pension plan prior to enactment which would count toward meeting the vesting standard. The aver­age cost increase for plans which now have no vesting provisions would be about 0.20 cents per hour for each covered em­ployee; for plans that now provide some vesting it would be even less.

The requirement that any retirement benefits under employer-financed defined-benefit pension plans should have the security of knowing that their vested benefits are being adequately funded.

For the protection of the participant under any pension plan is the assurance that when retirement age arrives, pension benefits will be paid out according to the terms of the plan. To give this assurance, it is essential that when an em­ployer makes pension promises, he begins putting away the money that will eventually be needed to keep them. Yet Fed­eral regulations at present are lenient on this point, requiring that only a small portion of pension liabilities be put aside each year.

My retirement savings proposal would augment this minimal protection with an additional requirement calling for at least 6 percent of the unfunded, vested liabilities in a plan to be funded annually. Over time, this rate of fund­ing would build up substantial assets for the payment of pension benefits. It would achieve an average rate of vest­ing which is far less dependent for his pension upon the survival of a former employer's business.

By requiring employers to be more forethoughted and prudence in preparing to meet their pension obligations, this reform should help to reduce the frequency and magnitude of benefit losses when pension plans terminate. Most of the termination losses for a major one; a study conducted at my direction last year by the Departments of Labor and the Treasury found that about $310 billion, retirement-eligible, and vested workers lost pension benefits through terminations in the first 7 months of 1972, with losses totaling some $10 billion.

So that these losses should be commensurate with more than $10 billion in benefits paid annually.

I also recognize, however, that these pension termination losses did work very real injustices and hardships on the individual workers affected, and on their families. Though the stricter funding requirements we are proposing will help to minimize these benefit losses, it has also been suggested that a Government-sponsored termination insurance program should be established to see that no workers or retirees whatever suffer termination losses.

After giving this idea thorough consideration, I am not recommending it at this time. No insurance plan has yet been devised which is neither on the one hand so permissive as to make the Govern­ment liable for any losses incurred between employees and employers, nor on the other hand so intrusive as to en­tail Government regulation of business practices and collective bargaining on a mass scale out of keeping with our free enter­prise system. With new support from the funding standard I am requesting, the private sector will be in a better position to provide protection against the small remaining termination loss problem, and I encourage employers, unions, and private
insurance companies to take up this challenge.

5. Employees who wish to save independently for their retirement or to supplement employer-financed pensions should be allowed to deduct on their income tax returns amounts set aside for these purposes.

Under present law, neither an employer's contribution to a qualified private retirement plan on behalf of his employees, nor the investment earnings on those contributions, are generally subject to taxes until benefits are paid to the beneficiaries. If an employee contributes to a group plan, the tax liability on investment earnings is similarly deferred—though in this case the contribution itself is taxable when initially received as salary. By contrast, a worker investing in a retirement savings program of his own is actually subject year by year to a double tax blow. He is taxed both on the savings contributions themselves as part of his pay and on the investment income his savings earn.

Employees who want to establish their own retirement plan or to augment an employer-financed plan should be offered a tax incentive comparable to that now given those in group plans. Accordingly, I am proposing that an individual's contributions to a retirement savings program be made tax-deductible up to the level of $1,500 per year or 20 percent of earned income, whichever is less, and that the earnings from investments up to this limit also be tax-exempt until received as retirement income. In other words, a worker must control the investment of these funds, channeling them into qualified bank accounts, mutual funds, annuity or insurance programs, government bonds, or other investments as he desires.

The maximum deduction of $1,500 would direct benefits primarily to employees with low and moderate incomes, who often do not benefit from the current tax allowance for employer-financed plans. The limit is nevertheless sufficiently high to permit older employees to finance a substantial retirement savings program which is of special importance to the 9 million full-time workers in this country who are between 40 and 60 years old and are not participating in private pension plans.

The $1,500 ceiling should be more than adequate for most workers. Supposing for example, that an worker in that situation was to start an independent plan at age 40, tax-free contributions of $1,500 a year from then on would be sufficient to provide him a retirement income of $7,500 per year at age 65, if the interest it earns, until he draws benefits, remains with one employer pays no such tax. This discrimination should be corrected.

In order to avoid the problems of administering funds for the benefit of a former employee, an employer will sometimes give a departing employee a lump-sum payment representing all his retirement benefits. Present law requires that the employee pay income tax on that payment even if he intends to put it aside for his retirement. A worker who remains with the same employer pays no such tax.

An important companion to the five-point reform contained in the Retirement Benefits Protection Act is the Employee Benefits Protection Act

By moving rapidly to enact the pension incentive and protection package I am recommending today, this Congress has the opportunity to make 1973 a year of historic progress in brightening the retirement picture for America's working men and women.

Under the reforms we seek, every participant in a private savings plan could have a better opportunity to earn a pension and greater confidence in actually receiving that pension upon retirement. Those who are not members of an employer pension plan or who have only limited benefits in such a plan would be encouraged to obtain individual coverage on their own. The self-employed would have an incentive to arrange more adequate coverage for themselves and their employees. And all participants could have well-deserved peace of mind in the knowledge that their welfare and pension funds were being administered under the strictest fiduciary standards.

The achievements of our private welfare and retirement plans have contributed much to the economic security of the Nation's workers. They are a tribute to the cooperation and creativity of American labor and management. We can be proud of the system that provides the basis for the alert to the alert to the Government's responsibility for fostering conditions which will permit that system's further development.
I urged at the outset of my second term that in shaping public policy we should "measure what we will do for others by what they will do for themselves." By this standard, few groups in this country are more deserving than the millions of working men and women who are prudently saving today so that they can be proudly self-reliant tomorrow. I urge the Congress to help these citizens help themselves by going forward with pension reform.

RICHARD NIXON.


BEEF PRICES RELATED TO OTHER COSTS

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

Mr. SYMS. Mr. Speaker, I have had a stream of cattlemen through my office this month and about as many housewives, all complaining about the price of beef. It could be we are hammering away at the wrong villain where the rising prices are concerned. Take a look at what we could be paying for beef if the price of beef had gone up as fast as hourly pay, the price of steers would be selling at $72.34 per hundredweight. If the price of beef had increased as much as medical care, steers would be brought at $73 per hundredweight. If the rise had been as fast as hourly pay, the price would be $80.69 per hundredweight. Compared to the cost of having a baby, steers would be bringing $119.13 per hundredweight.

Compared to the cost of services and commodities and the price of steers in Europe and Italy—all before the President issued his call for the freeze in April—11, 1973. As the rate of inflation and the cost of living have increased significantly since that date, the cost of goods and services has increased at an even faster rate.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yes 371, nays 14, answered "present" 1, not voting 47, as follows:

Providing for Consideration of H.R. 3180, Franking Privilege for Members of Congress

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 349 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 349
Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, clause 7 of rule XIII to the contrary notwithstanding, to amend title 39 of the United States Code, to clarify the proper use of the franking privilege by Members of Congress, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall not continue more than 2 hours, the bill shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairmen and ranking minority member of the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to offer an amendment of the whole to the bill and all amendments thereto, except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 349 provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate, waiving points of order for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7 of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, because no cost estimate was included in the report. The rule has also made the committee substitute in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and waives points of order against section 5 for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, which prohibits appropriations language in an authorization bill.

H.R. 3180 provides specific guidelines on the kind of mail that is frankable, and makes frankable under a general congressional policy that will permit the mailing only of matter that will assist and expedite the matter of frankable matter under the provisions of the bill in order to be frankable.

The bill provides that surviving spouses of all former Presidents shall have the right to use the frank for nonpolitical mail.

The bill also amends the rules of the House to provide for a new Select Committee on Congressional Mailing Standards to provide advice to Members on the use of the frank and to investigate alleged violations of the use of the frank.

The bill provides specific examples of what can and cannot be mailed under a frank. The listing of frankable items includes mail which is purely personal and unrelated to official business, solicitations of political support, and mail which has information laudatory of the Member on a personal or political basis rather than on the basis of his performance as a Member.

The bill specifically authorizes "postal patron" mailings. Previously this has been permitted only for the President at his head post office. The bill removes present special weight limitations on franked mail. Thus franked mail will be subject to the same weight limitations as apply to mail generally.

Existing law provides that the Congressional Records, or any part thereof, may be sent under the frank. The committee retains the right to use the frank for nonpolitical mail.

The Speaker. I urge the adoption of House Resolution 349 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 3180.

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

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 349 provides for the consideration of H.R. 3180, Franking Privilege of Members of Congress. This rule is an open rule with 2 hours of general debate. It also contains a waiver of a points of order for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XIII, which deals with cost estimates in a committee report. In addition, the rule makes the committee substitute an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and waives points of order against section 5 of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4 of rule XX, dealing with appropriations in a legislative bill.

The primary purposes of H.R. 3180 are first, to establish policy and specific guidelines as to the type of mail which can be sent under the frank, and second, to provide for a Select Committee on Congressional Mailing Standards to provide advice to Members on the use of the frank and to investigate alleged violations of the use of the frank.

The bill provides specific examples of what can and cannot be mailed under a frank. The listing of frankable items includes mail which is purely personal and unrelated to official business, solicitations of political support, and mail which has information laudatory of the Member on a personal or political basis rather than on the basis of his performance as a Member.

The bill specifically authorizes "postal patron" mailings. Previously this has been permitted only for the President at his head post office. The bill removes present special weight limitations on franked mail. Thus franked mail will be subject to the same weight limitations as apply to mail generally.

Existing law provides that the Congressional Records, or any part thereof, may be sent under the frank. The committee retains the right to use the frank for nonpolitical mail.

The bill also amends the rules of the House to provide for a new Select Committee on Congressional Mailing Standards to provide advice to Members on the use of the frank and to investigate alleged violations of the use of the frank, or the amending of the House rules would normally fall within the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee. However, in this case the Parliamentarian referred the bill to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service because of the general subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 349.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution, and:

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. WYDLER. 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—yes 371, nays 14, answered "present" 1, not voting 47, as follows:
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Mr. HENDERTON. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3180, to amend title 39, United States Code, to clarify the proper use of the franking privilege by Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERTON).

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3180, with Mr. O'MIGRIM in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERTON) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CHAMPAIGN) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

Mr. HENDERTON. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3180 as reported by the Committee, by our colleagues, to clarify the franking privilege of Members of Congress.

Unfortunately, the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York, was taken ill last week and is not able to be on the floor today. He wishes to express to the Members his wholehearted support of the bill and urges that the House take favorable action on this most important legislation.

The current franking laws have remained substantially unreviewed since the 19th century and as a result of subsequent practice and interpretation have become vague, inadequate, and basically confusing.

Since 1968, the Post Office Department and its successor, the U.S. Postal Service, have discontinued the previous practice of rendering advisory opinions to Members of Congress regarding proper usage of the franking privilege. The determination as to what constitutes official business, as a practical matter, is now left to the discretion of each individual Member of Congress and this continues to be the policy today.

In addition, except for the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, there is no machinery to enforce compliance with current franking laws other than the commencement of an action in the U.S. Courts. During this past year, some 12 actions concerning the frank were brought before the courts. The decisions emanating from these proceedings have only compounded the problem as to what is frankable and what is not. The result has been uncertainty and difficulty of this present system is unfair to both the Member and his constituency.

H.R. 3180 would clarify and update the existing franking laws, as well as establish machinery which our committee

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 64, the vote on the adoption of the rule House resolution 348—providing for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3180, I inadvertently voted "present." I intended to vote "aye" and ask that my statement appear in the Record immediately following the vote.
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I might add at this point that an amendment will be offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall) to change the select committee to an ad hoc subcommittee and I believe H. R. 3180 is a fine legislative product and urge its passage by the House.
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in the enumeration now, instead of just a narrow description of official business, we now attempt to list for the first time the kinds of things which are frankable and the kinds of things which are not. For that reason, there will be a sound, definite, statutory basis for the use of this important privilege.

I want to point out that if this bill fails, there is not a single change which would be made. Newsletters are mentioned in the bill; newsletters have been sent for many years. Government publications are now mentioned specifically in the bill; Government publications have been sent for many years. So, we are simply confirming the sound, solid, responsible use of the frank which the vast majority of Members of Congress have always followed.

For the first time, we will have in the law a list of things which are not frankable. We will have a committee which will spell out in detail, as we go down the road things which are and are not proper.

Further, the bill would eliminate one of the possible areas of abuses. It is the current practice to print a daily transcript of the Congress. Today, under the law and under past interpretations, anything which appears in the Congressional Record is frankable. This means that the week before election, for example, I could make an attack on my opponent, discuss the issues in my election race, I could denounce him by name, call him a thief, denounce his policies. I put it down the road things which are and are not proper.

However, Madam Chairman, it is not just a benefit bill for the Members, and a very sincere desire by the Members, and a very sincere desire by the Members here what the descriptions will be. It will be a Commission composed of three majority Members and three minority Members. These Members will also be in a position to give advance advisory rulings, to a conscientious Member who wants to determine in advance whether something is frankable, otherwise in the bill.

Now, with this he will have a forum. It will be a Commission composed of three majority Members and three minority Members. These Members will also be in a position to give advance advisory rulings, to a conscientious Member who wants to determine in advance whether something is frankable, otherwise in the bill. I am asked further, what other benefits, if any, are there for the public and the taxpayer in this legislation? Let me point out a couple more.

None of the public has a complaint or a grievance about something that has been franked, he has no place to go unless he can afford a lawyer and take the matter to court.
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Mr. UDALL. It is the purpose and intention of the bill. In several court suits the court said that because the Congress has no machinery to protect itself we will have to do it. They were begging the Congress to spell out what is and what is not frankable. We have a provision here that says you can make the complaint before the Commission. We say should any challenge is filed in the courts, the findings of fact of this Commission are binding on the court. I think the courts do not want to have a conflict with the legislative branch of the Government and will leave us alone if we police ourselves, as we provide in the bill here.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Many of these court suits were filed, I believe, not because of any intrinsic value to the suit but simply to embarrass the incumbent.

Mr. UDALL. That is true.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Is it any part of the purpose of this bill to have congressional machinery or funds to defend Members who have been hit by these nuisance suits?

Mr. UDALL. No. Our concern was two-fold. In the first place, I do not think we would have jurisdiction in our committee to say who the language had been chosen to. In the second place, it was our feeling that if we had a self-policing system of this kind, the courts would leave Members alone and they would not have these court suits filed.

I want to emphasize your point here. Some of these suits that have been filed were nuisance suits. The people who filed them knew that they had no validity and they were merely done to harass the Member.

Mr. UDALL. In this bill a Member of Congress would be able to go to the Commission itself and say, "I propose to send out this newsletter. Is it frankable or not?" Armed with that opinion, then he can publish it without a demurrer. Mr. UDALL. Of Maryland. One other question which concerns the possibility that Members may be required as a result of any act of the House to lean over backboards to avoid criticism. In a sense, then, quite aside from what the bill actually means, there may be a widespread impression among the press that the Member no longer has the freedom to send out that mail in a very wide variety of categories and to avoid criticism in the press he has to lean over backboards and stay well back from the dividing line. As an analogy, I can quote the Hatch Act, which has caused many people to avoid a political position in politics because they did not know where the line was and were afraid to go up to the line.

Mr. UDALL. I agree with that effect of this bill. Indeed, but I do not think it will have a chilling effect on our use of the frank. The fact is that 98 or 99 percent of the material going out of the mail room is good, solid information and in the public interest. The other portion you have, which you do not have in the Hatch Act, is you have no Commission where you can go down and say, "I want a certificate permitting me to go to a political meeting tonight."

Mr. ROUSSELOT. In the bill before us, H.R. 3180, on page 27, it refers to a "Select Committee on Congressional Mailing Standards," which, under this bill, would be the basic judge as to whether material is frankable or not. Mr. UDALL. That is correct, but let me emphasize that the Commission has nothing to do with what a Member chooses to put into the Congressional Record. That is at his discretion.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I understand that point, but I am talking about what items would be frankable for mailing, would be basically subject to the whims of six Members alone.

Mr. UDALL. In the final analysis, if it went to not, it would go to not. The mailing privileges of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Commission would have the power to decide what is or what is not frankable. Mr. ROUSSELOT. Well, if during the sessions some Members of the opposite party were criticizing the President of the United States, the executive branch, and then when campaign time came and that material was included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and then a Member mailed that out, and the President was then running for reelection, that could be considered campaign material; is that correct?

Mr. UDALL. No. Any discussion of public issues or public officials or their performance in office, or failure to perform, these kinds of things are typical of the political scene, and they are clearly a part of public matters, which is spelled out in the broadest terms in the bill.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Then in this bill we have really delegated to six people, the basic decisionmaking power, as to whether such material is in fact political or nonpolitical?

Mr. UDALL. Those six people are going to politician Members who deal with their colleagues, and they will be equally divided between the parties. I do not believe that any speeches that are mailed out on election day are going to vary a great deal from the practice in the past. The very narrow area of the provision is what might use this in my campaign to attack my opponent on a purely political basis; that is the wording of the legislation before us.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, I just wish to make an observation. The gentleman from Arizona is one of the most effective Members of this body, but in answer to the question from the gentleman from California, the gentleman said that the commission would be composed of six pol-l
Mr. UDALL. Yes. The limitation as to a congressional district applies only to the postal patron mail.

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Would the gentleman rather have six of the existing law that continues, or would he rather have a bunch of Federal judges and departments of the other body that would make these Members toe the line?

Mr. UDALL. I accept the gentleman’s challenge. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. Yes.

Mr. DERWINISKI. Mr. UDALL. Yes.

Mr. DERWINISKI. Mr. UDALL. Yes.

Mr. DERWINISKI. Mr. UDALL. Yes.

Mr. DERWINISKI. Mr. UDALL. Yes.
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The law, will have established a set of precedents which will make the act workable and provide service for this commission. 

Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield? 

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI). 

Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). 

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). 

Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. UDALL). 

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield? 

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. UDALL). 

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, in his statement just before he yielded to the gentleman from Iowa, the gentleman from Arizona stated several assurances that no bureau is going to be built up, no large staff needed to administer this proposed law. 

As one of the authors of the bill, let me publicly again assure the gentleman from Iowa that this is my purpose and intent. I agree entirely with the statement just made. 

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. I am sure the Members of the House are glad to have that assurance. 

Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield? 

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. UDALL). 

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona. I am sure the Members of the House are glad to have that assurance. 

Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). 

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). 

Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. UDALL). 

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona. I am sure the Members of the House are glad to have that assurance. 
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Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). 
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Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. UDALL). 

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona. I am sure the Members of the House are glad to have that assurance. 
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Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). 
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Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona. I am sure the Members of the House are glad to have that assurance. 

Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). 

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). 

Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. UDALL). 

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona. I am sure the Members of the House are glad to have that assurance. 

Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). 

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).
overhaul of our franking privileges, which were originally started in 1775. I do think it is an excellent bill, and I do want to associate myself with the comments made by my distinguished colleagues from Illinois and from Arizona. I think they have done a tremendous job.

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, I was chided a little bit ago about making a statement to the press, but I want to make one more comment which was brought to mind by the comment of the gentleman from Ohio.

There is an attitude around the country and in the press that there is a great flood of congressional mail; just a torrent inundating the mailboxes of the citizens of this country. The fact is, last year there was 303 million pieces of congressional mail.

In very rough terms, if one assumes there are 210 million Americans and there are 160 million adults—I believe that is a fact. In other words, the average citizen, who has one Congressman and two Senators, got two pieces of congressional mail and it cost him perhaps 200 cents at the moment. That is the dimension of this thing.

I hope the stories that are written about this bill will keep that in perspective.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to reply to the gentleman by saying I completely agree with the remarks he has just made, as well as his former remarks, and I want to be associated with those remarks.

Mr. HAYS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HAYS. I should just like to say in comment about what the gentleman from Arizona said, about how much mail people get, that I try to answer all the mail which comes into my office. If my people think they are getting too much mail from me, they can cut it down by not writing me so many letters.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HENDERSON. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, I intend to offer an amendment to this bill, but before I get into that let me say a word about the bill itself.

I am among those who agree that some such legislation is obviously in the months immediately preceding an election, particularly a general election. It seems to me that, like Caesar's wife, we should be above suspicion. We should bend over backward to try to make it clear that any such bill is not an electioneering bill. This is a good bill, in my estimation, for incumbent Congressmen in their offices. So I intend to offer an amendment which will prohibit the use of the frank for anything during the 60-day period they are under a postal patron type general address approach or whether they involve the use of mass mailing lists, whether computerized or compiled in some other manner, for a period starting 60 days before any general election.

I personally follow a policy of not sending out postal patron mail or other mass mailings less than 60 days before a general election, and I know a lot of other Members do likewise. I believe that we do so, not because our newsletters are political or otherwise contravene the spirit behind the legislative franking privilege, but because we want to be in a position where our constituents can feel that there is a real distance from the frank-mail that is coming from their Congressman in his representative and legislative capacity and not as a personal instrument.

There are some obvious problems in drawing that type of an amendment, and that is because there are some mass mailings, to address on mass mailing lists, for example, that have no political overtones of any significance. So I have put in my proposed amendment some exceptions to the 60-day ban. These exceptions would allow the mailing under the frank of replies to inquiries or communications from constituents, even though that might be a large list, because the Member got a lot of mail on a particular subject from his constituents.

There would also be an exception for the mailing under the frank of mass mailings to address on mass mailing lists, even though that might be a large list, because the Member got a lot of mail on a particular subject from his constituents.

So I might say, Madam Chairman, that it would be my hope that this exception for news releases would apply to cases where the news releases go to members of the mass media, and it would not cover the mailing of news releases to large lists of constituents under a postal patron or other mass mailing.

Finally, my amendment would make an exception for the mailing under the frank of nonpartisan voter registration or voting information.

Now, Madam Chairman, I realize that this alone does not solve the problem of how to even the score between incumbents and nonincumbents in general elections, and I think that it is important that we even the score. The mere existence of incumbency confers upon the officeholder certain advantages politically and from a public relations standpoint.

So I think if we passed this bill, we ought then to proceed with dispatch to do something about that situation, and I understand the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) is considering working up again a bill to provide for an underwriting of the cost of electioneering for incumbents and nonincumbents alike for mass mailings in the 60 days before a general election.

Obviously the use of the frank should have some limitation on it if used for political mail. I would also hope that we could get to the point where we would provide free time, with certain limitations, for incumbents and nonincumbents alike.

Madam Chairman, I think we should also consider other ways of underwriting, to the extent feasible, of the cost of election campaigns, so that we do not confer too great an advantage on those candidates who have access to large sources of revenue.

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FRENZEL) yield?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. FRENZEL. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. FRENZEL. Madam Chairman, I yield to Mr. HAYS.

Mr. HAYS. Madam Chairman and Members of the committee, I think my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) has already pointed out to the Members how ridiculous some of these ideas can get. Mr. FRENZEL, a gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) must know, as well as I do, that one can become a candidate for Congress in Ohio by paying $50 and filing a petition with 25 names. He does not have to go through a primary or do anything but get 25 signatures and pay $50 bucks.

So if his amendment—and I assume it is well intentioned—became law today, anybody who is a candidate for Congress could use the frank for 60 days before election, and we would have more charlatans and fakers and promoters and self-aggrandizement seekers and God knows what, because they could just pay the $50 and get the use of the frank for 60 days. And what a bargain that would be.

Now, Madam Chairman, this thing could get to be pretty ridiculous. I do not really mind and I am not going to get uptight, but the Committee should think about the advantage of incumbency; if we have any, I am glad of it, and I am going to use it. We also have some limitations on the political campaigns.
ought to lean over backwards.” I thought the quotation was: “Like Caesar’s wife, we ought to be above suspicion.”

I am not going to lean over backward to give my opponent any advantage. I will tell you now, whether Caesar’s wife did or did not.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAYS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I think if you will look at my language, I made them two separate things here, suspicion and leaning over backward.

Mr. HAYS. Maybe my ears were not functioning very well, but the fellow who was speaking had said I thought you said it the other way.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAYS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Actually, my amendment to this bill is limited to a 60-day废止, because the use of the franking privilege on mass mailings in general elections.

Mr. HAYS. I understood that, but you went on and said that you hoped somebody would consider this bill— I believe you said that—that would give all candidates for Congress the frank for 60 days. I am just saying this would be something that would cost the tax-payers a lot of money and you would have a lot of people who were seeking self-publicity who in Ohio for $50 could get a mass mailing by many letters which they could get together and send them out under the frank and get maybe half a million dollars of free publicity. So, although you have the best intentions in the world, I am pointing out how bad that can get.

And, of course, when your dear colleague (Mr. FRENZEL), endorsed it, that upset me some, because he is the author of that great substitute election reform spending bill we are all living under. So I think you should reflect on the times before you get too involved in that, because I think Mr. FRENZEL himself regrets the fact that he thought the substitute would have pretty roundly abused in recent years.

The writer of that editorial did not feel it necessary to give a single example of the so-called round abuse.

I really feel we are required to recognize that in many instances mischievous lawsuits are started for the sole and singular purpose of getting publicity for an opponent of an incumbent Congressman.

And so it was not felt too bad that most of the cases have been backed out of the court as soon as the judge took 5 minutes to read the case and listen to the lawyers.

That has not always happened, because we have had several judges who have, in my opinion, issued what, if I were not a lawyer, I would term as lousy opinions. Since I am a lawyer, I do not use language like that in referring to the action of the judges, but I have to tell you that as long as I am on the floor of the House, I am safe.

The suggestion is made by the one who introduced this legislation that there is some validity to the assumption by the writer in the Wall Street Journal. No one considers, for example, that the amount of money we spend on mail to communicate to the people who are our constituents is only a fraction of the cost of the mailing borne by the Federal Government.

I heard someone ask earlier in the debate whether there is anything in this bill to prevent the President from putting another political notice in letters, as he did in October when he, at someone’s suggestion, included a notice of his generosity, which was sent to all the senior citizens of our country with their October social security paychecks. There is nothing in this bill that would affect that.

What is more important, however, at no time was the committee was considering the necessity of legislating and regulating the use of the mails by Federal agencies did they ever consider legislation except the House or the Senate. We are the only part of the Federal Government elected directly by the people and answerable to the people, and in the House answerable more and more directly than anyone in the Federal Government.

We are the people from whom the public are most likely to expect the highest standards in the use of the mails and in the expenditure of funds for sending newsletters and communicating with them. And I am willing to believe that anyone in the House who abuses his newsletter privilege to the point that has been described by some people who urge the adoption of this kind of legislation is not going to be with us in the next term of Congress.

The people are not fools out there, they can look at a piece of material and make a judgment as to whether it really was intended to inform them, or whether it was intended to try to kid them about something. Whether they agree or disagree with the contents, they can categorically say this is something that comes to them very readily.

So I believe we ought to realize that there is a great deal more mature capacity in the House than it is possible to police ourselves on many of these things, and that this legislation would give us credit for.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and I have been negotiating and working on it so that you do not get an inundation of newsletters and communicating with the people. And I am willing to believe that anyone in the House who abuses his newsletter privilege to the point that has been described by some people who urge the adoption of this kind of legislation is not going to be with us in the next term of Congress.

The people are not fools out there, they can look at a piece of material and make a judgment as to whether it really was intended to inform them, or whether it was intended to try to kid them about something. Whether they agree or disagree with the contents, they can categorically say this is something that comes to them very readily.

So I believe we ought to realize that there is a great deal more mature capacity in the House than it is possible to police ourselves on many of these things, and that this legislation would give us credit for.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and I have been negotiating and working on it so that you do not get an inundation of newsletters and communicating with the people. And I am willing to believe that anyone in the House who abuses his newsletter privilege to the point that has been described by some people who urge the adoption of this kind of legislation is not going to be with us in the next term of Congress.

The people are not fools out there, they can look at a piece of material and make a judgment as to whether it really was intended to inform them, or whether it was intended to try to kid them about something. Whether they agree or disagree with the contents, they can categorically say this is something that comes to them very readily.

So I believe we ought to realize that there is a great deal more mature capacity in the House than it is possible to police ourselves on many of these things, and that this legislation would give us credit for.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and I have been negotiating and working on it so that you do not get an inundation of newsletters and communicating with the people. And I am willing to believe that anyone in the House who abuses his newsletter privilege to the point that has been described by some people who urge the adoption of this kind of legislation is not going to be with us in the next term of Congress.

The people are not fools out there, they can look at a piece of material and make a judgment as to whether it really was intended to inform them, or whether it was intended to try to kid them about something. Whether they agree or disagree with the contents, they can categorically say this is something that comes to them very readily.

So I believe we ought to realize that there is a great deal more mature capacity in the House than it is possible to police ourselves on many of these things, and that this legislation would give us credit for.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and I have been negotiating and working on it so that you do not get an inundation of newsletters and communicating with the people. And I am willing to believe that anyone in the House who abuses his newsletter privilege to the point that has been described by some people who urge the adoption of this kind of legislation is not going to be with us in the next term of Congress.

The people are not fools out there, they can look at a piece of material and make a judgment as to whether it really was intended to inform them, or whether it was intended to try to kid them about something. Whether they agree or disagree with the contents, they can categorically say this is something that comes to them very readily.

So I believe we ought to realize that there is a great deal more mature capacity in the House than it is possible to police ourselves on many of these things, and that this legislation would give us credit for.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and I have been negotiating and working on it so that you do not get an inundation of newsletters and communicating with the people. And I am willing to believe that anyone in the House who abuses his newsletter privilege to the point that has been described by some people who urge the adoption of this kind of legislation is not going to be with us in the next term of Congress.

The people are not fools out there, they can look at a piece of material and make a judgment as to whether it really was intended to inform them, or whether it was intended to try to kid them about something. Whether they agree or disagree with the contents, they can categorically say this is something that comes to them very readily.

So I believe we ought to realize that there is a great deal more mature capacity in the House than it is possible to police ourselves on many of these things, and that this legislation would give us credit for.
whether or not the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Ohio is adopted. If the amendment is adopted, I think it would be a better bill.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3180, the bill to regulate use of the franking privilege of Members in use of the mails, because as reported it fails short of an unqualified needed reform.

I do so with some reluctance, because I regard it as a step in the right direction. But it fails to contain a provision which I consider absolutely necessary: A limitation on mass mailings by Members during political campaigns.

Long-needed definitions of matter eligible to be mailed under the frank are to be applauded, with restrictions to material which will assist and expedite conduct of official business.

The bill’s prohibitions against mailing of personal matter are much in order, and the establishment of a Select Committee on Mailing Standards to monitor compliance are equally needed.

But I feel that the integrity of the conduct of official business is poorly served unless other Members are restricted from mass mailings in the period immediately prior to an election. Members are accorded reasonable access to the same privileges as a matter of fairness.

In 1971, I cosponsored H.R. 5084, a bill to restrict franked mail to candidates for Federal office. This reform has not been enacted.

In the absence of such a reform, mass mailings by Members must be restricted. Since this bill fails in this vital respect, I cannot in conscience support it regardless of its merits on other grounds.

Hopefully, an amendment to restrict franked mass mailings during campaigns will be adopted. If it is not, I will be constrained to vote against the bill.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Madam Chairman, I rise to oppose H.R. 3180, which clarifies the use of the franking privilege by Members of Congress. This bill is of vital relevance to every Member and deserves overwhelming support. Madam Chairman, and I unequivocally put the Congress on record as the master of its own affairs, answerable to no power except to the people of the United States. I commend H.R. 3180 to my colleagues and urge its overwhelming passage.

Mr. RARICK. Madam Chairman, I am concerned over the bill before the House seeking to define the franking privilege in H.R. 3180. There have been too many instances over the past several years in which the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States have been concerned with the use of the franking privilege to influence discovery in the Supreme Court.

Every citizen in this country is entitled not only to the same representation in Congress, but to the same kind of representation. Thus, a crisis is before us, and unless an equitable solution is reached, the ultimate loser will not be the Congresspeople who enjoy the privilege, but our constituencies. For they will certainly be deprived of their right to know what we, their elected representatives, are doing in Congress to keep their continued trust.

Every citizen in this country is entitled not only to the same representation in Congress, but to the same kind of representation. The latter would be unattainable for all if the courts hampered the use of the frank in one area and not another.

H.R. 3180, then, can be viewed as a measure which unambiguously outlines the acceptable use of the frank by Members of Congress and also unequivocally puts the Congress on record as the master of its own affairs, answerable to no power except to the people of the United States. I commend H.R. 3180 to my colleagues and urge its overwhelming passage.

Mr. RARICK. Madam Chairman, I am concerned over the bill before the House seeking to define the franking privilege in H.R. 3180. There have been too many instances over the past several years in which the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States have been concerned with the use of the franking privilege to influence discovery in the Supreme Court.

Every citizen in this country is entitled not only to the same representation in Congress, but to the same kind of representation. The latter would be unattainable for all if the courts hampered the use of the frank in one area and not another.

H.R. 3180, then, can be viewed as a measure which unambiguously outlines the acceptable use of the frank by Members of Congress and also unequivocally puts the Congress on record as the master of its own affairs, answerable to no power except to the people of the United States. I commend H.R. 3180 to my colleagues and urge its overwhelming passage.

Mr. RARICK. Madam Chairman, I am concerned over the bill before the House seeking to define the franking privilege in H.R. 3180. There have been too many instances over the past several years in which the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States have been concerned with the use of the franking privilege to influence discovery in the Supreme Court.

Every citizen in this country is entitled not only to the same representation in Congress, but to the same kind of representation. The latter would be unattainable for all if the courts hampered the use of the frank in one area and not another.

H.R. 3180, then, can be viewed as a measure which unambiguously outlines the acceptable use of the frank by Members of Congress and also unequivocally puts the Congress on record as the master of its own affairs, answerable to no power except to the people of the United States. I commend H.R. 3180 to my colleagues and urge its overwhelming passage.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of comparison.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled: That (a) section 3210 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:"

"§ 3210. Franked mail transmitted by the Vice President, Members of Congress, and congressional officials"

"(a)(1) It is the policy of the Congress that the privilege of sending mail as franked mail shall be established under this section in order to assist and expedite the conduct of the official business, activities, and duties of the Congress of the United States.

"(2) It is the intent of the Congress that such official business, activities, and duties cover all matters which directly or indirectly pertain to the legislative process or to any congressional representation functions performed by Members of Congress in order to assist and expedite the conduct of the official business, activities, and duties of the Congress of the United States."

An amendment to the existing franking privilege is a step in the right direction. However, as currently written, the legislation does not go far enough. The franking privilege has been abused by Members of Congress in the past, and it is necessary to establish clear guidelines on the type of mail matter that is privileged to be sent.

The amendment to the franking privilege is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough to address the potential for abuse. It is necessary to establish clear guidelines on the type of mail matter that is privileged to be sent.

A limitation on mass mailings by Members during political campaigns is a step in the right direction. However, as currently written, the legislation does not go far enough. The franking privilege has been abused by Members of Congress in the past, and it is necessary to establish clear guidelines on the type of mail matter that is privileged to be sent.

The amendment to the franking privilege is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough to address the potential for abuse. It is necessary to establish clear guidelines on the type of mail matter that is privileged to be sent.
authority of government, as a guide or a means of assistance in the performance of their official functions.

(3) It is the intent of the Congress that mail matter which is frankable by a Member of Congress specifically includes, but is not limited to—

(A) mail matter to any person and to all agencies and officials of Federal, State, and local governments regarding programs, decisions, and other related matters of public, governmental, and congressional officials; reports on public and official actions taken by Members of Congress; and discussions of proposed or pending legislation or governmental actions and the positions of the Members of Congress on, and arguments for or against, such matters;

(B) the usual and customary congressional newsletter or press release which may deal with such matters as the impact of laws and decisions on public, or the views and opinions of any Member or any political party, or a vote or financial assistance for any candidate for any public office;

(C) mail matter which specifically solicits political support for the sender or any other person or any political party, or a vote or financial assistance for any candidate for any public office;

(D) reports of how or when such Member or Member-elect, or the spouse or other member of the family of such Member or Member-elect, spends time other than in the performance of, or in connection with, his official functions of such Member or the activities of such Member-elect as a Member-elect; or

(E) mail matter which specifically solicits political support for the sender or any other person or any political party, or a vote or financial assistance for any candidate for any public office.

(4) It is the policy of the Congress that the privilege of sending mail as franked mail matter which constitutes or includes any article, account, sketch, or likeness is to be considered as read, printed in the Rayburn, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. That is objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Udall

Strike out all the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment, as shown in italics in the reported bill, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

(a) section 3210 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"3210. Franked mail transmitted by the Vice President, Members of Congress, and congressional officials.

(1) It is the policy of the Congress that the privilege of sending mail as franked mail shall be established under this section in order to assist and expedite the conduct of the official business, activities, and duties of the Congress of the United States.

(2) It is the intent of the Congress that such official business, activities, and duties cover all matters which directly or indirectly pertain to the legislative process or to any congressional or other representative functions generally, or to the functioning, working, or operating of the Congress and the performance of its functions.

(3) It is the intent of Congress that such official business, activities, and duties cover all matters which directly or indirectly pertain to the legislative process or to any congressional or other representative functions generally, or to the functioning, working, or operating of the Congress and the performance of its functions.

(4) Franked mail may be in any form appropriate for mail matter, including, but not limited to, correspondence, newsletters, questionnaires, and recordings.

(5) Franked mail shall not include matter which is intended by Congress to be nonmailable as franked mail under subsection (a) (2) and (3) of this section.

(6) It is the intent of the Congress that mail matter which is frankable by a Member of Congress specifically includes, but is not limited to—

(A) mail matter to any person and to all agencies and officials of Federal, State, and local governments regarding programs, decisions, and other related matters of public, governmental, and congressional officials; reports on public and official actions taken by Members of Congress; and discussions of proposed or pending legislation or governmental actions and the positions of the Members of Congress on, and arguments for or against, such matters;

(B) the usual and customary congressional newsletter or press release which may deal with such matters as the impact of laws and decisions on public, or the views and opinions of any Member or any political party, or a vote or financial assistance for any candidate for any public office.

(C) mail matter which specifically solicits political support for the sender or any other person or any political party, or a vote or financial assistance for any candidate for any public office.
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The mail matter dispatched by a Member of Congress between his Washington office and his district offices, or between his district offices;

(2) mail matter directed by one Member or Member-elect to Congress or to representatives of the legislative bodies of State and local governments;

(3) mail matter expressing unduly favorable or unfavorable sentiments toward a person who has suffered a loss or gratulations to a person who has achieved some personal or public success;

(4) mail matter including general mass mailings, which consists of Federal laws, Federal regulations, other Federal publications and other mail matter which consists of voter mail matter, including general mass mailing of the Member or Member-elect, or the spouse or any person and is unrelated to the official business, activities, and duties, as intended by Congress to be nonmailable as franked mail under subsection (a) (2) and (3) of this section;

(5) It is the intent of the Congress that the franking privilege under this section shall not permit, and may not be used for, the transmission through the mails as franked mail, of matter which in its nature is purely personal to the sender or to any person and is unrelated to the official business, activities, and duties of the public officials covered by subsection (b) (1) of this section.

(1) Franked mail may be in any form appropriate for mail matter, including, but not limited to correspondence, newsletters, questionnaires, recordings, facsimiles, reprints, and reproductions. Franked mail shall not include matter which is intended by Congress to be nonmailable as franked mail under subsection (a) (4) and (5) of this section.

(2) A Member-elect to the House of Representatives may mail franked mail with a simplified form of address for delivery within that area constituting the congressional district from which he was elected.

(3) For the purposes of this subsection, the franking privilege under those sections (a) (4) and (5) of this section shall be nonmailable as franked mail, any part of, or reprint of any part of, the Congressional Record, including speeches or reports contained therein, unless the copy is a franked mail under section 3210 of this title.

Sec. 3. (a) Section 3214 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3214. Mailing privilege of former President; surviving spouse of former President.

"(a) Former President and the surviving spouse of a former President may send non-political mail within the United States and for international postage.

Sec. 4. (a) There is established a special commission to be known as the "Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards," which shall be comprised of six Members appointed by the Speaker of the House, three from the majority political bodies of the House of Representatives, and three from the minority political bodies of the House of Representatives, with the Speaker designating one of the Members to be chairman of the Commission. The members of the Commission shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House and each member shall serve for a period of two years.

(b) The Commission shall provide guidance, assistance, advice, and counsel, through advisory opinions or consultations, in connection with the mailing or contemplated mailing of franked mail under section 3210, 3212, 3213 (b), or 3218, and in connection with the operation of section 3215, of title 39, United States Code, upon the request of any Member of the House or Member-elect, Resident Commissioner or Resident Commissioner-elect, Delegate or Delegative to Congress, or any other head of the professional staff (by whatever title designated) of such commission, and shall conform to regulations prescribed by the Commission by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(c) In performing its duties and functions, the Commission may use such personnel, office space, equipment, and facilities of, and obtain such other assistance from, the Commission on Post Office and Civil Service of the House, as such committee shall make available to the Commission. Such personnel and assistance shall include, in all cases, the services and assistance of any other or head of the professional staff (by whatever title designated) of such commission, and shall conform to regulations prescribed by the Commission by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(d) The Commission shall provide guidance, assistance, advice, and counsel, through advisory opinions or consultations, in connection with the mailing or contemplated mailing of franked mail under section 3210, 3212, 3213 (b), or 3218, and in connection with the operation of section 3215, of title 39, United States Code, upon the request of any Member of the House or Member-elect, Resident Commissioner or Resident Commissioner-elect, Delegate or Delegate to Congress, or any other head of the professional staff (by whatever title designated) of such commission, and shall conform to regulations prescribed by the Commission by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The Commission shall provide guidance, assistance, advice, and counsel, through advisory opinions or consultations, in connection with the mailing or contemplated mailing of franked mail under section 3210, 3212, 3213 (b), or 3218, and in connection with the operation of section 3215, of title 39, United States Code, upon the request of any Member of the House or Member-elect, Resident Commissioner or Resident Commissioner-elect, Delegate or Delegate to Congress, or any other head of the professional staff (by whatever title designated) of such commission, and shall conform to regulations prescribed by the Commission by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The Commission shall provide guidance, assistance, advice, and counsel, through advisory opinions or consultations, in connection with the mailing or contemplated mailing of franked mail under section 3210, 3212, 3213 (b), or 3218, and in connection with the operation of section 3215, of title 39, United States Code, upon the request of any Member of the House or Member-elect, Resident Commissioner or Resident Commissioner-elect, Delegate or Delegate to Congress, or any other head of the professional staff (by whatever title designated) of such commission, and shall conform to regulations prescribed by the Commission by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The Commission shall provide guidance, assistance, advice, and counsel, through advisory opinions or consultations, in connection with the mailing or contemplated mailing of franked mail under section 3210, 3212, 3213 (b), or 3218, and in connection with the operation of section 3215, of title 39, United States Code, upon the request of any Member of the House or Member-elect, Resident Commissioner or Resident Commissioner-elect, Delegate or Delegate to Congress, or any other head of the professional staff (by whatever title designated) of such commission, and shall conform to regulations prescribed by the Commission by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The Commission shall provide guidance, assistance, advice, and counsel, through advisory opinions or consultations, in connection with the mailing or contemplated mailing of franked mail under section 3210, 3212, 3213 (b), or 3218, and in connection with the operation of section 3215, of title 39, United States Code, upon the request of any Member of the House or Member-elect, Resident Commissioner or Resident Commissioner-elect, Delegate or Delegate to Congress, or any other head of the professional staff (by whatever title designated) of such commission, and shall conform to regulations prescribed by the Commission by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.
SEC. 9. (a) The House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards is directed to promptly evaluate in a hearing the problems relating to and the arguments for and against a policy which would prohibit the use of

(1) the prohibition of the deposit of such mail matter in the mail more than thirty days immediately before the date of any primary or general election in which a Member is a candidate for any public office;

(2) the prohibition of the mailing under the frank of replies to inquiries or communications of constituents; and

(3) the prohibition of the mailing under the frank of replies to inquiries or communications of constituents.

Sec. 10. (b) Section 3210 of title 39, United States Code, as amended by section 3 of this Act, and the provisions of subsection (d) of section 3210 of title 39, United States Code, as amended by section 3 of this Act, shall take effect as of December 1, 1974, and then paid to the legislative branch for that purpose, to the Postal Service, for postal revenues payable by the Post Office Department to the Treasury of the United States.

Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to the following:

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, as my colleague from Michigan has suggested, since the bill was reported by the committee in response to a great deal of concern by our colleagues, a number of suggestions have been made. As one of the managers of the bill, after consultation with Mr. Henderson and the vice chairman of our committee, the manager of the bill, I thought it would be well to incorporate a number of those amendments into one amendment, so that the amendment I offer is a substitute for the entire committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There are no objections to the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.
In a highly technical decision, it was actually a reproduction of a public document and make sure of that technically in this rewrite.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), who is chairman of the Republican Conference, suggested an amendment to the section that is before the committee today: that is to say, the franking of the frank to make it clear that the Democratic Caucus and the Republican Conference, which both have a generally accepted and have staffs supplied by the House, would be entitled to use the frank in the same way that the standing committees would be entitled to use the frank.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD was quite critical of section 4 dealing with the franking standards, as it was reported by the committee. This established the Select Committee on Mailing Standards. Working with Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD and Mr. HENDERSON and some of our other colleagues, we have done a rewrite of that section. Basically it changes the select committees to a commission to make sure that we are not establishing a new House bureaucracy in a standing committee. It makes clear that the findings of fact and this was a very constructive suggestion Mr. FORD made —of that commission, if there should be a court challenge on some of its findings of fact, or for any purpose it goes to court—are conclusive on the court, and it would not be questioned.

The procedure is sharpened up and clarified in some further respects, but basically it follows the outline of the original select committee but turns it into a commission of the House. There are a few other technical changes that are made in going through it, but basically the substitute I offer is the action of the committee with those improvements.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the gentleman now offering his substitute as an amendment for H.R. 3180?

Mr. UDALL. Yes. The committee had one committee amendment. We struck out all after the enacting clause and had one committee amendment. For that committee amendment I now offer one substitute.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman's entire substitute?

Mr. UDALL. Yes, and some can be perfected, of course, with some amendments that may be offered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the same assurance applies to the commission in the gentleman's substitute he establishes a commission rather than the select committee?

Mr. UDALL. It does indeed.

Mr. GROSS. And the same assurance applies as to the staff?

Mr. UDALL. To the staff and the bureaucracy and the building of an em-
other body is concerned, I am not sure we want that equality at all times.

Mr. DERWINSKl, Madam Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is totally out of place in this legislation, and I am at a loss to understand why the sponsors of the bill would agree to accept it.

The amendment deals with an apparent problem which the gentleman from California, with certain language in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, and I suggest that it would be more appropriate to attempt to amend that act rather than the legislation we are now considering.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 3180 deals solely with identifying mail matter which is permitted to be mailed under the frank. If matter is frankable under the definition of this bill, then it is frankable, period, and the source of financing such mail, which is not brought into consideration. If the gentleman's newsletter or whatever material he wishes to send out under the frank meets the specifications of H.R. 3180, then the mail is frankable.

If the amendment offered seeks to obtain relief from some restriction of the Federal Election Campaign Act, it is not proper to seek such relief under the frankling legislation now under consideration. I urge the rejection of the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. UDALL.

The amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. William D. Ford to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Udall.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Amendment offered by Mr. William D. Ford to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Udall.

The amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Amendment offered by Mr. William D. Ford to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Udall.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Madam Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to strike out some of the "thou shalt note" that the committee put into the bill. In my opinion, if we are going to legislate in this area, we should have the simplest form of legislation that will vitally the fewest attacks on the basis of subjective tests that might be applied to it. What we have here, which I think is a basic defect in the bill, is a laundry list of things we cannot mail, and a laundry list of things that we can mail.

That would be bad enough in and of itself, except that the laundry list of things we cannot mail, you will discover, are prohibitions which are couched in terms which no one really understands. If we pass a law prohibiting something that does not clearly let us know in advance whether we are prohibiting something, we invite a situation where anyone who wishes to allege a violation of these vague provisions, automatically, by simply making those allegations, shifts the burden to us to prove we did not violate the regulation.

For example—and perhaps the worst one in here—look on page 5. It says that one shall not mail as franked mail:

- mail matter which constitutes or includes any article, account, sketch, narration, or other matter which is inherently insignificant to any Member of, or Member-elect to, Congress on a purely personal or political basis

I do not know what kind of a jam that would get anyone into, if the President used any of the language in the House. If that is not, about me, recently, but some other Members might be interested in that—and some other Member of the House might be interested in that—then the matter is, in fact, frankable.

By that simple action, it seems to me, one would be subject to attack on the ground that the matter was "laudatory and complimentary" of him or some other Member of the House. It is a subjective kind of test which I suggest should be left to the wisdom of the Commission on Mailing. If there is a problem raised, let the Commission examine the specific case and make a ruling with respect to that specific case. Let the Member go to the Commission, as the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall) suggested, and get that guidance.

On page 4 there is another one. It looks innocuous at first, but on further examination there is a "hooker" in the bill, when it says "mail matter which contains a picture, or other likeness.

One can send out a picture or other likeness, but here is how he would get into trouble. If the picture is of a Member of Congress and it is a part of a mass mailing, it shall be "not of such size" and "shall not be such frequency" in the mail matter concerned as to "lead to the conclusion that the purpose of such picture, sketch, or likeness is to advertise the Member or Member-elect rather than to sell or promote a text."

Again, what is the purpose of a picture of a Member of Congress conferring with the President? Is it solely for a picture or other likeness?

I believe it would be better if we did not have the vague language here and if we left it to the self-policing system that they will leave it up to the President to say what does not clearly let us know in advance whether we are prohibiting something, we invite a situation where anyone who wishes to allege a violation of these vague provisions, automatically, by simply making those allegations, shifts the burden to us to prove we did not violate the regulation.

On page 4, line 11, strike out the semicolon.

And on page 4, line 11, strike out the semicolon and the word "and" immediately after the semicolon.

And on page 4, line 11, strike out line 12 and all that follows down through the period in line 3 on page 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) It is the intent of the Congress that a Member of or Member-elect to Congress may not mail as franked mail, matter which specifically solicits political support for the sender or any other person or any political party, or a vote or financial assistance for any candidate for any public office.

And on page 7, line 2, strike out "and"

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Madam Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to strike out some of the "thou shalt note" that the committee put into the bill. In my opinion, if we are going to legislate in this area, we should have the simplest form of legislation that will vitally the fewest attacks on the basis of subjective tests that might be applied to it. What we have here, which I think is a basic defect in the bill, is a laundry list of things we cannot mail, and a laundry list of things that we can mail.

That would be bad enough in and of itself, except that the laundry list of things we cannot mail, you will discover, are prohibitions which are couched in terms which no one really understands. If we pass a law prohibiting something that does not clearly let us know in advance whether we are prohibiting something, we invite a situation where anyone who wishes to allege a violation of these vague provisions, automatically, by simply making those allegations, shifts the burden to us to prove we did not violate the regulation.

For example—and perhaps the worst one in here—look on page 5. It says that one shall not mail as franked mail:

- mail matter which constitutes or includes any article, account, sketch, narration, or other matter which is inherently insignificant to any Member of, or Member-elect to, Congress on a purely personal or political basis

I do not know what kind of a jam that would get anyone into, if the President used any of the language in the House. If that is not, about me, recently, but some other Members might be interested in that—and some other Member of the House might be interested in that—then the matter is, in fact, frankable.

By that simple action, it seems to me, one would be subject to attack on the ground that the matter was "laudatory and complimentary" of him or some other Member of the House. It is a subjective kind of test which I suggest should be left to the wisdom of the Commission on Mailing. If there is a problem raised, let the Commission examine the specific case and make a ruling with respect to that specific case. Let the Member go to the Commission, as the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall) suggested, and get that guidance.

On page 4 there is another one. It looks innocuous at first, but on further examination there is a "hooker" in the bill, when it says "mail matter which contains a picture, or other likeness.

One can send out a picture or other likeness, but here is how he would get into trouble. If the picture is of a Member of Congress and it is a part of a mass mailing, it shall be "not of such size" and "shall not be such frequency" in the mail matter concerned as to "lead to the conclusion that the purpose of such picture, sketch, or likeness is to advertise the Member or Member-elect rather than to sell or promote a text."

Again, what is the purpose of a picture of a Member of Congress conferring with the President? Is it solely for a picture or other likeness?

I believe it would be better if we did not have the vague language here and if we left it to the self-policing system that they will leave it up to the President to say what
The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall) has probably laid out the problem. We faced this problem in committee. It was studied extensively, debated extensively, and the chances are that unless we have in the bill some prohibition against the abuse of the frank, we could be subject to the criticism of sweeping all the problems under the rug and not meeting the complications which we know to exist.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall) very properly makes the point that we have to have prohibitions—as he remarks, we said that salty language—the "no-noes." They are a very key part of the bill, and I think we can justify the argument against the amendment.

Mr. Udall, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM, Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. Bingham), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Madam Chairman, I would like to address an inquiry to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall), with regard to this amendment.

I must say that I share some of the concerns that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. William D. Ford) has expressed about the interpretation of some of this language, for example, the lanigan (Mr. William D. Ford). The amendment that I feel might make some legislative history.

But, once it is locked into the statute you invite someone to go to the courts with an injunction against you on the ground of vagueness, sufficiently vague so that it should be looked into and the matter should be held up until it is looked into. It might be a good regulation and, if it is, it should be made by the Post Office. And, if they meet with any difficulties, I would like to ask the gentleman whether his amendment strikes out all of these so-called no-noes or only those to which he referred.

Mr. WILliAM D. FORD. I would like to strike three and leave an absolute prohibition against the political use of the frank mail. I think most Members have found that people treasure that.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will state that I did track this back pretty well from the old postal manuals. That shows us where we get into difficulty.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would not worry about language that leads you to the conclusion that its real purpose is that a manual is to be interpreted by a postal employee which was made under the post office, was still operating the Post Office.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. William D. Ford) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall).

Mr. BINGHAM. I would like to point out that subsection (a) (4) of section 3210(a) (3) eliminates a contradiction in the bill and removes language which I feel could be subject to valid criticism.

The paragraph I wish to amend, as it is now written in the bill, permits the franking of expressions of condolence to a person who has suffered a loss or congratulation to someone who has achieved some personal distinction.

I point out that subsection (a) (4) of the same section of the bill does not permit the franking of the matter which is in its nature purely personal to the sender or to any other person and is unrelated to official business.

Mr. WILliAM D. FORD. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. William D. Ford).

Mr. BINGHAM. I would like to strike three and leave an absolute prohibition against the abuse of the frank, we could make up at the time the Congress was made up of a picture, which is probably laid out the problem.

Mr. WILLiAM D. FORD. Madam Chairman, I have over the years compiled a list of things one could or could not do, and picture does not illustrate the text and the use of pictures, which I feel could be subject to valid criticism.

Mr. BINGHAM. I think most Members have found that people treasure that.

Mr. WILLiAM D. FORD. I would like to have the gentleman's comment on that?

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Bingham) has a way in his supposition that the use of a picture is to be prohibited on a newsletter. Let me make some legislative history.

In the masthead or the heading of a newsletter with a picture of the Member is intended to be approved. As a matter of fact, in this language we turned it around. These no-noes are taken out of the old Post Office Manual, where they had over the years compiled a list of things one could or could not do, and pictures, except to illustrate text, used to be under the prohibitions.

Here we say one can send pictures, but not if there are so many of them or they are in too big a size. If a newspaper employee, and I would reach the conclusion that the Member is simply advertising himself and not illustrating the text.

Madam Chairman, the Post Office did rule out and over again that one's picture on the masthead of the newsletter does illustrate the text. It shows who the Member is, and so on.

Secondly, there is a quite to the contrary of what the gentleman says.

Mr. BINGHAM. Madam Chairman, I am glad to have the gentleman's reasons. I am sure that I illustrate some of the difficulties of interpretation that the gentleman from Michigan is pointing out.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am glad to have the gentleman's reasons. I am sure that I illustrate some of the difficulties of interpretation that the gentleman from Michigan is pointing out.

Mr. WILLiAM D. FORD. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. William D. Ford).

Mr. BINGHAM. I would like to strike three and leave an absolute prohibition against the abuse of the frank, we could make up at the time the Congress was made up of a picture, which is probably laid out the problem.

Mr. WILLiAM D. FORD. I would like to have the gentleman's comment on that?

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Bingham) has a way in his supposition that the use of a picture is to be prohibited on a newsletter. Let me make some legislative history.

In the masthead or the heading of a newsletter with a picture of the Member is intended to be approved. As a matter of fact, in this language we turned it around. These no-noes are taken out of the old Post Office Manual, where they had over the years compiled a list of things one could or could not do, and pictures, except to illustrate text, used to be under the prohibitions.

Here we say one can send pictures, but not if there are so many of them or they are in too big a size. If a newspaper employee, and I would reach the conclusion that the Member is simply advertising himself and not illustrating the text.

Madam Chairman, the Post Office did rule out and over again that one's picture on the masthead of the newsletter does illustrate the text. It shows who the Member is, and so on.

Secondly, there is a quite to the contrary of what the gentleman says.

Mr. BINGHAM. Madam Chairman, I am glad to have the gentleman's reasons. I am sure that I illustrate some of the difficulties of interpretation that the gentleman from Michigan is pointing out.
sending out 200 or 300 letters a day, having clipped the names from the local newspapers. That is the practice that my amendment is aimed against.

Before the amendment is written, it would be aimed at the situation pointed out by the gentleman from Maryland, and the gentleman would have to go to the Home Stamp Allowance.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. If the gentleman will yield still further, the point I am trying to make is, is it really such a bad thing because a Congressman has to do so much on a very broad front, many things which I feel, and I think quite rightly so, and many of our constituents feel, are a congressional prerogative, and I do feel that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Derwinski) is doing an awful lot toward taking away what I think is a very legitimate prerogative of a Congressman.

I just wonder whether the gentleman from Illinois has thought through all of the implications of the legislation since apparently the gentleman had not taken into consideration the situation I raised.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I acknowledge that that is a valid point, but inasmuch as far as the use of mail is concerned, but through the years I have been of the opinion that it is in poor taste to permit the writing of condolences to people they have never seen or heard of. That is the point I am making.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, if I have time.

Mr. GROSS. Madam Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his amendment, and to say to him and to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Long) that if the war is over now.

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

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

This amendment would change the existing, and traditional practice in a number of respects, and I think it is wise to do that. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Long) has pointed out that the condolences which are frequently sent to parents or families of young men who die in action would be outlawed. We would have to pay for them through our stamp allowance, as far as these kinds of communications were concerned.

In addition, a number of Members send condolences to the widows or spouses of families who have died, and this would be prohibited.

I think there is something good in this country about a public official who takes time to do this sort of thing. You can argue that almost anything you do is political. For instance, if I am here today performing my duties as a Member, that is a political matter to many people back home.

You know, I was at a gathering the other night where the Governor showed up in a State limousine with a State trooper guarding him and a State trooper of the car also, and it was at a church social. Then he went on to a Boy Scout function. One could argue that these are purely personal, and that the Governor of a State should not in effect have a State-owned ear and driver to take him around to these kinds of places.

I think there is an area where in performing our duties as public officials that we do send messages of interest when we do these kinds of things.

For example, many Members write letters to high school graduates, and this is intended to be covered by the language of the amendment, but where it is a matter of personal distinction. So you can say that that is political, and it gets you votes, but on the other hand there are a lot of young people who think Government does not care and is remote. They think it an important thing to hear from their Governor or their Congressman, or some public official who congratulates them on attaining some goal.

I do not do a lot of these things. I do not send out condolences, but some Members do send our condolences, and congratulate graduates on attaining some goal. There is certainly a self-correcting principle here in operation.

The Member who abuses this, who uses it purely as an attempt to get a fore­ tally to get a backfire. Somebody is going to write an editorial about what he is doing. He is going to find out it will hurt him. So I would leave the language in the way it is written and leave this to the good judgment of the Member, and I would hope and believe it would not be abused and that abuses would bring on their own penalty.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GROSS. The sending of condolences is and should be a very personal matter.

Mr. UDALL. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Members have a stamp allowance. I cannot understand why they should want or use the franking privilege for a purpose as intimate and personal as the sending of condolences.

Mr. UDALL. I agree in terms of practice. I do not do it myself, unless I know the deceased or know the family. I think some Members have found they get in trouble when they start sending letters of condolence. It is an unwise practice. I think the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Derwinski) to the amendment in the name of a substitute offered by Mr. Udall.

Mr. UDALL. I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is: "Amendment offered by Mr. Seiberling to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute Offered by Mr. Udall." Page 8, line 13, strike out the quotation marks and the second period; and immediately below line 13 and above line 14 insert the following paragraph:

18 (c) Matter with a simplified form of address and matter to be mailed in accordance with mailing lists of one hundred or more names, whether the names are printed on, whether the names are printed on, otherwise shall not be transmitted in the mail under the frank by a Member of Congress, Delegate or Resident Commissioner or the House of Representatives, or delivered, under this subsection during the period of sixty days before any general election in which such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner is a candidate for election to the House of Representatives. This paragraph shall not prohib­ it—

"(A) the mailing under the frank of replies to inquiries or communications of constituents;

"(B) the mailing under the frank of mail matter to colleagues in the Congress or to government officials (whether Federal, State, or local), or the mailing under the frank of news releases; or

"(C) the mailing under the frank of non­ partisan voter registration or voting in­ formation.'

Mr. SEIBERLING. Madam Chairman, the purpose of this amendment, as I outlined in the general debate, is to avoid the possibility that this bill could be con­ strued to mean news releases to incumbent Members of Congress in their so-called entrenched positions. There are all kinds of ways to do this, but the most critical period, if somebody wants to claim that we are using the frank for political purposes, is obviously in the period just before a general election. What this amendment proposes to do is simply to say that franked mailings to postal-patron-type mailing lists, or franked mailings to any mass mailing list—and it defines that as a list of 100 or more addresses—shall be prohibited in the 60 days immediately before a gen­ eral election. It makes certain exceptions to this ban.

The first exception would be that it would not prohibit the mailing under the frank of replies to inquiries or communications of constituents, no matter how large a number that might be, if it was really a matter of speaking to constituents.

The second exception is that the mailing would not be prohibited under the frank to colleagues in Congress or government officials at any level of government, or the mailing under the frank of news releases.

Here I should like to say that I would construe this to mean news releases to members of the media.

Finally, it would make an exception to the 60-day ban for the mailing under the frank of nonpartisan voter registra­ tion or voting information.

These are the same exceptions that are included in the bill with respect to the matters which the study committee is to make recommendations on. They read identically to that except, since this prohibition would be effective in the 60 days before a general election, it does not include the bill's prohibition against the committee making any recom­ mendations with respect to the prohib­ iting of the use of the frank 30 days be­ fore a primary or general election.

Of course what I am saying is that, like Caesar's wife, we should be above
suspicion. Most of us follow a policy to­
day of not mailing out newsletters and
similar mass mailing under the frank
just before a general election. I person­
ally have never done it, and I don't
think that most of our colleagues have.
I know many others who follow this same pro­
cedure. I think if this amendment is in
the bill we can make a very strong case
against the inevitable criticism that will
be made, and already has been made, that we are trying to protect our posi­tion
by this legislation.

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

Madam Chairman, in the original leg­
islation that I introduced we had a 60­
day cutoff. A number of members of the
committee and our colleagues in the
House raised very serious questions on
this subject. We probably debated this
proposal more than any other in the
markup before the Post Office and Civil
Service Committee. As a result we had a
vote and the cutoff provision was taken
out of the bill.

Eventually, I would hope we could find
some rational basis, some fair basis, some
reasonable basis to provide for this kind of
cutoff that many Members voluntarily do
do today. But in my opinion we would be
unwise at this time to take this particular
 provision and try to write it in the bill.

Let me point out that in the substitu­
tion before us, there is a provision which
requires the new Commission to study
and report back by next January whether
many Members voluntarily do not mail any out later than 2
months before a general election. I know
that many others who follow this same pro­
cedure. I think

Mr. UDALL. Someone has facetiously
suggested that with the mail service we
now get we have automatically a 60-day
cutoff anyway. I think the period immediately following a
Congress.

I go to the recording studio and I see
Members from all over the country who
are making tapes. Many of us who are
tucked into the big metropolitan areas
have no way of communicating with our
colleagues and constituents as to what we
did toward the end of the Congress, with respect to
the matters which they express the most
concern about, which comes anywhere
close to that kind of coverage.

In the State of Michigan, for example,
the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WILLIAM D.
FORD) has facetiously suggested that with the
60 days preceding the general election,
virtually all the time between the time
the primary takes place and the general
election we cannot communicate with
our constitu­
ents. If Congress adjourns 30 days before
the election, we cannot give our voting
records. The Members can be sure that
somebody else will cut there giving their
version of them.

Let us remember with all this talk
about the advantages of being the incum­

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, will
the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. SEIBERLING. Will the gentleman
yield?

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. SEIBERLING. I too would be con­
cerned about the lopsidedness of this if
it did not operate to cover computer­
type mailings as well as postal patron
mailings, but the language of my amend­
ment restricts matter with a simplified
form of address such as postal patron
mailings and matter to be mailed in ac­
cordance with mailing lists of 100 or
more addresses.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is obvi­
ously correct, but there are some techni­
cal problems which have been
expressed by some of the Members that
language of this kind, if not carefully
studied in drafting, would have the effect
of discriminating against one class of
matter and not against the other.

I think the gentleman's approach is a
fair approach, but it deserves a lot more
study before we take that action.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Madam Chairman,
I honestly do not believe that another
year's study is going to produce any dif­
ferent result, because the basic problem
is not the technical problem of drafting;
it is the problem of sending out mass
mailing just before a general election.

That is where we are going to be crit­
ically concerned. If we pass this bill without an
amendment such as the one I am offer­
ing.

Mr. DENNIS. Madam Chairman,
will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, I rise to the gentleman
from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Madam Chairman, if my
understanding of the gentleman from
Ohio is correct, and I want to be sure
that I do understand him, this applies
to mass mailing 60 days before a general
election.

Mr. SEIBERLING. That is correct.

Mr. DENNIS. No reference is made to
a primary.

Mr. SEIBERLING. No reference is made to
a primary.

Mr. DENNIS. Madam Chairman, I am in support of the
gentle­
man's statement. It is going to be hard to
enforce any particular time such as 30
days because we have local problems.

For example the Postal Service often
does not deliver mail until quite some
time after it is mailed. There will be confu­
sion about when a letter was mailed and
when it was delivered. This matter has
to be dealt with by a committee which is
able to consider all the intricacies and
subtleties. It cannot be dealt with by this
committee at this time.

Mr. UDALL. The amendment was faceted by that the with the mail service we
now get we have automatically a 60-day
cutoff anyway. I think the period immediately following a
Congress.

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, will
the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman
from Ohio. I yield to the gentleman
from Ohio.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Udall).

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, I still have the floor and one of those days we can slowly and deliberately look at this.

One thing which bothers me most in the discussion, one of the great traditions of our system of government is that we tell the people Congress is adjourned, here is what we did, and here is what we did not do.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. It occurs to me there might have been a kind of people listening on the question of wanting to know what the gentleman's opponent thought. I wonder if the gentleman would like to support giving the franking privilege for the Congress adjourned for the purposes of communicating necessary material to the constituents. I know that the House has sufficient experience now to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. I believe a lot of us recognize in certain instances this would impose hardships on some of the Members, but if we are going to get a bill we can stand up and defend reasonably well it seems to me we have to accept the fact that there have to be some sort of lines drawn.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Some 15 years, we have had a tradition of people giving the franking privilege for the Congress adjourned for the purposes of communicating necessary material to the constituents. I know that the House has sufficient experience now to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. I remind the gentleman that this Commission will in fact study this specific subject. The recommendations and reports which have shown us how different things are different in different people. The fact is that the hodgepodge of regulation needs some congressional definition right now, but I think the bill would be vastly improved with the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. FRENZEL. Madam Chairman, I think it will give the public a lot better feeling about equal opportunity in election contests. When we all mail material near election day, we all mail material near election day, and the material is distinctly informative, even though it is a public service, nevertheless, it puts our name in each home in the district we use the postal patron system of putting out that mail.

It reminds the electorate who the "good old incumbent" is, and even if his name is not on the material, the simple signature across the frank is enough to bring a sort of a political ad at that time of the year.

Now, Madam Chairman, in supporting this amendment I am not criticizing the franking privilege as political, and I am not criticizing any Member's use of the frank. I am only saying that there is a real and significant advantage to an incumbent running for reelection when he puts out a postal patron mailing near the election—in other words, a whole 60 days prior to the election or 1 day after the election, and his people will be very well informed.

Mr. CORMAN. Madam Chairman, I prefer that primary elections be covered, but for now, in the House and Senate, the political. They put postage stamps on mass mailings and wrap-up commentaries on legislation 6 or 8 or 12 weeks after the Congress adjourned.

In the full Congress, I have been a Member here, some 15 years, we have had session. We have had session, and twice we have had "lame duck" Congresses. In 1964 we adjourned on the 31st of July and we will have no need for the Members of Congress to be sending mass mailings and wrap-up commentaries on legislation 6 or 8 or 12 weeks after the Congress adjourned.

The realities of the situation are that the heaviest legislative workload, even in election years, falls in September and early October. The amendment would arbitrarily cut off effective communication of items the Member legitimately would be sending to his constituents.

If the gentleman from Ohio will note page 17 of the bill, it is stated that the Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards which is established will have until January 1, 1974, to report to the House, or to the Clerk of the House, the results of its study, together with such recommendations as the Commission considers appropriate with respect to such standardization of means of communicating with such primary or general elections in 1974.

I am sure the Commission, when it is established, will be pleased to entertain suggestions from the gentleman and other Members, and make practical recommendations to insure that the frank will not be abused in the weeks before elections.

Since this mechanism will be available for all Members, I believe the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. I think the gentleman from Ohio. I believe a lot of us recognize in certain instances this would impose hardships on some of the Members, but if we are going to get a bill we can stand up and defend reasonably well it seems to me we have to accept the fact that there have to be some sort of lines drawn.

A lot of us have drawn these lines on our own. I, for one, have refrained from sending out mass mailings 60 days prior to a general election, and we have not suffered any catastrophic results. It seems to me one of the kind of things we can live with.

This is what I consider a reasonable policy to adopt.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman's personal policy is reasonable.

I personally follow the policy of not sending out any mass mailings after the end of September regardless of whether the Congress is in session. I knew of a colleague who had three mass mailings on the last weekend before an election, and it boomeranged against him and almost cost him that election.

I remind the gentleman that this Commission will in fact study this specific subject. The recommendations and reports which have shown us how different things are different in different people. The fact is that the hodgepodge of regulation needs some congressional definition right now, but I think the bill would be vastly improved with the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. FRENZEL. Madam Chairman, I think it will give the public a lot better feeling about equal opportunity in election contests. When we all mail material near election day, even if the material is distinctly informative, even though it is a public service, nevertheless, it puts our name in each home in the district we use the postal patron system of putting out that mail.

It reminds the electorate who the "good old incumbent" is, and even if his name is not on the material, the simple signature across the frank is enough to bring a sort of a political ad at that time of the year.

Now, Madam Chairman, in supporting this amendment I am not criticizing the franking privilege as political, and I am not criticizing any Member's use of the frank. I am only saying that there is a real and significant advantage to an incumbent running for reelection when he puts out a postal patron mailing near the election—in other words, a whole 60 days prior to the election or 1 day after the election, and his people will be very well informed.

Mr. CORMAN. Madam Chairman, I prefer that primary elections be covered, but for now,
because of the variations between the States, I think the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) has wisely omitted primaries, as I think he has given us a substitute amendment which most of us can support.

We will, as everyone here knows, be giving up a little advantage if we vote in favor of this amendment, but I think it will be a vote in favor of equal opportunity at election time.

Madam Chairman, I certainly hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. DERWINSKI. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I think this type of proposal, as well as the bill itself, will really put an end to independent membership in the House. When I say, "independent membership," I mean those of us—there may not be too many of us here, although there are some—who are independent of the press here at home.

There are a few who cannot get accurate information transmitted through some segments of the press; it will be slanted, if printed at all. The Member himself has not written or slandered or defamed, and he has no way to get the true picture, or at least his side of the issue, before the people. Only the other side, only the derogatory side, is shown.

I am saying to the House, if we are to insure that there can be Members of this body who are independent, we should vote against this amendment.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. I am delighted to yield!

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. I want to thank the gentleman for his statement.

I think we should also consider being independent of common cause. I would say this is probably the common cause amendment or else the millionaires amendment. We had this 60-day business in the Post Office and Civil Service bill, and the majority of the Members voted to remove it because the argument was made that by leaving the 60-day limitation there or a restriction on mailings we are admitting what we put out is political by that very thing itself. Certainly this is a bad amendment, and to keep the independence that the gentleman has spoken about I think we ought to vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

The amendment was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SEIBERLING) there were—ayes 21, nays 68.

The amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WILLIAM D. FORD TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. UDALL.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows: Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. On page 17, lines 3 and 4 strike out "the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards and Insert in lieu thereof the word "committee".

On page 17, line 14 and line 17 strike out the word "amendment" and insert in lieu thereof the word "committee".

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Madam Chairman, I had not intended to offer this amendment until I heard the gentleman from Arizona say that he thought and he hoped that the Commission set up under this bill would come back with a recommendation for some kind of a cutoff of mailings before election time.

That is the issue we have just voted on, and I think we know how we feel about it.

If you look at the way the Commission is set up, it is extremely likely, and I really hope that the gentleman from Arizona will be the chairman of that Commission.

Now, however, that I find that the gentleman is strongly about having the Commission make a study, and in advance of making that study the gentleman has already made up his mind that there should be no limitation, and a cutoff, I am so sure we ought to handle it that way. So what in my amendment instead of referring the study of the question of a cutoff to the special Commission I will be appointed by the Speaker, I would like to refer the study to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. This is a bipartisan committee with a bipartisan staff, which has procedures for overview, and for study, and it could report to the House its recommendations in the form of legislation.

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, I want to speak in opposition to this amendment, and I will do so in just a moment, but I do want to make my position perfectly clear, and that is that I said that I hope we can work off a cutoff some day, somewhere down the road. I have not prejudged the question, and indeed spoke against the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) on the ground that I had trouble right now working out a cutoff that is fair and equitable.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. The gentleman will agree with me that what the gentleman is saying is that the gentleman could not write one that is fair in the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BURTON. Madam Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. William D. Ford). I think this will eliminate the necessity of setting up unnecessary duplicative mechanisms.

The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has its jurisdiction. I was considering changing this Commission, and referring it to the Select Committee on Official Conduct. I thought we would get all the discussion here. But I think the gentleman from Michigan has found an appropriate mid-course that will permit the House to vote, if its will would prevail to vest any jurisdiction spelled out by the House rules, and I urge the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Madam Chairman, may I say to the Members that it is with shaking knees that I dare argue this subject against two of the greatest philosophers in the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SEIBERLING) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON). But the point is that as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I am concerned that the gentleman from Michigan might be overworking a very busy and important committee of the House. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan were adopted, the only thing the chairman can do is to appoint a new subcommittee with six members, adding to our heavy schedule.

Mr. BURTON. Madam Chairman (Mr. SEIBERLING) has wisely omitted primaries. I think we should also consider being independent of common cause. I would say this is probably the common cause amendment or else the millionaires amendment. We had this 60-day business in the Post Office and Civil Service bill, and the majority of the Members voted to remove it because the argument was made that by leaving the 60-day limitation there or a restriction on mailings we are admitting what we put out is political by that very thing itself.

Certainly this is a bad amendment, and to keep the independence that the gentleman has spoken about I think we ought to vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

The amendment was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SEIBERLING) there were—ayes 21, nays 68.

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WILLIAM D. FORD TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. UDALL.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

It is obvious that...
the gentleman from Michigan has a tendency to misunderstand the gentleman from Arizona, which makes me wonder what conclusion there is within the DSG as a whole with everyone in attendance. However, the gentleman from Arizona has covered some of the points that were the concern of the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Michigan, and again I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD) ought to be defeated. As I understand the authority of the Commission created in the legislation before us, it would make the initial life of this commission. They are going to have to draft the legislation before us, it would make the initial life of this commission. They are going to have to draft the legislation before us, it would make the initial life of this commission.

Mr. UDALL. I do not want us to miss the point. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona is simply a six-man bipartisan group, better equipped to make that decision be made; let the study be made. If we can find one that is fair, I do not know that we can. I await a study of the careful input from all of the Members to resolve that question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to. The bill was ordered to be engrossed in its present condition.
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PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file reports on H.R. 6628 and H.R. 6706.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Reprinted from the Williston (N. Dak.) Herald, April 11, 1973.)

Do not bite the hand that... Editor, the Herald:

For several weeks now every paper I pick up carries headlines boasting of skyrocketing or just plain screaming about the high price of food, particularly meat. Boycotts are being organized in almost every town on the country to stop buying meat the first week in April. People are being urged to eat macaroni and cheese that week, or perhaps even for a month, in order to bring meat prices down.

But the amazing fact that has prompted much of this is that the price of meat is being organized even in Minot, in the heart of the most agricultural state in the U.S.... long known as the "breadbasket of the world"... North Dakota!

I think it is time that consumers, particularly those in North Dakota, stop engaging in such an action or who go along with it, realize a few facts.

Without a prosperous agriculture North Dakota cannot stay alive. For every 11 farmers who leave the country-side, one main street business closes, and five of the 11 farmers are out of work. And farmers ARE quitting and leaving because for years costs have been too high to profits too small to stay in business.

Statistics show that the American farmer is the lowest paid man in the world... that the American wage earner is the most affluent in the world.

Statistics also show that American consumers spend a smaller percentage of their take-home pay for food than any other in the world... at the present time 17 percent, up 2 percent from a couple of years back but still below the 20 percent Canadians spend and far below other countries, ranging all the way up to 50 percent of their income in Russia.

This is all because the American producer has received far less in return for the booming economy. People criticize the payment of subsidies to farmers, which in reality is a minimum wage for farmers much below that which is guaranteed by law for the wage earner, and which has helped assure a continuous supply of cheap food for the consumer.

So in reality, by providing cheap food for the hungry public all along the line, and ranchers and farmers have been subsidizing consumers.

Now for the first time in nearly 20 years, the farmer’s share of the food dollar has risen somewhat, along with that of the consumer all along the line, and consumers are up in arms to force it into the "basement" again.

On the evening news the statement was made: "We will be putting our hand on its knees!" Don’t people realize that prices to the producer go down to barely cost of production because the price of beef will be produced because production costs are such that the producer will NOT increase the price and the consumer will only rise again to new heights?... Only when it becomes profitable to increase herd size can things get better.

If the producer must take a cut in earnings, then will all of you who are crying about the price of beef also agree to take a cut in wages so that our cost of production can be lessened?... You who are selling the machinery we need to put up the hay and feed needed during the two years it takes to raise a beef, the mechanics who work on our tractors, all those who deal with these producers, paper, tires, tools, oh, the list goes on and on.

For every dollar a farmer makes and spends is regenerated seven times over in this country. It is in this regeneration that we bring down meat prices, who do you suggest take the cut? Will the workers who transport the meat take a cut in pay, or maybe the meat cutters will? Will the meat handlers down the line? No one of these will take the cut because pay scales don’t allow it, only up.

Only farmers must go to market and ask “What will you give me?” Instead of “This is what I must have.” And only if there is no news on the country producing the meat, farmers should ask questions about paying the same price as the past on supplying the quantity and quality of meat, or cut down the line, only up.

Mr. FRASER. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration may have until midnight tonight to file reports on certain resolutions.

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

There was no objection.
food America has been so used to finding on the grocery shelves at so reasonable a price.

What if the day comes when those counters are empty of good red meat because so much of it has been converted or frozen into a cent of hot dogs or hamburger if there were none to be had? You can get along buying most anything underlying a market, and make do, but who wants used food? If you feel you must join the crowd, buy your own meat and eat it cold, with a salad and cheese for a week or a month, then you must, but then you may eventually be eating macaroni and cheese for many more months to come.

If this prospect doesn't appeal to you then perhaps it would be wise to heed the words of that old song, "Don't act like the hand that's feeding you." A rancher's wife.


[From the Minot (N. Dak.) Daily News, Mar. 31, 1973.]

The Price of a Good Deal?

This outburst of housewives' talk of meat boycotts may be a signal that shoppers are catching a glimmer of what lies ahead.

The irony here may be that administration intentions in farm policy are moving in the direction of ending the good deals too. Agriculture in America has had in food buying for the last 40 years.

Something deeper than concern about the current price of meat may well be spiritual to the customers. Perhaps they are beginning to realize that if the farmers are no longer to receive direct incentives to stabilize production and marketing, it will be the consumers who will suffer.

The milling and baking industry did not take kindly to the federal programs of production and marketing controls when they were first instituted. But the millers and bakers have lived with this system for quite a while now, and they know very well what it means to the consumer.

Morton J. Sosland, editor of Milling and Baking News, puts it this way: "To a great extent, U.S. farm programs that began in the 1930s and many of which are now being labeled as a subsidy to American consumers than their more widely criticized and publicized role as a subsidy to American farmers.

If federal farm programs—the so-called subsidy programs—are phased out, as Secretary Butz says the goal is, the era of abundant food in America at moderate prices will end with them. These programs have served to moderate the forces which would operate in a free market. These forces will inevitably, in the long run, push prices higher for those food items that the affluent consumer wants, and as consumers most of us have been living high on the hog until recently. If farmers no longer are to receive direct incentives from government to encourage plenty and stability, one can expect farmers' decisions to follow where the highest market returns are. More land may be set aside as a well-rounded production for the good of the country.

Byzantine food production in this country has become an increasingly expensive enterprise. The total amount of cultivated land is a problem, the amount of time total population will continue to increase for many years to come. At the same time, also, the accelerating trend toward integration of American agriculture to enlarge its export sector. Without continuation of production and marketing programs providing direct incentives to farmers, the consumer in the United States is likely to find himself paying over the country for food shipped abroad to improve our balance of payments.

An important part of the increased cost of farm production is, as Sosland points out, the fact that the cost of land itself has increased greatly. Sosland observes: "Land suitable for crop production in the United States is limited. Witness the fact that farmers last fall, in response to the highest prices in a quarter of a century, seeded only one per cent more acres to winter wheat. Inputs such as labor, machinery, fertilizer, and better seeds are, in a very real economic sense, substitutes for land. In the past relatively few American farmers have considered the end-use of their products, and it will be required to stimulate the inputs that substitute for land.

It appears that the administration has hardly begun to realize that the American consumer on the matter of what the cost of food means to the consumer.

"PROTEST PATCH" TO HELP FOOD BUDGET

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

Mr. CONTE, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues of an important step that I took this morning in the fight against inflated food costs. Given my usual disposition on the subject, it may surprise some of you to hear that I have turned to farming. But I believe it is time for the people of this country to take action against food prices, rents, and interest rates to the protest patch. When you consider that this same man who speaks the truth.

This morning I turned over soil for a "protest patch" at my home. I would like to encourage Mr. and Mrs. America to fight the battle of the supermarket by looking to their backyards. I would like them to follow a course similar to the one I have undertaken today and sow their own crops and garden vegetables.

Even though our Government is paying subsidies to keep some 60 million farm acres out of production, there still must be enough food for all. The protest patch of today could have as wide an effect as the victory garden of yesterday if America is willing to get back on its knees and do a little planting and weeding. Let me remind you that at one point during World War II there were nearly 20 million victory gardens in the United States, according to Mr. Sosland, for 40 percent of all the vegetables produced in this country. Total production was in excess of 1 million tons of vegetables with a retail tag of $650 million.

With the improved equipment and the additional leisure time Americans enjoy today, protest patches could crack the record of the victory gardens and plow a deep furrow into the current food price level in the process.

Of course, there are advantages to this other than economic. A distinguished writer, Charles Dudley Warner, who lobbied in the print vineyard, once said that—

To own a bit of ground, to scratch it with a hoe, to plant seeds, and to watch the renewal of life—this is the commonest delight of the race, the most satisfactory thing a man can do.

When you consider that this same man also said "politics makes strange bedfellows" you realize that here is a man who speaks the truth.

For all the delights of gardening, it is still the trauma of the grocery store checkout counter that should spur America to the protest patch. When you consider that it costs only about 29 cents for a package of seeds, it does not take much zucchini at today's price of 59 cents a pound for it all to be worthwhile.

LIVESTOCK FEEDERS HERE TO FIGHT ROLLBACK

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

Mr. MAYNE, Mr. Speaker, the irresponsible and capricious action of a majority of the Banking and Currency Committee last week in voting to roll back prices, rents, and interest rates to January 1970 levels has created great anxiety and consternation throughout America.

At last seven mass meetings have been held in Iowa's Sixth Congressional District since the committee's action, some of them attended by hundreds of concerned farmers. I have personally heard from a great many constituents who are deeply fearful not only of what such a rollback would do to them personally but to the whole American economy. At least 50 livestock feeders from northwest Iowa have come to Washington in the last 2 days at their own expense to do what they can to make sure we in the House clearly understand that only this rollback would disrupt livestock production.

I urge you to open your doors to them when they come trying to give you the true facts as to how much havoc this rollback would actually wreak. After you talk with them there will be no doubt in your mind about some of the consequences in cattle numbers and a lot less meat in the counter when the consumer needs exactly the opposite.

Small and medium sized feeders would actually be forced by financial losses to withdraw from the livestock
business, liquidating their herds to cut their losses. Many others would elect to withdraw voluntarily rather than operate on the "heads I win, tails you lose" concept which Congress would force upon them by a full-on, rolling back proposed by the committee, and this would forcefully limit production of meat and create much greater difficulties for consumers than their reluctance to pay current prices.

I say again, let us unite in defeating the rollback proposed by the committee, and vote instead for a simple extension of the Economic Stabilization Act as requested by the President.

REPORT ON OAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETING

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, one week ago today, on April 4, the third regular session of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States opened here in Washington. Congressman Steele and I have the privilege of representing the House of Representatives on the U.S. delegation which is headed by our very able Secretary of State William P. Rogers. Because of the importance of the General Assembly meeting and the widespread interest in it here in Congress, I would like to take just a few minutes to briefly summarize what has happened thus far.

APRIL 4, 1973

On April 4 the third regular session began with Secretary Rogers and some 15 other Foreign Ministers in attendance. Even the ceremonial speeches by the Provisional Assembly President Foreign Minister Moe of Barbados and OAS Secretary-General Batres revealed a great deal of time in getting down to business on what has become the session's main theme: adopting the OAS to the rapidly changing and disconcerting world. Foreign Minister Moe's assessments of prospects was generally more dismal than the Secretary General's and the nationalist tenor of his criticism of the United States was in contrast to Galo Plaza's even-handedness. Both men agreed, however, that radical measures might be necessary to the OAS to the times.

As expected, Venezuelan Foreign Minister Calvani was unanimously elected President of the OAS General Assembly.

In separate action, the question of placing on the meeting's agenda the granting of Permanent Observer status to Great Britain failed to achieve the necessary two-thirds majority.

APRIL 5, 1973

The opening speaker during general debate in the first plenary session of the third General Assembly was Foreign Minister Miguel de la Flor Valle of Peru. He delivered a wide-ranging analysis of the problems of the inter-American system and gave Peru's views on how Foreign Ministers should go about restructuring it. Minister de la Flor asserted that Peru's sovereign nationalist and independent foreign policy was guided by great principles of sovereign equality, nonintervention, respect for treaties, and permanent sovereignty over natural resources, and ideological and political pluralism. As expected, he referred to Peru's position concerning the offshore oil in the South Pacific, saying under Article 19 of the OAS Charter, the inadequacy of the present OAS-Cuba policy, the alleged invidious influence of some multinational corporations and the negative effects of proposed U.S. sales of minerals from our strategic stockpile. However, a major portion of his speech was devoted to an analysis of the inter-American system, supposedly dominated economically and politically by the United States, and the need for setting up a commission to analyze the structure of the OAS and the necessary changes. He suggested that separate and distinct major organs would handle, respectively, political, juridical matters and cooperation for development.

A plenary address, April 5, of Ecuadorian OAS Ambassador Galo Leoro was a moderate recitation of familiar Ecuadorian points which emphasized sovereignty, dignity, defense of natural resources, and the need for economic assistance without the kind of ties that permit the inter-American system to be used as an instrument of pressure.

Foreign Minister George Moe of Barbados stressed the need for developing a true concept of the inter-American family and full inclusion of newly independent nations in this family.

Brazilian Foreign Minister Gibson, without attempting to identify himself down the line with Spanish-speaking Latin American positions, seemed in his speech to be trying to ward off a growing sense of isolation of Brazil from the Spanish-speaking members of the OAS. His theme was consistent with the earlier Peruvian speech.

Dominican Foreign Minister Gomez Borges expressed concern that hemispheric solidarity was being disrupted by systematic negativity which managed to portray everything that happened in its worst light.

Bolivian Foreign Minister Gutierrez emphasized the principle of nonintervention, and called for an American community operating without the exclusion of anyone. He referred to the social advances of 1822 and Bolivia's new investment incentives law. He praised the OAS but left the way open for revisions of the system. He also called for establishment of measures which would prevent the selling of strategic stockpile minerals in such a way as to prejudice the Bolivian and similar economies and asked that priority be given to the needs of developing countries. Brief reference was also made to a territorial dispute with Chile.

APRIL 6, 1973

Foreign Minister Oscar Carriozoa, of Colombia addressing the OAS General Assembly on April 6, stated that the regional organization must institute reforms necessary to save itself or passively suffer a process of disintegration. If it continues, he warned, "this nightmare would turn to other existing organizations to solve its problems. He said that Colombians believe that the OAS must become a forum for policy cooperation between the United States and Latin America, and that the United States can no more divorce itself from the other countries of this hemisphere than they divorce themselves from the world's foremost industrialized powers and most technologically advanced nations.

On behalf of his colleague Foreign Minister Almeyda delivered a long, generally unemotional address to the Plenary. His remarks concentrated on a Chilean analysis of the shortcomings in the inter-American system and possible means for rectifying them. Almeyda also reviewed Chilean-United States differences focusing on nationalization of U.S. investments and recent bilateral press accounts which implied that Chile's subjects covered briefly included law of the sea, the Mexican charter on economic rights and duties of the state, the Pan-American Highway, and OAS policy. The United States exercised its right of reply to briefly refute Chilean accusations.

APRIL 7, 1973

Nicaraguan Foreign Minister Montiel suggested that the OAS Charter was probably flexible enough to permit change and that charter revision ought not to be attempted unless absolutely indispensable. He suggested that every effort to revise the charter could usher in a prolonged period of confusion which could seriously damage the inter-American system.

Honduran Foreign Minister Batres addressed the OAS General Assembly calling for a serious evaluation of the inter-American system, both its successes and its failures. He said, however, that the hemisphere is, to some degree, a better place to live in because of what the OAS has done. Batres noted that the OAS must remain a political and must concern itself about all else with the pacific solution of disputes.

APRIL 9, 1973

The speech by Guatemalan Foreign Minister Arenales deliberately gave a brief speech, noting that in order to dedicate the greatest possible amount of time to actual deliberations his delegation thought it convenient to limit itself to two brief points. He said he had been gratified to see that the delegations, despite press accounts to the contrary, were able to express their poltical and must concern itself about all else with the pacific solution of disputes.

APRIL 11, 1973

The criticism of the member states on the Carriozoa highlighted the growth in 9 meeting. Arenales deliberately gave a brief speech, noting that in order to dedicate the greatest possible amount of time to actual deliberations his delegation thought it convenient to limit itself to two brief points. He said he had been gratified to see that the delegations, despite press accounts to the contrary, were able to express their poltical and must concern itself about all else with the pacific solution of disputes.
Mr. Speaker, Foreign Minister Calvani of Venezuela concluded the round of opening statements before the full General Assembly. Beginning yesterday the focus of attention changed to a number of cases where there were various specific questions on the agenda. Within the next several days, I will present another report to the House on the activities of the General Assembly.

TRADE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEVEL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABEUR), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONABEUR. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Trade Reform Act of 1973 represents a comprehensive approach to insuring for the United States a leading role in world trade. The bill's provisions for an aggressive program for Congress to work with the administration to define a global economic balance of commitments. We are moving now on the monetary front; recent devaluations have improved the competitive position of American products in foreign markets. And now the time is opportune for progress to reduce a wide range of trade barriers. For, by so doing, the American worker and our productive capability can be rewarded for their efficiency.

I hope this issue will be resolved by constructive compromise, rather than confrontation. Congress cannot negotiate with our trading partners, but the Congress must authorize the President who does have negotiating capacity. We must, therefore, work closely and constructively to insure the best possible climate. The administration blueprint is a good beginning.

I am particularly interested in the provisions of the proposed bill which offer a mandate to our negotiators to eliminate, reduce, or harmonize nontariff barriers to trade. If import tariff levels have moved downward, many governments have devised other, more complex barriers which restrict access for many American products in foreign markets. Unless these practices are brought under control, they are apt to proliferate and become even greater obstacles. In some problem areas, such as customs valuation, Congress should be prepared to give advance authority to implement the results of negotiations. More complex areas, however, call for negotiated agreements which would have to be brought before the Congress for approval or rejection. An example of this would be international code on government procurement.

In cases where competition and distortions to efficient world trade can be eliminated, they should be; where this is not attainable, then governments should at a minimum, such practices should be allowed to continue only on a basis that their burdens are properly shared by all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, events in recent years have clearly illustrated that the international economic system is not working smoothly. The Trade Reform Act of 1973 is a much-needed and long-awaited step toward a global system under which economic and trade frictions are minimized.

LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, my office has been directed to every household in the seven counties of the First District a legislative questionnaire containing 11 questions on timely subjects. My office has received and tabulated an estimated 15,000 of those questionnaires.

With this information, I will be better equipped to consider and vote on bills that concern major questions which will affect our lives. While I cannot follow the questionnaire results blindly, I will study them and take them into consideration before voting. The questionnaire returns are a big help to me each legislative year.

Judging from the returns, First District residents are very much in favor of the Alabama State Legislature changing Alabama election laws to allow the name of a Presidential candidate on the ballot rather than the name of the party. The number of voters, however, is too small to be convincing.

One of the most overwhelming was the count for limited reinstatement of the death penalty. Ninety-three percent said the death penalty should be reinstated for certain cases while 7 percent were opposed. I have introduced a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment which would make the death penalty available for the willful taking of another life.

Also receiving a lopsided tally was the question of aid to North Vietnam. Eighty-three percent said "no" to the proposal while 7 percent said "yes." I have withheld public comment until all our American prisoners were returned home. Now I can say that I am emphatically opposed to any type aid to the North.

A 74 percent "yes" to 26 percent "no" vote was recorded on the question, "Should economic and cultural trade with China and Russia be continued?" I read into these figures the feeling that this strong "yes" vote contemplates that such trade must serve the purposes of world peace. I also feel that our people are tired of war, and hope, along with President Nixon, that within such trade lies a better way toward peace.

The internationally used metric system of weights and measurement received a negative reaction from a majority of those who answered the questionnaire, but the amount of the negative vote was somewhat surprising to me. The count was 69 percent to 31 percent. I think a thorough study into the
cost of changing or gradually changing from our present system to the metric system should be made before the Congress considers any permanent legislation on the subject.

Critics of the Federal budget brought numerous comments from residents. Seventy-two percent said they favor some programs more than others being cut as opposed to an "across the board" cut of all Federal programs. The great majority of those who said only some programs should be cut listed foreign aid and welfare as the two areas they would most like to see whittled down.

Sixty-eight percent said the Federal Government should provide more money for public school education while 32 percent said the funds should come from local property taxes. This tells me that much of the public is not willing to increase local taxes. But it is good to remember that whether the funds come from the Federal or local government, they are still coming from each citizen's pocket in the form of tax dollars. I suppose that the answer is a reasonable balance between Federal, State, and local authorities. The question still remains: What constitutes a reasonable balance?

Also of specific concern to residents, according to the returns, were inflation, drug abuse, crime, national defense, and pollution.

PRICE ROLLBACK THREATENS KANSAS ECONOMY AND COULD GENERATE MEAT SHORTAGES

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

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern over the actions by the House Banking and Currency Committee to freeze all prices, including livestock and food prices, at January 10 levels. I fully recognize the need to stabilize and reduce the skyrocketing cost of living for American consumers, and I support an extension of the President's authority to impose wage and price controls for another year.

However, the committee has added amendments to the Economic Stabilization Act which threaten the economy of my home State of Kansas, and which pose a danger at the hearts of many family farmers and those engaged in the food industry.

The mandatory rollback of food prices seems like a good idea on the surface. It may be politically popular for while, especially for those of us who represent urban constituencies.

But in the long run it can only mean shortages of meat in the supermarket, and possibly the creation of a black market.

The enactment of such a rollback amendment would kill the incentive of the farmer and others who through the years have endured low prices while threatened by inflation, the weather, and more Government regulations and controls.

Since this measure was reported by the committee, I have been hearing from farmers in my congressional district as well as retailers and other businessmen. I want to include some excerpts from some of my mail on this vital matter:

One of the small packers in my district wrote:

In terms of dollar loss our small plant would have an immediate cash loss of approximately forty thousand dollars. It has been our brief experience that the newly set ceiling prices caused an upturn in prices, disrupted marketing and production intentions, but has not created a situation that cannot be worked out. In the case of a rollback we feel that an industry that has furnished the world's best meat supply would be irreparably damaged and the consumer would be the ultimate loser.

The meat and livestock industry is the largest industry in Kansas. The legislation, as proposed by the Banking and Currency Committee, would spell bankruptcy for stocker operators and cattle feeders.

The Kansas Livestock Association has estimated that the rollback of prices to January 10 would cost the cattle industry in Kansas alone in excess of $100 million. The association stated:

If prices were rolled back it would not only bankrupt the industry, producers, feeders, packers and retailers, but it would result in a shortage of red meat supplies. Let's assume we rolled the price of hamburger back to 50 cents per pound. In a period of acute stimulant demand and clean out the meat case leaving a shortage. It would completely and totally demoralize producers thereby reducing future supplies.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to my colleagues to approach with caution H.R. 6168 as the basic laws of supply and demand.

The threat of a rollback could result in some immediate increase in livestock marketing, but certainly would decrease the meat industry's ability to meet immediate liquidation. I urge Members of the House of Representatives to merely extend the present authorization of the President's authority to impose wage and price controls for 1 year. This is the only logical and reasonable approach to the problem.

ALASKAN OIL: THE TRANS-CANADIAN SOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Anderson) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the decision reached in blocking development of the trans-Alaskan pipeline has placed this issue squarely in the hands of Congress. I believe we must face development because delivery of oil from the vast North Slope reserves demands intensive analysis of a host of political, economic, and environmental issues that are properly within the purview of Congress. Today the Public Lands Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee began hearings on pipeline legislation. I was privileged to testify before the subcommittee and state the case as well as others who joined me on behalf of the trans-Alaskan pipeline. My testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN B. ANDERSON, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, APRIL 11, 1973

Mr. Chairman: It is an honor to testify before the Committee on an issue and specific legislation which I know we agree will be a major factor influencing United States energy policy for decades to come. The Supreme Court decision which halted the effect of barring construction of the Alaskan pipeline, placed the decision-making responsibility directly in the hands of Congress.

My testimony this morning is in support of legislation to be introduced today by the distinguished colleagues of my party who have joined us as co-sponsors of the legislation.

The Act, which we have titled the Arctic Oil and Natural Gas Act of 1973, would provide an exemption from all width restrictions of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 for an oil pipeline built from the North Slope of Alaska to the United States. It would further establish a federal task force to study thoroughly the potential Canadian routes and the feasibility of those routes by October 1, 1973. In addition, the Secretary of State would be directed to begin negotiating with the Canadian Government for rights-of-way, and also report results back to Congress by October 1, 1973. If these negotiations are successful, the Canadian pipeline will be compatible with the construction of a Canadian overland system. The leasing Act exemption would become effective as of November 1, 1973.

My testimony, which follows, discusses the five issues which I consider crucial: 1) predictions of U.S. energy needs in terms of regional supply and demand, and the effect of foreign oil dependence; 2) cost estimates of a Trans-Canadian versus a Trans-Alaskan pipeline; 3) analysis of Canadian stipulations and attitudes toward pipeline development in Canada; 4) considerations of the delays that might be associated with the development of a Canadian line; and 5) estimates of comparative environmental hazards.

I. OIL DEMAND AND SUPPLY PROJECTIONS FOR WEST COAST AND MIDWEST MARKETS

By the early 1980's, approximately 1.8 to 2.0 million barrels per day of recently discovered North Slope Alaskan oil could be ready to be piped to the United States. The wisdom of whether in the interim we should build a Trans-Alaska Pipeline (TAP) to transport the new oil resources to the West Coast, or a Trans-Canadian Pipeline (TCP) to pipe them to the Midwest, depends greatly on what we can accurately predict about the 1980 supply and demand for oil in those two regions of the country. That would not be the case if the supply and demand for oil were roughly similar in each region, or if the oil could be easily transported from one area to the other. But the fact the there will likely be tremendous imbalances in supply and demand between the regional markets in the U.S. and the cost of moving petroleum between regions would be prohibitively expensive.

On the West Coast: A potential surplus

Tables I and II, below, project West Coast and Midwest supply and demand for oil in 1980, without the North Slope Alaskan reserves.
### TABLE I—West Coast (PAD IV) Oil Supply and Demand, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (in millions of barrels per day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required from imports</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import components</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Middle East</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required from Middle East (23%)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total imports</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In light of Table I, consider what would probably happen if 1.8 million barrels per day from the North Slope were delivered to the West Coast via the TAP in the early 1980s. Such a development would currently be projected by Alexsey.1 While such consequences are difficult to predict, the most likely result would be the sale of all currently imported foreign oil, or in other words, the oil would be "backed out" of the West Coast market. Though not all the Canadian supply could be reallocated to other United States markets, at least 500,000 barrels per day of essentially secure foreign oil could be backed out of the U.S. completely.2

Furthermore, once all the foreign oil were backed out of the West Coast markets, an surplus of 200,000 barrels per day of domestically produced oil would still exist. A surplus of this magnitude would naturally encourage a variety of efforts to reestablish a balance between supply and demand. One possibility, if the resource were to be a drop in oil prices in order to stimulate additional consumption. But considering the tremendous shortage which would prevail in other parts of the nation and the need to reduce West Coast gasoline consumption in order to comply with air pollution standards, that does not seem like a very rational solution. Moreover, crude oil price in the Midwest are already 20 percent higher than those on the West Coast, a drop in West Coast prices that would be necessary to erase this projected surplus would widen this gap to 38 cents per barrel, an amount the market will not accept to detect much equity in that kind of solution.3

Another alternative way of diminishing this surplus would be to export a portion of the 1.8 million barrel daily Alaskan production. Some oil executives have already gone so far as to propose that 500,000 barrels a day of Alaskan oil be shipped to Japan. But in light of the fact that by 1980 we will depend upon foreign imports for at least 50 percent of total national petroleum supply, much of it from uncertain Middle Eastern and perhaps South American sources, it is bit ludeous to propose that we export even one barrel of domestic production. Finally, it would be possible to ship some of the TAP oil landed on the West Coast or oil produced on the West Coast to other markets. Additional pipeline and other transportation costs, however, would range from 25¢ to 50¢ a barrel. To move surpluses in this roundabout manner would not appear to be a very viable solution either, unless the cost of transporting Alaskan oil directly to these markets via the TCP would be even greater. As is demonstrated in the next section, this just is not the case. In short, the surpluses which would be created on the West Coast by the influx of vast new supplies of Alaskan oil simply would not be disposed of in a manner which would be economically rational or in keeping with national interests.

In the Mid-West: Potential crippling

By contrast, consider the 1980 outlook for the Mid-West market as summarized in Tables II-A and II-B.

Table II-A. Mid-West (PAD II) Oil Supply and Demand 1980, Without Alaska reserves (In millions of barrels per day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (in millions of barrels per day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required from imports</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total imports</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import components</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Western Hemisphere</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required from Middle East (81%)</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total imports</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II-B. Mid-West (PAD II) Oil Supply and Demand 1980, with Alaska reserves (In millions of barrels per day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (in millions of barrels per day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required from imports</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total imports</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import components</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Western Hemisphere</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required from Middle East (28%)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumes TCP through-put of 1.8 MM b/d and that 25% of oil will continue on to East Coast markets.**

Of the estimated six million barrels per day demand in 1980, only 1.88 million will be supplied by domestic production. The remaining 74 percent will have to be obtained from foreign sources. Moreover, because of likely continued Canadian curbs on exports to the U.S. and limited supplies elsewhere in the world, truly 2.65 million barrels of this total 4.45 million barrels imported daily will come from Middle East sources. That means that without Alaskan oil the Mid-West will have to buy over 70 percent of its 400,000 barrels a day of imported oil from foreign sources, with perhaps 50 percent of its total petroleum supply.

The net result of the powerful position that could be used by the Arab-producing nations when they see that all but one country in the petroleum-producing countries of the Middle East are importing Arab oil, could be Iran controlling 60 percent of all known oil reserves and that their oil income could easily quadruple over the next seven years. If that develops, the income of the Arab nations would exceed the current combined income of Foy's 500 largest U.S. industrial corporations.

The effect of these kinds of resources, coupled with ideological fervor and nationalism, pride, enabled Libya to force oil companies to increase Libya's oil royalties by 120 to 200 percent. The rule of Libya, Colonel Muammar Gaddafi, further states that he now decides foreign economic policies for his country. Whether the force is political blackmail or economic blackmail, it is a phenomenon we cannot ignore.

The direct transmission to the Mid-West and to the rest of the expected 1.8 million barrels of daily Alaskan output is not only economic nonsense. One hopes that this untenable situation will be resolved. Assuming that 25 percent of North Slope oil transmitted directly to the Mid-West via an overland pipeline would eventually find its way to East Coast markets (which unlike transmission from the West Coast, to the Mid-West economically feasible) the need for Middle Eastern oil would still be cut nearly in half. Put another way, with Alaskan oil the Mid-West would depend on the Arab states for only about 26 percent of its total supply. Figures slightly higher than those projected for the West Coast with no Alaskan oil.

In sum, the basic fact that in terms of regional fairness and coherent national planning, it would be far more desirable to distribute the risks of Middle Eastern oil dependence rather than to create a situation in which one region would be floating free of any substantial surplus of secure domestic oil, and the economy and energy supply of another would be hanging in the balance of events in the politically volatile Middle East.

Rather than deliver the new Alaskan oil to a market where it is needed, or further increase the prices at the pump, we seem inevitably to either increase or decrease the threat of political blackmail, the TCP could deliver vast new supplies to a market where it is desperately required.

**The latest case for TAP: Convenient demand, convenient supply, mysterious diversion.**

Last there be further misunderstanding, let me call attention to a number of discrepancies between the estimates I have cited, and corresponding estimates made by the Secretary of the Interior in a letter to each Member of Congress recently. In the letter, the Secretary sets forth the position of the Administration with the virtue of the TAP versus the TCP.

As part of the case, the Secretary's letter assumes 1980 demand for West Coast (PAD IV) (West Coast) to be 3.315 million barrels per day, instead of 1.88 million barrels per day—the amount the Department is projecting up until late March of this year. The increase in demand is due to a rise in the price of $40 billion.

The increased demand is then used to estimate that the TCP would deliver vast new supplies to the market where it is desperately required.

**Assumes that 50% of Gulf Coast excess production is diverted to the Mid-West.**

Currently, about 40% of this excess now flows to District II. Interior's projections assume 60% of excess flowing into the Mid-West.
years of West Coast population growth and economic expansion, oil demand grew at only a 4.7 percent annual rate. Yet, auto-mobility and EPA standards will be needed to meet stiff anti-pollution standards during the remainder of the decade. Production of offshore oil, especially off-shore of the West Coast population and economic growth rate, such a projection would appear to be clearly erroneous. Thus, according to Interior's assumption, we are predicting a West Coast production of only 1.278 million barrels per day. This contrasts with the estimate NPC made of at least 1.5 million barrels of production per day for the 1980-1984 period. In the soon to be announced energy message, the Administration will call for accelerated development of offshore petroleum including the huge offshore reserves of Southern California and Alaska. The proven reserves of Alaska and California, excluding the North Slope, total 4.9 billion barrels—a large percentage of which will be tied up by offshore developments in national energy policy regarding these offshore reserves, the deflated Interior estimate of production overstates the actual or设计 that this production decline will continue into the remainder of the decade, and the auto controls will impose on any pipeline route suggest a cost of about $1 billion for the Alaska portion (if TCP). According to the State of Washington, the construction and acquisition cost of the Alaskan route, even assuming Valdez to various West Coast ports. A transfer of the total cost of laying an entirely new $1 billion plus would be required for the construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline from Valdez to various West Coast ports. This would yield a surplus of 1.5 million barrels daily. This would either have available, or have sufficient refinery capacity to process. While exaggerating the need for TCP oil on the West Coast, with inflated demand and deflated production estimates, the Department has also stressed the need to inflate the issue of domestic supply in PAD II (Mid-West) and hence the need for Middle East imports. The Mid-West now produces 40 percent of the excess production of the Gulf Coast (PAD III). According to NPC projections, the rates will stay about the same and the producers will not have the incentive to make any move into the Gulf. By 1980, yielding a surplus after intra-District consumption of about 1.5 million barrels. However, much work needs to be done in that direction in order to produce a new oil. The facts are as follows: This would indicate that only slightly more than one-half of the new pipeline construction costs would be involved in the trans-Canadian route, a fact which provides initial advantage of at least $2 billion 800-mile line would have to be constructed for only slightly more than one-half of the route—the two pipeline projects mentioned above. This would follow existing highway systems, hence precluding the heavy access road construction costs required by the Alaskan route. Specifically, even if 61.2 million is allowed for the construction of each pipeline mile from Prudhoe Bay to Watseka, Illinois, equal to that allowed for the Alaskan route, although the terrain would be considerably less rugged (and, of course, is not required for interest during the construction period and other costs, such as access such work would be far more difficult, simply to avoid admitting there would be a cost over $800 million. This would be far less than one-third of the total cost of laying an entirely new pipeline. Thus, a conservative estimate of the lower portion of the trans-Canadian route would entail total capital costs of about $600 million. In combination with the costs of the trans-Alaskan, overall capital costs would be in the neighborhood of $5.5 billion in 1971 dollars, a figure at the high estimate range for the Alaskan system. III. CANADIAN CONDITIONS AND ATTITUDES In his recent letter Secretary Morton reiterates his foresight and wisdom in suggesting that Canadians would require 51 percent of the project. This, of course, would impose no serious or insurmountable interpretation of the alleged Canadian position. Morton correctly indicates in his letter that Canadians would require 81 percent ownership.

Ownership: Can the Canadians pull their own weight?
April 11, 1973
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cent ownership in any pipeline crossing their territory, in conformance with their foreign investment policy. This stipulation has been interpreted to imply that the Cana­dians would have to come up with 51 percent of the total cost of the pipeline. Given the inherent foreign policy rationale behind this stipulation, it is understandable that some have concluded that raising such huge sums would be beyond the ability of participating Cana­dian interests.

The fact of the matter, however, is that the cost of a pipeline is completely determined by the ability of either the Canadian or American firm to finance it. It is certainly possible that, in the eyes of the Canadians, the ability to finance such a pipeline solely to the equity portion of the pipeline’s total capitalization, yet pipelines are generally at least 80 percent debt-financed. Thus, the accu­racy of the Canadian contribution to the project would amount to only about 11 percent of total capital costs. If it is assumed that the $8.5 billion figure presented earlier is a realistic estimate of TCP costs, it is clear that the Canadians would only be re­quired to raise something in the order of $850 million. Considering the likely profit­ability of the TCP, this does not seem like an unreasonable amount for Canadian in­terests in the pipeline to raise.

Capacity; missing Canadian production and Canadian markets

Secretary MacEachen further asserts that Canadian conditions require that at least 59 percent of the capacity of the pipeline be reserved for the transportation of Canadian oil to Canadian markets. It is telling that the letter omits mention of present Canadian law. The Canadian government considers any pipeline crossing a provincial border (as the TCP, of course, would) a common carrier. Hence, it is not subject to any such restriction.

But the entire issue is without meaning because, under even the most fortuitous con­ditions, Canadian reserves will not reach an amount near 50 percent of capacity until 1985. Fifty percent capacity would mean one million barrels per day, yet the most optimis­tic Canadian assessment puts the highest daily production levels, from its only produc­ing source that could utilize TCP, at a mere 400,000 barrels per day between 1980 and 1985.

Beyond 1985, projections become much murkier. It is estimated, for example, that in addition to the 9.6 billion barrels on the books at Prudhoe Bay, there are probably combined American and Canadian Arctic reserves totaling 25 billion barrels. Thus, according to one optimis­tic conservative figure based on limited explor­ation. But transport of even 25 billion barrels would require over 100 years of an econ­omid pipeline. Thus it is unlikely that the Canadians would need to utilize TCP capacity until the late 1990s, and after that, com­bined U.S. and Canadian production might well require an entire second line.

It must also be considered that a portion of any amount of Canadian oil transported via the TCP will likely reach American, not Canadian consumers. The Department of Interior itself admits that Canada will only export 1.3 million barrels per day to the United States in 1980. Though this estimate may have been somewhat low, it is clear that the entire amount would be shut off. Yet this would have to happen before the TCP is needed, for example, when the Mackenzie Valley production to Canadian markets.

Canadian management: Not a real problem

The second突出 issue concerns concern about Canadian wishes to manage the TCP. Yet a major Canadian-owned and managed pipeline company, Interprovincial Pipeline, already operates a line transporting oil to the U.S. with no major handbooks. Beyond that, we own and manage 90 percent of all Cana­dian-based mineral extraction industries which, one should keep in mind, provides un­considerable U.S. bargaining power. Thus, while the Canadians may indeed want to manage the TCP, it is difficult to see why this would be a major problem.

Lost Alaskan jobs and purchase of U.S. materials

Estimates of potential construction jobs lost to TCP are based on an optimistic assumption that 20,000 jobs will be created. And surely we must all share concern for any such loss. I encourage the representatives from Alaska to stress this possibility in the case in behalf of the interest of their State.

This is their duty.

But in any discussion national policy concern­ing an issue of crucial importance to the economic and national security of the na­tion, Congress must put the concerns of one State and one industry in perspective. First, we are discussing jobs that do not now exist, and would be created for one task during a three-month period. When, however, the matter involves the proper market for at least ten billion barrels of oil, conservatively valued at $3.5 billion, per 30 years, other con­siderations must hold sway. The essential consideration, for example, is our national energy policy which assures the present secu­rity of jobs in many regions of the coun­try but also concerns the national security and economic well-being of the Canadian in­terests in the Canadian economy where they could otherwise be used.

Moreover, a substantial portion of the pipeline jobs would be slots for managerial and technical workers or highly skilled construction workers, the school­ers and welders. Skilled personnel of such types simply are not available in the Alaskan labor market. The U.S. labor market would have to be purchased in the lower forty-eight states, and so any of these skills, especially in the construction trades, are already in short supply there.

Thus, theTCP’s job figures do not mean nearly that many jobs for native Alaskans: in many cases it would involve only the transfer of skilled workers to the side to another with possible inflationary conse­quences in skill shortage sectors. This would also be true if the year were to be conducted during the next two or three years when the U.S. economy is expected to be operating at full employment.

The Department of Interior also fears the consequence of giving Canadian companies a first preference on the purchases of pipe and other materials for the TCP. But while first preference may be given to the Canadians, it is not at all clear that Canadian firms have the capacity to deliver the grades, sizes, and qualities in the required amounts during the relatively short three-year construction period. It is safe to say that considerable amounts of the ma­terials necessary for construction of the pipe­line will have to be purchased in the U.S. because they are not available elsewhere.

And, as a general rule, it should be noted that such construction ought not to be excluded need not be excluded if purchased from the U.S. Because the TAP system would still be a major problem.

Furthermore, huge economic inefficiencies are involved with one aspect of TAP construc­tion that may ultimately cause greater na­tional output and welfare losses than the gains attributed by the Interior Department to the construction of TAP. The TCP system, for example, would require the construction of at least 41 oil tankers to transport the North Slope oil from Port Valdez to ports on the West Coast. However, under the provi­sions of the Jones Act, no oil products can be shipped in American-built and operated vessels, all of this oil would have to be transported in American flag tankers.

Yet it is well-known that both the American shipbuilding industry and the U.S. merchant marine are by far the most inefficient in the world.

In stimulating demand in these industries for the 73,000-man-years of ship construction and 770-man-years of U.S. maritime crews created, the TCP would be subject to the loss of both capital and labor resources likely would be drawn from other sectors of the American economy, whereas they would be used more productively. Indeed, without the pro­tection of the restrictive Jones Act, either more resources would be directed to the U.S. shipbuilding and maritime indus­tries or huge operating and construction sub­sidies would have to be paid to the U.S. taxpayers. In short, jobs allegedly created by TAP or any other large undertaking must not be viewed in isolation. In the present case, the marine portion of the TAP system would actually shift workers to a sector that would reduce the total level of national output and income relative to that which would likely result from alternative uses of such resources.

Vast Arctic reserves: The key to Canadian attitudes

While the problems posed by Canadian “conditions” have been exaggerated, the Canadian cooperation in the TCP has been curtailed by the absence of a positive Canadian opposition to TAP has been all but ignored.

A real key to Canadian attitudes on this question is the fact that vast reserves of petroleum are known to be available in the Beaufort Sea and in the continental shelf off the U.S. Alaska, but it is not clear that any future date would have to be pumped down a pipeline through the Mackenzie Valley if the TAP would bring the largest and most valuable portion of this oil to market.

Given the known economies of locating a previously­existing line, it would seem unlikely that the Canadians would be needed to bring the development together at a significant savings to them at some date in the not-too­distant future.

Canadian concerns with environmental impact of TAP

In a recent letter to Secretary Morton, for example, Donald S. MacDonald, the Canadian Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources said:

“In reciting some of the advantages to the United States and Canada of a cooperative ship­ping arrangement between the U.S. and Canada for an oil pipeline across Canada, I am mindful, to, that such a measure would avoid the problem of increased oil tanker traffic to the Pacific Coast and particularly in the inland waters of Alaska, British Co­lumbia and Washington. This, in turn, would result in a consequent significant risk of serious environ­mental and economic damage. This is an area not yet solved by the United States and can­not be solved by us today, could produce difficult influences in Canada-United States relations.”

Earlier, this key member of the Canadian government had also pledged during a de­bate on the floor of the House of Commons that “there will be no unnecessary roadblocks (to the Mackenzie Valley pipeline) at the Canadian end and Canadian governmental side.” As recently as March, 1972, when the Interior Department released its final impact statement was released, this same official traveled to Washington to urge U.S. author­ities to reconsider the potential advantages of the Canadian alternative.

In the same letter noted above, Mr. Mac­Donald called attention to the Interior De­partment’s environmental impact statement released March 20, 1972. He said:

“As you are well aware, the comments made in the report on the so-called Canadian alternative are based on data in the public sector, some of which have become out of date and very little has happened in the last two years. Your officials did not ask for any technical assistance from de­partments of the Government of Canada in
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connection with the environmental aspects of this study.

The picture which emerges then, is one that offers a prognosis for immediate and active exploration of the TCP alternative. On the one hand, operation of the marine leg of the TAP system will have a significant influence on the Pacific coast lead to severe strains in U.S.-Canadian relations, due to the very real likelihood that the Canadian alternative is more effective in minimizing ecological impact. Even the Interior Department has admitted that the TAP project has had to be suspended due to the alleged lack of preliminary work on a Canadian system. I would like to briefly review the contents of this study for this committee. In addition, I will make available a number of copies of the complete study to those on the committee who wish to explore this material in more detail.

(1) Route Selection and Specification—The pipeline study would have to traverse 1,738 miles from Prudhoe Bay, Alaska to Edmonton, Canada, where it would connect with the existing Interprovincial Pipeline system. The route leaves Prudhoe Bay and runs easterly along the base of the Arctic Range and Richardson Mountain. When it reaches the Mackenzie Valley, it turns southward, generally following the river's eastern edge. In the valley, the line eventually reaches Edmonton. Construction specifications are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Below ground (1,345 miles)</th>
<th>Above ground (389 miles)</th>
<th>River crossing (94 miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above ground (389 miles)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Route Evaluation—Evaluation was done by aerial and ground reconnaissance, soil investigation, and terrain classification. An extensive physiographic evaluation was undertaken with the general findings:

Sixty percent of route (over 1,000 miles) passes through boreal forest (coniferous trees, aspen, etc.). Ground cover consists of mosses, lichens, herbs, and woody shrubs. This is ecologically the most stable type of range and taiga.

The remainder traverses tundra and taiga. Tundra is very fragile ecologically, while taiga is more stable. Consisting of open grassland interspersed with small areas of tree growth. Since a considerable portion of the TAP will traverse tundra, too, the environmental impact of the two systems on this fragile arctic eco-system would not be substantially different.

(5) Environmental Impact—The proposed pipeline project would end. The studies made by the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Research Limited, a consortium of seven large pipeline companies, raises the question of the adequacy of the environmental impact assessment. The Alaska oil pipeline project was undertaken to determine specific ecological parameters, including species that would be endangered by the proposed pipeline, and in planning for construction activity and logistics. It is often argued in defense of exaggeration that the economic impact of the proposed pipeline has been created or greatly exaggerated and sometimes used as a bludgeon against those seeking serious consideration of the Canadian alternative. Although some delay estimates range as high as ten years, such wild estimates for the most part are based on very unlikely contingencies, in some cases, contrary to, or evidence of, all. More realistic estimates of the additional time needed to complete a Canadian pipeline fall in the 2- to 4-year range.

Moreover, even these more realistic time-delay estimates must be set in the proper context. Such a conclusion is often offered up to 10 years of production during a period of continually-increasing U.S. foreign oil dependence. To go ahead with an uneconomic Alaskan oil route, which may accelerate the initial through-put date for almost one-third of a century of production by only 24 months, strikes me as anything but prudent. In my view, the overriding consideration should be to get the North Slope reserves to the right markets during the decade of the 1980's, when most of the U.S. will have passed through oil, and petroleum terms of foreign oil dependence, rather than whether initial start-up will begin in 1977 as opposed to 1978 or 1979.

The Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Research Ltd. feasibility study
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groups favor the TCP route, it is unlikely that such a statement would be contested in court or be subject to protracted legal delays. In the light of the construction difficulties of the TCP route, it is evident that any such statement would have to be a tentative construction permit from the various Canadian energy boards and an unresolved Canadian environmental claim. However, I do not see any evidence that either will prove to be the insurmountable obstacle suggested by the Secretary's letter. As was noted previously, the construction timetable developed by the Mackenzie research consortium already includes a one-year allowance for permits approval by the Canadian Federal and Provincial Governments. Considering the affirmative action of the Canadian Government regarding TCP, this would seem to be not an unreasonable estimate, and one that conforms to the average one-year, submission/permit approval period in these situations.

The native claims problem suggested by the Secretary is probably the most nebulous potential barrier, as well as most open to debate. In the current debate has presented very much concrete information regarding the problem than before, but if it can be agreed that it is inappropriate to compare this question to the problems faced in Alaska. The TCP route has been shown to pass through a territory not a province and therefore falls totally under the Federal Jurisdiction. Moreover, there is a number of treaties and tools in existence that already define the salient issues, making the matter subject to specific hearings and deadlines. In any case, the Interior Department has certainly presented precious little information to support its contention that this issue could be a major stumbling block.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPARISON OF THE TWO ROUTES

There are only tentative conclusions

In the two years since the initial proposal for a pipeline from the North Shore, no aspect of the investigation has been more thorough than the impact on the environment. The result of the debate has been a much better understanding of the effects of any route that has been proposed. We have also learned that conclusions on environmental impact, more than almost anything, have been often amended by complications of trade-offs and technical advantages simply by the accumulation of more detail. Thus, in statements such as this—intended for laymen and necessarily shorter than technical documents—one must at least acknowledge the complexities of the problem in order to build a strong case.

Judged by this test the Interior Department's case for the environmental superiority of the TCP route passes. According to his letter to Congress, for example, stated: "Because the Canadian route is about 4 times as long as the U.S. route, you have to mean the 2800 miles from Prudhoe Bay to Chicago. But if you do that you cannot by any stretch of the imagination imply that Canadian route is four times as much because nearly half the distance, 1100 miles, from Ed蒙ton to Chicago, is already covered by existing pipelines." Further ambiguities exist in evaluating the effect of the TAP on wilderness areas along the remaining portion of the route. We know, for example, that whether the U.S. route would be a natural gas pipeline or not, a natural gas pipeline would be built along the TCP route. It must be built along that route because of the byproduct of gas liquification at Valdez and also because of the problems banning flaring at the well site. Thus, if the U.S. decides to build the TAP, wilderness will be disrupted along both routes instead of one. It makes greater sense, as the Canadians have proposed, to build both the gas and oil pipelines along the same right-of-way. Regarding the permafrost problem, no one disagrees that the TCP crosses more permafrost than the TAP route. But as the Department of Interior contended in making its case for the TAP, engineering breakthroughs have basically solved the problems of laying pipeline in permafrost.

The crucial environmental question

As these arguments indicate, many serious environmental questions from each proposal. But the question turns on whether we can reasonably predict that one route rather than another is inherently catastrophic. The TAP route entails three threats that could be so described. First, the route of the lower 70 percent of the proposed route would pass through a thicket of known earthquake epicenters, and within close range of three major tracks of potential for pipeline breakage and vast oil spills is underscored by the fact that this area has experienced 23 earthquakes with a Richter rating of 6 or more during the last 70 years. A second environmental threat is posed by the clashing tidal waves in Prince William Sound, the site of storage and transmission facilities scheduled to be constructed in the port city of Valdez. In 1964 the worst recorded earthquake in North American history, and the tidal waves which followed it, literally destroyed the original town on this site. Yet, the Alaskan pipeline system would result in the continuous storage of more than 20 million barrels of oil in Valdez, posing a clear and serious threat to the rich fishing resources of the Sound—to say nothing of other aquatic life and literally thousands of miles of Alaskan and Canadian coastline.

Finally, the hazard presented by two million barrels of oil on barges on the route between Valdez, Puget Sound and southern California needs little elaboration. Even the environmental statement by the Interior Department noted that the "whole coast between Port Valdez and southern California is seismically active, some of the largest historic earthquakes occurred in these areas and the magnitude and frequency of future seismic events are predicted to be high." The statement also noted that "Prince William Sound is poor climatologically with frequent sand storms and high winds, with high temperatures and extremely violent and violent winds. In all, the Department concluded that up to 140,000 barrels of oil would be sent by ship and returned into the north Pacific each year as a result of these conditions. By contrast, the terrain of the Canadian route contains no such hazards that could produce such potentially catastrophic results. Less than five percent of the route between Prudhoe Bay and Edmonton would pass through seismically active areas, and as indicated previously, it would pass through relatively flat terrain. Furthermore, the rugged, Alaska mountain chains, obviously, there would also be no threat of marine spills and oil storage containers could be transported to those associated with the Alaskan route.
ida, and the Gold Coast from Palm Beach to Miami in Broward County, Fla., is one of the chief centers of tourism. Cruise ships put in and out of Port Everglades, which is located between Port Lauderdale and Hollywood, every day. In addition, privately owned pleasure craft seek an outlet to, or an inlet from, the Atlantic Ocean are increasingly using the harbor. Many international tourists to visit not only southern Florida but other parts of our country, also.

Industrial employment has increased by 45 percent in the last 6 years in Broward County which is the largest percentage increase in the State of Florida. This has placed increased demand on the harbor, also.

In the late 1950's when the request for modification of the harbor was first made, Port Everglades was processing 5.8 million tons per year. Due to the aforementioned changes in south Florida, Port Everglades almost doubled its volume in a decade, processing 10.1 million tons in 1971. It is imperative, therefore, that Port Everglades be improved to meet the needs for even greater traffic in waterborne commerce expected in the future. The improvements recommended by the Army Corps of Engineers are:

First, a channel depth of 42 feet—from 40 feet—in the entrance channel and main turning basin plus an additional 3 feet for wave allowance in the ocean entrance;

Second, widening the 300-foot-width section of the entrance channel to 450 feet;

Third, removing part of the north jetty;

Fourth, extending the main turning basin to the southeast about 11816 feet with a 36-foot depth; and

Fifth, widening pier 7 channel to 400 feet with a 36-foot depth; and

Sixth, making both berths 1 channel to 36-foot depth.

Two added benefits arising from the proposed improvements are the possible construction of a south jetty fishing wall, and the widening of the south beach of Fort Lauderdale's public beach south of the port with sand dredged from the project.

The Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the House Committee on Public Works has assured me hearings will begin on this project soon. The Office of Management and Budget is now reviewing the project to determine the amount of revenue needed to start development of the project.

I applaud these efforts and hope that they will lead to authorization of the $8,000,000 modification of Port Everglades Harbor which I have just outlined.

THINKING ABOUT AMNESTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle­man from New York (Mr. ROBINSON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, after I presented the first of what will be several background state­ments on the highly charged and emo­tional topic of amnesty last Wednesday, several of my colleagues and some members of the press asked me why I chose to bring up the issue when I did. Had not President Ford already announced, in view of the Publicity of the President's near total rejection of "amnesty" and in face of continuing rev­elations of the physical and mental tor­ture of our POWs? My reply has been first, to rephrase what I said in the clos­ing lines of my last statement—that I realized I was swimming upstream against the political cur­rents, but that, sooner or later, this issue has to be put into a rational perspective. The question of amnesty simply will not go away.

And, I also explained that part of my reason for beginning now, rather than later, was a letter I recently received from one of my constituents. The con­stituent explains:

I am writing to you as a last resort. Can anything be done pertaining to Amnesty? Some time ago I read that you were not against it. My son has been gone to Canada now for five years. Sir, I'd like him to be able to come home. This is not just the time. It took him three years to leave his country and family, but he is not a coward. Before he left he tried to join every branch of the Reserves. At that time the quotas had all been previously filled.

Congressman Robison, I'd like him to be able to come home, without a prison sentence awaiting him, nor to go on probation or some sort of penance in substitution for him. He is a national citizen, a decent intelligent human being. I know these things have all been said before, Mr. Robison, but surely you must have some sort of solution?

There have been many military crimes permitted in this war and known to be forgiven. Why not our sons who did not want to kill? Thank you.

I imagine, Mr. Speaker, that just about every Member of Congress has re­ceived one of these letters, or will be re­ceiving one in the next few months. And, I wonder how many of them have for­warded them? None? Do we tell them we do not want their sons, that they should stay in uniform?

Washington consequently issued two proclamations during that month: The first ordered the rebels to cease their insurrectional activities against their homes; the second called up the militias from Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

Federal efforts to negotiate with the leaders of the uprising proved fruitless, and, in following weeks more than 12,000 troops were moved to the interior regions of Pennsylvania. This excessive show of military force by the Government melded the opposition of the farmers and their supporters, thus avoiding any violent and regrettable battle. After the confronta­tion, the troops occupied the region, captur­ing the remaining rebels andativists. The 12,000 that was a sig­nal of the "Majesty of the Law" in an important and timely demonstration of the power of the young Federal Govern­ment. Although no real opposition was encountered, the massive display of mili­tary might seems disproportionate in re­trospect. However, the administration de­fended its action for its importance as a victory of the Federal Government over its first rebellious adversary.

During the next year, Washington turned to the task of strengthening the common bonds in the new Nation through his Government. He demon­strated that, through his strength, Gov­ernment could show its mercy by offering amnesties to those who had rebelled against the laws.

On July 10, 1975, the Pres­i­dent issued a proclamation declaring:

A full, free and entire pardon to all per­sons, of all types of military crimes or the­table offenses against the United States committed within the fourth survey of Penn­sylvania before the 22nd day of August last past . . .

In granting this amnesty, exceptions were made for those persons who: "re­fused or neglected to give assurance of submission to the laws of the United States; violated any law, or made a presentment of rebel­lions to the Government, at that time, to demonstrate its strength by its grace and com­pass in forgetting the penalty that the law would otherwise demand."
WASHINGTON:—Though I shall always think it a sacred duty to exercise with firmness and energy the Constitutional powers with which I am vested, I shall not allow that any one page of the history of the operations of the Government every degree of moderation and tenderness which justice, dignity, and safety may permit.

Mr. Speaker, in a society such as ours, where there is the prevailing conviction for the majesty of the law, amnesty is a recognition that, in certain cases—please note I say, "in certain cases," for I do not support what is called "blanket amnesty"—it is far better for a society to absolve offenses of the law in the interest of reconciliation than to perpetuate post-war conditions of sectionalism and vindictiveness. Particularly do I suggest this is true when the leaders of society have the avowed purpose of rebuilding a strong and lasting nation to deal with the more-pressing problems of the future.

By pardoning the insurgents of the "whiskey rebellion," George Washington set a precedent, not only for amnesty, but for the nation's expansion and growth, with the healing of wounds and the restoration of harmony to our society after a military conflict has ended.

The precedent to mind following the end, now, of the Vietnam war, there will be obvious differences of opinion as to the relationship between Washington's action and the question of amnesty today. However, in this—the second in a planned series of discussions of the issues involved in that latter question—let our understanding of our own history will promote that rational and objective approach to our current problem that I continue to feel is needed.

That at least a few others may share my view is indicated by the following—and, for my purposes, timely—column by Roderick MacLeish as published on Monday, this week, in "The Christian Science Monitor":

THINKING ABOUT AMNESTY

(By Roderick MacLeish)

WASHINGTON:—Like all wars, Vietnam does not end at the precise point in time that President Nixon declared the American armed forces out of Vietnam. The war was not fought and won, but ended almost by default, and the nation is armed conflict plus a vast skein of political and social consequences unearthered by the domestic impact of the armed conflict. The fighting stops. The troops and the prisoners come home. The national memory begins to draw its shutters upon the horrors. But, in this, first, confused period of aftermath, the domestic impact still trembles and no issue symbolizes that impact better than the burning question of amnesty.

What Vietnam did to this country was to destroy a military weapon and its leaders must first decide what end they wish to achieve. There would be no military advantage to gain from granting amnesty to the thousands who, among their number, include deserters of the Vietnam war. Hence, we are left with the alternate end—resulting a bitterly divided nation in the collision between conscience and tradition.

If we consider amnesty on that basis, to achieve that end, we must engage in some rather dispensation analyses of ourselves. Are we still divided and at odds with each other? Will we continue to be for a long time to come? Would the granting of amnesty soothe our infrastructural or exacerbate the situation.

At the moment, with millions in the country honoring returned war prisoners as the only viable process of otherwise sordid conflict, we are in a situation comparable to the one that existed after Lieutenant Calley's murdering of My Lai. Millions of Americans demonstrate, by their feelings, the paramount national need—to believe in the good—many years after the Vietnam war. The granting of amnesty to thousands who, among their number, include men who refused to serve because they thought American intentions were bad, would taunt the national need of the moment and thus exacerbate the situation.

But the national memory continues to draw its shutters on the Vietnam war. The horrors, controversies, and emotions recede in time. The dominant majority of us can grasp that the continuity of American history is good even though several short years are necessarily misused policies in Vietnam. At that point we will be ready for the exercise of General Washington's words of determination—which justice, dignity, and safety permit.

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS

RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Wolff) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Chairman WILBUR MILLS and I, along with 224 co­signers, a clear majority of the House, today introduced a "sense of the Congress" resolution calling upon the Treasury Department to begin making arrangements for the prompt repayment of the reparations claims—those claims for services rendered to the United States by foreign nations. Our resolution requires Treasury to submit to the Congress, within 90 days, a report on the cost and feasibility of the repayment of those claims.

According to Treasury Department figures, the United States is owed at least $46 billion in outstanding obligations; of that amount, $18 billion is past due from World War I. It is safe to assume, however, that the actual debt owed to the United States is considerably more than $46 billion because, one, the interest on delinquent debts continues to rise and second, the Treasury Department does not have an overall figure. As outstanding claims we have on foreign governments, which undoubtedly approaches the billions of dollars mark.

What Vietnam did to this country was to destroy a military weapon and its leaders must first decide what end they wish to achieve. There would be no military advantage to gain from granting amnesty to the thousands who, among their number, include deserters of the Vietnam war. Hence, we are left with the alternate end—resulting a bitterly divided nation in the collision between conscience and tradition.

The Treasury Department has admitted that the United States has never, for a long time to come? Would the granting of amnesty soothe our infrastructural or exacerbate the situation.

At the moment, with millions in the country honoring returned war prisoners as the only viable process of otherwise sordid conflict, we are in a situation comparable to the one that existed after Lieutenant Calley's murdering of My Lai. Millions of Americans demonstrate, by their feelings, the paramount national need—to believe in the good—many years after the Vietnam war. The granting of amnesty to thousands who, among their number, include men who refused to serve because they thought American intentions were bad, would taunt the national need of the moment and thus exacerbate the situation.

But the national memory continues to draw its shutters on the Vietnam war. The horrors, controversies, and emotions recede in time. The dominant majority of us can grasp that the continuity of American history is good even though several short years are necessarily misused policies in Vietnam. At that point we will be ready for the exercise of General Washington's words of determination—which justice, dignity, and safety permit.
funds for domestic programs, and with little or no felicity to sight, we are placing heavier demands on our own people than we are on these foreign nations, many of whom owe us money that date back 50 years or longer. The problem of international debts is a basic responsibility of nations; were we to see to it that this responsibility is recognized, we might very well find we have the funds to meet our own domestic needs, like education, health, pollution cleanup, and crime control.

With our serious economic situation, the United States can simply no longer afford to sit idly by without coming to some understanding as to these outstanding international debts owed to us. The resolution the 224 Members of Congress are introducing today would serve to underscore the feeling of Congress that it is imperative that we find out exactly what is owed to us by whom, and begin very definitely to make all necessary arrangements to be repaid. This feeling is not a new one to the House.

Over the past few years the Committee on Government Operations and the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information have tried repeatedly to secure from the Treasury Department an exact figure of the debts owed to the United States, but their efforts have not been wholly successful because apparently the Treasury simply does not know the true amount.

I would like to quote from a report prepared by the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, which was released in September of 1970, on the subject of international debts:

Because legal debts to the United States have not been paid, our Government does not have the use of these funds to pay for the heavy costs of vitally-needed programs at home. The same debts contribute to the continuing deficits in our national budget, whether Government spending is cut or not, and regardless of the administration in power. These debts must not only be paid, but must go on the money market and borrow at high rates of interest and/or raise taxes on our already overburdened citizens, thereby increasing our national costs, and add to the inflationary pressures which eat away the value of the dollar spent by our families at the grocery store. I think we can say without contradiction that the subcommittee in effect today is asking that our Government get busy and bring these repayments up to date. Something must be done to wipe this slate clean. It will require a higher priority, creativity, determination and dedication to accomplish the job.

Despite the fact that the subcommittee pinpointed the problem and urged the Treasury Department to take action 3 years ago, a very little, in fact nothing, has been done.

Our resolution would set the wheels in motion to make it a policy of the United States to know exactly how much we are owed and to require repayment of these long-standing debts which are delinquent in nature.

The Treasury Department has made demands on taxpayers in my district, one of whom owed 10 cents to the U.S. Government. They sent a letter which cost them 8 cents to get this tire over. Therefore, I think the Treasury Department should use the same procedures that they use with our own taxpayers on those around the world who owe us money.

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I wonder if we should consider using Internal Revenue Service to collect debts owed to us by nations which are justly owed by them to us.

As my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York has said, if the same set of foreign debts that is used to collect taxes from the American people, we would be receiving a lot of needed revenue. I am confident this would be a welcome use of IRS—just for the American public.

Now I want to speak in a more serious vein—and we should be very serious about all aspects of collecting the huge sums that are owed to the American people by foreign nations. These funds represent sacrifices by the American taxpayers, sacrifices made in good faith to help the people of other nations. Many of those nations now are in better financial status than our own country. They are not required to fund and to pay interest on their debts. They do not have national debts or deficits comparable to ours. The money they owe us is a very big part of our huge national debt.

I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from New York on his statement and his outstanding work in this field. It is very, very significant that more than half of the Members of the House feel as he and I do about the importance of collecting at least some of the money that is owed to us by other countries. I trust that what is said here today in support of the resolution which has been introduced will show to the administration and to the Department of State that congressmen are very concerned about this matter and that Congress wants action.

The gentleman has rendered a very distinct service to the Nation and to the country to help collect the debt or, at least make an effort to get some interest on those debts. They do not have national debts or deficits comparable to ours. The money they owe us is a very big part of our huge national debt.
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He has done an outstanding job in this field. I am quite concerned about what is happening not only in the area the gentleman is discussing but also with the entire country. The policy with respect to trade that this Nation is engaged in.

It is shocking when we realize that during the past 15 months there have been two official devaluations of the dollar and one unofficial devaluation of the dollar when the European countries raised their currencies and it resulted in a further devaluation of our dollar overseas.

The effect of this some people would have us believe ends at the shoreline. The gentleman can believe me, it does not end at the shoreline because the evidence is quite apparent today. Interest rates throughout the Nation are rising to staggering heights.

It is also interesting to notice that some of our trading partners, and some of the people who have benefited by this terrible trade policy our country is in-
ducing, (of the groups that the big oil companies in the Arab na-
tions have speculated in the dollar. We even found some of our multinational corporations, like Mobil, profiting in the speculation in the dollar. What a horrendous thing for these multinational corporations to do, when they enjoy a $4 billion annual tax break, what a hor-
rendous thing for them to go overseas and speculate in the U.S. dollar and further depress its value.

What are we faced with? This is why I hate my friend, the gentleman from New York. We are told the energy shortage within 10 years will require us to import over $35 billion more in oil a year. Last year it was 10 percent of the oil we used. Last year we had a $10 billion trade deficit, because included in those figures of exports was the entire military and economic aid the U.S. taxpayer paid which was shipped overseas. So we must take those two figures together, the $10 billion and added onto it the $35 billion deficit, and consider that the result of all this is that the year we have been watching the past 4 years increased the national debt $125 billion.

It is quite evident that they are going to hasten the day when we will have increased the national debt by $250 bil-
lion in 6 years.

Then, add on to that the trade deficit of 2 years ago and the trade deficit of last year. Just going at the status quo we are traveling now, another $10 billion per year. The result is that in 10 years, if we can stand under the economic policy of this administration, we are on a collision course to chaos. We have a $35 billion per year deficit in trade, which is what we are facing within 3 or 4 years; $125 billion addition to the national debt every 4 years. Who is going to pay for it?

We will have $40 billion of American money will be overseas. They will have it, we will not have it. Yet, the floodgates are opening, the flow of textiles and food, and wear and electronics and every imagin-
able item. They have taken over the entire national pastime. A person cannot buy an American-made baseball glove today.

I asked at television the other night, and what is the Chrysler Corp. doing? It is going to import the new Chrysler-made Dodge Colt, made in Japan. Why don't they make it here? It is going to sell for $2,025. They could make that Colt here for that much, but they would rather make it over there, because they can make more money. The tax money is deferred until it comes back here, so they keep expanding their plants overseas.

I hope the automobile workers' union will pay attention to this. General Mo-
tor is losing money overseas; Ford Motor Co. is building cars overseas. It is just the beginning; they have just touched the surface.

In Detroit, Mich., within 5 years 50 percent of those automobile workers could be walking the streets unemployed. The First National Bank of Boston, as I pointed out the other day, predicted that New England within 10 years is go-
ing to become a service-oriented area with no jobs in the factories or mills.

That is what a good friend from New York (Mr. Wolf) who has been watching this problem and watch-
ing our partners benefit with the money that they owe us and failing to come up with the sharing, but expecting us to give everything. Yes, I thank the good Lord for the good Member from New York. This body is very fortunate to have him as a Member.

Mr. Wolf. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I am sure he has exerted the same type of leader-
sip in the past that General Motors has exerted today in putting this country on a sound fiscal and financial basis.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join again with my col-
league, Leslar Wolf, in sponsoring the concurrent resolution regarding the out-
standing delinquent debts that a number of nations have owed the United States for many years. In the resolution, repayment of the $45 billion could have a healthy impact on our bal-
cane of payments and the Federal budget, both of which have been in a deficit position for too many years. The time is long overdue when those nations which incurred these debts should live up to their responsibilities. I congratulate my colleague for continuing his leader-
ship in this area.

Mr. Fulton. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining in the cosponsorship of the concurrent resolution, having this war in Asia by the strength of well over 200 cosponsors to date, this legislation to provide the ad-
mistration with the true sense of the Congress, very definitely can and must be passed.

At a time when our budget is so out of balance through planned deficits and at a time when the American people are well aware of the need, it is difficult to understand why the administration is not doing more to see that this country gets back on an even keel so that we can meet our obligations.

It is incredible that the Treasury De-
partment will not even furnish the Con-
gress or the public with a breakdown of how much each nation owes or is behind in payment. It is critical to our economy at this point not only to have this in-ormative but it is critical that our states, to make immediate arrangements for the repayment of these debts. While we have helped rebuild the economies of many of our partners, we must continue to defer payment and, at the same time, attack the dollar while prac-
ticing trade discrimination which con-
tains a healthy impact on our balance-of-payments deficit. Enough is enough and it is time to start collecting.

THE TRADE REFORM ACT OF 1973

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-
man from Iowa (Mr. Culver), is recog-
nized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Culver. Mr. Speaker, As chair-
man of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the House Foreign Af-
fairs Committee, I believe time is critical. The President has at long last laid before the Congress his proposed Trade Reform Act of 1973.

The administration has taken the es-
ternal first step toward passage of new

and long-needed trade legislation. I, for one, hope that having opened the way, the President will continue to lend his full support to this initiative throughout the period of congressional consideration of the bill. Without such support a major opportunity to create a fairer interna-
tional trading system for workers, busi-
nessmen, and farmers may be lost.

The President has signalled a new will-
ingness to work with the Congress to de-
vlop a greater and more responsible congressional role in oversight and im-
plementation of trade negotiations. In his message the President invited the Congress to--

Set up whatever mechanism it deems best for closer consultation and cooperation to ensure that its views are properly repre-
sented as the trade negotiations go forward.

This comprehensive trade legislation places a special responsibility on the Congress to devise methods for useful and timely interplay of executive-legislative views and perspectives on U.S. foreign trade policy.

I urge the Congress to take the oppor-
tunity raised by the submission of the Trade Reform Act of 1973 to consider this problem closely and to design a mechanism which will finally modernize our own congressional machinery for considering foreign economic policy, and for giving to Congress its proper role in the design of new trade policy and in setting guidelines for the negotiations.

As to the other major sections of the Trade Reform Act, the thrust and scope of the authorities requested as the resolution states, to make immediate arrangements for the repayment of these debts.
I invite my friends to witness the mystery of the making of menudo, to marvel at the skills, the patience, the devotion of the great menudo makers. But you will have to come to San Antonio, one of the few places around that prides itself in the art of making menudo, to get the real flavor. Come to the Menudo Olympiad.

My friend Sam and I will show you what it is all about.

EARTH WEEK AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

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, on March 12, 1973, President Nixon proclaimed this, the week beginning April 8, as Earth Week, 1973.

I applaud this action by the President. Mr. Speaker, indeed in the last 3 years our annual observance of Earth Week has been a significant vehicle for educating our citizens about the burgeoning array of problems intrinsic to our national environmental situation.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is what the President said in proclaiming Earth Week, 1973:

Our environment is the source of life upon which we all depend; its preservation has brought us the best in the American character. In thousands of communities, citizens have joined to improve the quality of their lives and those of their neighbors. Our environmental problems have not been resolved since Earth Week, but we have done much and will do more. While our new awareness has taught us that our natural resources are exhaustible, we know that our most important resource, the American spirit, is not.

I particularly congratulate the President, Mr. Speaker, for citing "our new awareness . . . that our natural resources are exhaustible," and I also draw to my colleagues' attention, the following sentence from the President's proclamation:

I ask that special attention be given to personal voluntary activities and educational efforts directed toward protecting and enhancing our life-giving environment.

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ACT

That sentence, Mr. Speaker, perhaps best expresses the reason that motivated the Senate and the House in their decision to establish the best dish available. And so rare are the opportunities to eat menudo that an Olympiad alone could satisfy the deprived appetite of the true menudo lover.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my friends to learn about menudo, for as Sam Kindrick—and there never was a more honest man—will tell you, to know menudo is to love it.

And I am pleased to note also Mr. Speaker, that the modest Environmental Education Act, signed into law by President Nixon on October 30, 1970, was designed, in part, to promote the personal voluntary activities lauded by the President in naming the week of April 8, Earth Week, 1973.

For the measure provides funds to give local community groups maximum encouragement in developing environmental education programs.

SUPPORT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

The President makes this regrettable proposal, Mr. Speaker, in the face of overwhelming bipartisan support for environmental education, Mr. Speaker, has culminated with President Nixon's 1974 budget which would provide no funds at all for the Office of Environmental Education.

There isn't any real dispute about the worth of these environmental objectives. The question is how much we are willing to pay for them.

Up to now the average citizen hasn't had the foggiest notion of what choices were available, what choices indeed they do have at all. Once people understand what is at stake and what's required, they will do what needs to be done.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, the President has unfortunately proposed that we kill the one Federal program that makes a modest beginning to teach people—in the words of Mr. Ruckelshaus—"what choices are available," so that they can "understand what is at stake and what's required.

HEARINGS SCHEDULED ON EXTENSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ACT

But because of the importance of education about our environment, Mr. Speaker, I have joined with my colleagues, Mr. Hansen of Idaho, Mrs. Mink of Hawaii, and Mr. Ruckelshaus, head of the Environmental Protection Agency, and quoted in the New York Times on April 8, the first day of Earth Week, 1973.

In introducing H.R. 3927, which would extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years, and provide for a slight increase in authorizations.

I should also tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that next week, the Select Education Subcommittee will hold 2 days of hearings in Washington, D.C., on H.R. 3927.

On Tuesday, April 17, we are scheduled...
A PLAN FOR ECONOMIC JUSTICE AND EQUALITY IN MARRIAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Fulston) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Fulston. As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and during the course of our tax reform hearings, I have had the opportunity to hear and read the testimonies of hundreds of our Nation's citizens on the need for no equal space within our tax system. There has been testimony on the inequitable tax treatment of single persons—then the inequities to married persons who both earn incomes.

However, Mrs. Virginia B. Cowan, an attorney at law of Nashville, Tenn. for whom I am personally a great friend, has treated rationally the subject of "equality in marriage" in testimony presented to our committee. She has a central tax reform plan for economic justice and equality in marriage which would readily be adopted and merits the attention and serious consideration of every Member of Congress. The following is her testimony, it speaks for itself:

TESTIMONY OF MRS. VIRGINIA B. COWAN

I am Bonnie Cowan, of Nashville, Tennessee. I am a practicing attorney with a special interest in the legal problems of women. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Committee on Ways and Means to present a special proposal for a tax reform which, if adopted, would help redress the economic imbalance experienced by married women under our present laws.

Some months ago, your Honorable Chairman stated in the news media that this Committee, in considering tax reform, might examine in turn each of the exemptions in the entire current tax system. It occurred to me that no study of the exemptions, no matter how diligent—in fact, no study of the entire Internal Revenue Code—not only reveals the subtleties of the economic inequities affecting more than one-half of our adult population, namely, women. Many state and national women's organizations are exploring tax inequities and suggesting methods of reform. Their work has, in the legal problems of women. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Committee on Ways and Means to present a special proposal for a tax reform which, if adopted, would help redress the economic imbalance experienced by married women under our present laws.

For these reasons, I would give wholehearted support to the efforts which are now being made with a sincere desire to assist the situations I have outlined. In particular, I would support H.R. 253 (Ambrog), H.R. 707 (Stenaker), H.R. 742 (Duke), and many other proposals which have already been presented to this Committee directed toward these problems.

But now it is necessary to ask why it is that so many women have been facing these problems. Why would it be that the problem of the aged in our country is primarily the problem of poor old women, and that the majority of those over 65 have incomes below the subsistence level?

As Leo Kanowitz has pointed out in his landmark book "Women and the Law" (University of New Mexico Press, 1969), the doctrine of coverture is a specifically Anglo-Saxon concept. The theory holds that upon marriage a woman's identity becomes "subsumed" in that of her husband. Or, in marriage, there is only one, and that one is the husband.

To digress for just a moment into the history of race relations, Charles Silberman demonstrated in "An Apology in the House" (Random House, 1964) that slavery had different (and in many ways worse) consequences than adoption into one cultural group than into any other culture, because of this same Anglo-Saxon proclivity for obliterating the identity of the ex-slave.

Although the idea of the coverture of married women has roots deep in the origins of the Anglo-Saxon common law, it later became enshrined and sanctified after its enunciation by Blackstone in the late eighteenth century, when his earlier developments toward the legal independence of women which had marked the beginning of the English colonists.

Coverture and all the myriad implications and ramifications flowing from it have distorted and obscured ideas about women literally for centuries wherever the Anglo-Saxon system of common law has been established. It is somewhat sobering to reflect that the continental legal systems have never needed to develop any comparable legal concept.

The English common law, of course, became the prevailing legal system in this country.

In the fields of property and domestic relations, for instance, state jurisdictions today are common law states. In these states, a married woman generally has the legal right to be supported "necessaries" (an inexact term) by her husband, and she in turn is generally obliged to render services for the promotion of the comfort and happiness of the home. As was pointed out in a Tennessee case, "the law presumes that such services are gratuitous." (Hull v. Hull Bros. Lumber Co., 184 Tenn. 28, 298 S.W.2d 28).

Too often, the result of these common law origins has been the assumption that any family income accruing to the wife becomes the property of her husband, and that the wife still has no enforceable economic equality in marriage. (It is my understanding that Toms and Washington have now established equity.)

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 12th day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred ninety-seventh.

RICHARD NIXON

April 11, 1973
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Despite a prevalent mythology to the contrary, women do not control the wealth in this country. Department of Labor statistics for 1971 indicate that the average woman from all sources has an amount less than one-half not of total income, but less than one-third all income. In the exceptional, newsworthy cases, wealth has come to women by way of gift, inheritance, or spousal support. Virtually, not by virtue of legally enforceable economic equality in marriage.

The average American wife who is not employed outside the home can quickly discover the implications of her legal status. In that situation by simply asking a bank to make her a small loan in her own name.

I am suggesting to this Committee that the institutions of marriage and family are surely among the most fundamental and necessary of all our institutions. I am further suggesting that one reason for the alarming increase of family instability might well be the increased awareness of the legal and economic inequities of marriage. Unless we can rid ourselves of the no longer useful implications of coverture, we may well find that young women will become increasingly unwilling to enter into marriage and the creation of families. And we can all take heart from the fact that institutions which are based on the principle of the senior dependency represent, after all, Holy Writ.

The taxing power of this country, while admittedly primarily directed toward raising revenue, has an honorable history of addressing the problems of poverty and economic inequality. We have used the taxing power in endless other ways to improve our society. I now urge that the taxing power be used the privilege in endless other ways to improve our society. I now urge that the taxing power be used to establish economic equality and justice for married women.

We are all familiar with the income-splitting provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. A married couple wishing to report on a joint income tax return could simply arrange for complete income-splitting. The taxing power intended to establish economic equality and justice for married women ever will have become a reality.

Accordingly, as the cornerstone of economic equality and justice for married women, I urge this Committee to recommend to Congress and the Committee to pass one simple requirement for any couple before they can take advantage of the benefit of income-splitting.

Specifically, I propose that any such couple be required to attest to an oath to be added to Form 1040. This oath by each of the two married partners, stating that he or she does in fact have equal ownership, management and control of the income, assets and liabilities of the marriage partnership, with penalties for perjury and fraud inhering to the oath.

The greatest benefit to society from this simple requirement for income-splitting would be that in any marriage reporting joint return all members of the household have actual income (regardless of employment status) amounting to one-half of the family income. The requirement of joint ownership would have become a reality.

Let us look at some of the results which could flow from this act. First, that fact that all members of the household will be working (whether working or not) owned one-half the family income. Such a wife, of course, would be able to draw support from each of her half-ownership of family assets. But she would own something real. She could undertake obligations, make a valid and establish credit in her own name, manage her funds, provide for her economic future and security. She would develop management skills which society has a strong interest in fostering, since almost all marriages end before the death of the wife.

Once the tax law is amended in this manner, women owning income as a consequence of their being a marital partner is established, married women will be able to consider the economic benefits of many other benefits from which they may have been excluded. For example, bank loans, personal loans, etc. Such a change would move us into the social security system and establish her own coverage (rather than inclusion as a dependent). Likewise, the tax law requires that the Kegel plan could not be opened up to married woman wishing a tax-sheltered retirement fund for purposes such as retirement or in order to pay for college expenses. Every opportunity for independent action, rather than dependent status, will be to the benefit of all. Although I have discussed these problems from the standpoint of married women, I think the more desirable approach in legislation before this Committee is to use the word "spouse" as possible, avoiding sex-specificity. The laws should apply to men and women equally, and there may well be instances where a wife is employed outside the home and the husband is not.

Because husband and divorce represent major adjustments to all people, of both sexes, I would further recommend that this Committee consider amending divorce law so that surviving divorced spouses who have used the privilege in endless other ways to improve our society. I now urge that the taxing power be used to establish economic equality and justice for married women. We are all familiar with the income-splitting provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. A married couple wishing to report on a joint income tax return could simply arrange for complete income-splitting. The taxing power intended to establish economic equality and justice for married women ever will have become a reality.

Accordingly, as the cornerstone of economic equality and justice for married women, I urge this Committee to recommend to Congress and the Committee to pass one simple requirement for any couple before they can take advantage of the benefit of income-splitting. Specifically, I propose that any such couple be required to attest to an oath to be added to Form 1040. This oath by each of the two married partners, stating that he or she does in fact have equal ownership, management and control of the income, assets and liabilities of the marriage partnership, with penalties for perjury and fraud inhering to the oath.

In conclusion, I submit to this Committee my plan for economic justice and equality in marriage in the United States. It seems to me to be a simple and workable plan with very beneficial consequences. It is a central tax reform which I heartily endorse. I commend it to the members of this Committee and urge its active support and adoption by this Congress and by the Congress of the United States.

CAMBIODIAN BOMBING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. STEVENS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, 3 consecutive weeks of bombing in Cambodia indicates that a Nixon commission of American military support has been made to that country. Once again Congress has not been consulted about the President's decision to commit U.S. airpower to battle. Indeed, we have not even been informed as to the extent of the bombing.

The legal basis for this new American military intervention is quite apparent. No Tonkin Gulf resolution exists to justify President Nixon's actions. Quite the contrary, last December Congress amended the Supplementary Foreign Assistance Act to forbid the use of American ground troops or advisers in Cambodia. It also added:

Military and economic assistance provided by the United States to Cambodia and authorized or appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act shall not be construed as a commitment by the United States to Cambodian forces in its defense.

Secretary of Defense Elliot Richardson stated on "Meet the Press" on April 1 and before the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on April 2 that the use of U.S. airpower in Cambodia is "consistent with the previous use of them." This statement appears to contradict the intent of December's act of Congress or to forget the Executive powers as Commander in Chief, as invoked during our incursion into Cambodia in 1970, could not apply now that all American ground troops and prisoners of war have been removed.

The administration's other public rationale for committing American forces in Cambodia is an even more shocking example of the constitutional double talk that Americans have come to expect from the present administration. As the Secretary of Defense argued on national television, the administration's constitutional authority to bomb Cambodia rests on the circumstance that we are coming out of a 10-year period of conflict in Southeast Asia, and Mr. Kissinger has stated that this government...and that the use of Armed Forces in Cambodia is an even more shocking example of the constitutional double talk that Americans have come to expect from the present administration.

My letter raised the further issue of whether the legal basis that the President and the Congress does not now threaten to reinvoke America in the quagmire of Southeast Asia, this time in Cambodia. If Congress does not act to halt our involvement, we may wake up one day soon to learn of newly captured American prisoners of war which the President could use to justify renewed air strikes into Indochina.

Mr. Speaker, on April 10 I sent a letter to President Nixon requesting information as to whether the legal basis that the President believes he has the authority to reinvoke us in Laos should new fighting erupt there. From what the administration has said publicly on this point, the President believes he has the authority to reinvoke us in Laos in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, if Congress is not to take action to halt the President's unilateral commitment in Cambodia before it is too late.
April 11, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

11823

NATIONAL WORKING MOTHER'S DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle­
woman from New York (Ms. ABRUZO) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. ABRUZO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was National Working Mother's Day and
mothers across the country participated in this event by bringing their children
to work, by rallying and by lobbying. Some mothers participated by wearing
daisies like the one I wore and by joining in the other activities.

What these women and men are demonstrat­ing for is a change in the regu­
lations regarding social services recently proposed by Secretary Caspar Weinber­
ger and the Department of Health, Educa­tion, and Welfare. These regulations, if
adopted without serious changes, would disastrously cripple the already limited
federally subsidized child care we now have. The regulations so narrowly define
who is eligible, that persons such as low­
income families that qualify, they provide
so little in the way of controls to insure the quality of child care that many
parents are asking to know what no child care would mean.

There are 7 million single-parent households in America; 6 million headed
by women and 1 million headed by men. These parents need child care to enable
them to work and remain economically independent. There are 6 million pre­
schoolers in America whose parents work. These children need child care so they
can grow and be educated and become whole human beings. But in America we are currently serving only
700,000 children in federally subsidized centers and at least one-half of that
number, 350,000, would be affected by these new regulations.

The people who would be hurt the most by these cuts, which are the most in­
human of the inhuman budget cuts, are the very ones who can least afford it, the
working poor. With an administration that is rigid in and encouraging of the
work ethic, it is, to me, a contradic­tion to promulgate these new regulations.
In New York a family of four that earns $5,400 a year would be “too rich” for day
care. In Washington, D.C., a mother with
one child earning more than $2,500 a year would be “too rich.” These regula­tions
will force people, especially women who are beginning to make it econom­
ically, back onto the welfare rolls.

Yesterday’s event, and it took place nationwide, was sponsored by the Mobi­l­
azion for National Working Mother's Day. The group was organized as an out­
growth of a meeting that I had in March with Secretary Weinberger, other women Members of Congress and representatives of the leading day care groups in Amer­
ica. The group organized a coalition to build this event that included the
NAACP, the National Women's Political Caucus, the National Education Associa­tion,
NOW and others.

If these regulations are not seriously changed, and I do not think we can count
on that, then we, in Congress, must be
prepared to do the job of providing at least the holding of the line on day care
and then the passage of a comprehensive child development bill similar to the one
passed out of the 92d Congress.

I would like to report in the Record at this
point an editorial that appeared in today's New York Post on Working Mother's Day and the text of a telegram
sent to me by Dr. Mary Jo White, the
Sissy Farenthold, national chairperson of the National Women's Political Caucus:

WORKING MOTHERS DAY

Few theories about public policy are more popular in official Washington nowadays than the conviction that the poor ought to be
working. Why, then, is so much being done to harass the working poor?
The question will be asked countless times during a national protest today—Working Mothers Day—against proposed reduc­tions in day care eligibility by the U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare. Women par­
2065
dropping their plans to issue new and more
strictive social services regulations. We oppose regulations lowering child
care standards, downgrading health and nutri­tion requirements that will deprive parents
of the assurance that their children are getting a proper start, and that their children in that school district.

If a child is not receiving “educational service,” his parent—under this legisla­tion—may institute civil action against the local school district. If the court decides that the school district is in violation, then all Federal financial assistance to that school district would cease. If within a 1-year period from the
day of the court's initial decision the school district does not correct the
problem,

Parents who file these civil action suits will not have to pay legal fees unless so
designated by the court. This provision will allow parents to file civil suits or
class actions without the fear of “bankrupt­ing legal fees.”

EDUCATIONAL CRISIS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

State and Federal authorities were able to identify, counsel, and place in
educational facilities only 40 percent of the handicapped children under 21 years
of age in 1971.

Sixty percent of all handicapped children are ignored, unidentified, and un­
treated. Parents who seek counseling for their children are often added to waiting lists. The child seeks an education, and
is denied access to a public education or is virtually barred from private school due to prohibitive tuition rates.

In most cases, the handicapped child is excluded from schools because the
States are either unable to define and deal with his illness, or care is so ex­
duous that the problems are multiplied. Then the handicapped child is accepted in the
classroom he is shunted about until he becomes a failure or a dropout. Then he

EDUCATION FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN A BITTER NIGHTMARE FOR MILLIONS OF AMERICAN PARENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a
previous order of the House, the gentle­
man from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recog­
nized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Presi­
dent's veto of the Vocational Rehabili­
tation Act was a shameful and cruel
decision. He has allowed the “budget
axe” to strike down the hopes of millions
of children.

I fully support the need to streamline the
budget and eliminate needless spend­
ing. This must be done. But it all boils
down to priorities. We could strip the
Federal Government of needless bur­den­s—subsidy programs that only serve
to limit the prospects of a few at the ex­
pense of many; the counter-productive
agricultural subsidies that cost the tax­
payers billions of dollars to keep the
farmers from planting certain crops, should be in the bullseye of the Presi­
dent’s budget guns. The administration
has clearly made its choice in eliminat­
ing “people programs.” The handicapped
children of our Nation have become “po­
itical expendables.”

THE EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED AMENDMENT

An estimated 4½ million handicapped
children of school age are excluded from
public schools in America. This
shock­ing figure represents approximately 60
percent of all school-aged handicapped
children in the entire United States.

The Congress must recognize the di­

mension of this educational crisis and
seek corrective action—in spite of recent
cuts in programs.

Today I am introducing the “Educa­
tion for the Handicapped Amendment” to
guarantee that every handicapped child is provided “educational service” at
least equal to expenditures for other children in that school district.

If a child is not receiving “educational
service,” his parent—under this legisla­
tion—may institute civil action against the
local school district. If the court decides that the school district is in
violation, then all Federal financial assistance to that school district would cease. If within a 1-year period from the
day of the court’s initial decision the
school district does not correct the
problem,

Parents who file these civil action suits will not have to pay legal fees unless so
designated by the court. This provision will allow parents to file civil suits or
class actions without the fear of “bankrupt­ing legal fees.”

EDUCATIONAL CRISIS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

State and Federal authorities were
able to identify, counsel, and place in
educational facilities only 40 percent of
the handicapped children under 21 years
of age in 1971.

Sixty percent of all handicapped children
are ignored, unidentified, and un­
treated. Parents who seek counseling
for their children are often added to
waiting lists. The child seeks an education, and
is denied access to a public education or is virtually barred from private
school due to prohibitive tuition rates.

In most cases, the handicapped child is
excluded from schools because the
States are either unable to define and
deal with his illness, or care is so ex­
duous that the problems are multiplied. Then the
handicapped child is accepted in the
classroom he is shunted about until he
becomes a failure or a dropout. Then he

According to figures of the Department of Education, my own State of Ohio is denying special education services to 160,578 handicapped students.

Even though only 52 percent of our impaired children, we still have a much better record than most States. But while the State as a whole serves 52 percent of the handicapped children overall, individual counties, in some instances performed worse.

Brown County — serves only 424 children out of a possible 906.

Trumbull County — serves only 2,064 out of a possible 6,275.

Every county in Ohio provides classes for the educable mentally retarded; 44 counties — 50 percent of the State's counties, do not have classrooms for the hard of hearing, deaf, crippled, visually handicapped, neurologically handicapped, or emotionally disturbed children.

Many of these children would be capable of working, utilizing a skill obtaining employment, and paying taxes, if he received the proper education and training. Over 32,000 students in Ohio participated in the work study program for the educable mentally retarded. In 1970, they paid an estimated $282,000 in Federal income tax. They paid an estimated $50,503 in State sales taxes. Of the 1,522 graduates of the program in 1969-70, 82 percent or 1,230 are currently employed full time.

TAXATION WITHOUT SERVICE

Our Federal, State, and local governments tax handicapped people, their parents, and relatives, but fail to provide services for them. Parents pay school taxes yet cannot send their disabled children to public schools. They pay Federal taxes, but how much effort is made to educate the handicapped child through ESSEA — the Elementary and Secondary Education Act — impact aid, and other programs? Programs provided by the Federal Government almost never make provisions for the handicapped.

PARENTS BEGIN TO FIGHT FOR THEIR CHILDREN'S RIGHT TO AN EDUCATION

"Right-to-education" law suits for the handicapped are pending in about half of the States. An attorney for one of those suits in the State of Ohio, Vincent Yano said:

'We've been begging for years; we don't intend to beg anymore.'

On October 30, 1972, Judge Joiner, of the U.S. District Court of the Southern District of Michigan, handed down a landmark ruling. This civil action focused essentially on whether children who have learning, social, mental, or physical handicaps, have the right to participate in and receive the benefits of a public education as other children. Judge Joiner ruled that providing education for social disabled children, while not providing it for others is a denial of "equal protection" under the 14th amendment.

In Brown v. Board of Education (1954) and again in Swann v. Texas (1973) the court stated that —

In these days, it is doubtful that any child should be reasonably expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the State has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all children on equal terms.

These principles will continue to be cited again and again throughout the United States as decisions are handed down that the more the President's program on rights to education suits in Federal district courts. These civil actions are the spearhead of a movement designed to alter the disgraceful status of education for the handicapped in America. It is very clear that these cases represent a growing concern — but these cases do not provide a much needed national approach in solving the problem.

The "Education for the Handicapped Amendment" introduced today will provide a vehicle that will demand action. Direct pressure on school districts and the Federal Government will translate the principles being set forth in the courts across the land into action, insuring that every child is provided a chance in school.

Now, it is administratively impossible to demand that every school district provide services for every type of handicapped child in that school district. I submit a recommendation that the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, recommend a series of joint educational ventures, pooling funds proportionately from several school districts to provide needed facilities. Under this legislation the details of educational services for the handicapped will be determined in light of local needs, with the flexibility needed for efficiency. But educational opportunity will be required for every child.

The veto of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and the apparent cutbacks in certain programs for the handicapped demand that this amendment be adopted. The administration's position on impoundment and vetoes leaves another alternative but "pressure point funding" for which this legislation will pave the road.

THE ENERGY/DOLLAR CRISIS

(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, yesterday, I invited my colleagues' attention to a very serious article by the noted columnist Joe Alsop concerning our growing dependence on foreign fuel supplies. I inserted this article which is entitled "Oil: The Vulnerable Jugular," in the Congressional Record (p. 11714).

Today, Mr. Alsop's second energy article was published. It is entitled "The Energy/Dollar Crisis." I also highly recommend this article to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Alsop, in this article, points out the magnitude of the monetary problem which the need for oil imports creates.

Mr. Alsop also refers to a study the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has made of our overall energy supply/de-
mand situation. Many of my colleagues have reviewed the graphic presentation of the data we were not discussing this matter. I plan to publish the data from this study in the near future in order that the information can be made available to be read.

I wish to commend Mr. Alsop for his efforts in informing the public of the serious nature of our energy supply problem and to include his additional articles on this matter.

Without objection, I am submitting the second of Mr. Alsop's articles for inclusion in the RECORD:

**THE ENERGY/DOLLAR CRISIS**

(>Joseph Alsop)

Everyone talks about the "energy crisis." But that phrase merely scratches the surface of the problem. Known as much as it is now worth little enough. As for our children's dollars, they may almost resemble the April 11, 1973
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Everyone talks about the "energy crisis." But that phrase merely scratches the surface of the problem. Known as much as it is now worth little enough. As for our children's dollars, they may almost resemble the

As for 1985—when children born last year will just be entering college—the optimistic spread is between $30 billion and $70 billion for our foreign oil costs! If the optimistic future, it must be added, again make no allowance either for further loss of value of the dollar, or for the further increases in world oil prices. They are like weather forecasts, in truth, that make no allowance for storms that any new weather forecaster ought to allow for. Furthermore, these are not oil company figures, although they parallel the projections recently made by Oil Co. Instead, they come from briefings now being given to senators and leading congressmen by the staff of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The sponsors are the committee chairman, Mr. Price of Illinois, Rep. Chet Holifield of California and Sen. John Pastore of Rhode Island. All are Democrats; and Sen. Pastore, a strong liberal Democrat, has personally begged all other senators to give ear to the dire facts.

The figures also mean an energy crisis, of course. There will be local fuel shortages this summer. At least in a fair number of states, there may be gasoline rationing in the summer of 1974. The idea that our oil and gas distributors are due to suffer shockingly, if not to be wiped out. Short supply is the basic reason. Another reason is the greed of the big companies. Yet inconvenience for many and heavy loss for a few, are mere trifles compared to the national tragedy of the over-valuation of the dollar. That is the greed of the big companies. Yet inconvenience for many and heavy loss for a few, are mere trifles compared to the national tragedy of the over-valuation of the dollar. That is the greed of

TWO SIDES TO EVERY COIN

(Mr. CLAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extra material.)

Mr. CLAY: Mr. Speaker, last week a freshman Member of Congress, the Honorable Harold V. Froehlich, of Wisconsin, inserted a newspaper article in the Congressional Record which in essence was a derogatory attack on two Members of this body.

I feel compelled, Mr. Speaker, to refer to this threat to democracy, the threat to this administration, the threat to the energy situation. And even this is only the first chapter of the horror story.
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Mr. CLAY: Mr. Speaker, last week a freshman Member of Congress, the Honorable Harold V. Froehlich, of Wisconsin, inserted a newspaper article in the Congressional Record which in essence was a derogatory attack on two Members of this body.
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Has anyone informed Scott that more than half those workers were living in poverty? For they were not only America's Community Action? Has anyone informed Scott, so he can explain to his President, that when they kill off the payroll and wages of the poor, will be forced back into poverty, and this will produce more some more welfare recipients for this administration?

No, they expect the public to swallow this malarkey that salaried folks we're "taking off 40 to 80 percent of the funds," but the truth is that over half of those salaried people are the poor. Citing their obvious abuses in the books does not obscure that truth.

The public must also understand that the work done by those salaried people was in many cases the most vital and helpful part of Community Action. Those workers got millions of poor, aged people enrolled in Medicare who otherwise would never have known their rights. That made Medicare a great human success. But it burns arch-conservatives like Phillips and his YAF crew, because enrolling all those old, sick, poor people raised the cost of Medicare.

Similarly, those Community Action workers saw that only 40 percent of the eligible were getting surplus food commodities, and only 20 percent of the eligible were getting food stamps. So "outreach" workers helped many thousands to get the notice they needed and to get the benefits to which they were legally entitled.

This burns Phillips and his crowd, just as it infuriates him that OEO lawyers helped hundreds of the welfare payments to which they are legally entitled.

This TAF gang's fight is, Phillips says, "not that "you're not being the poor," as the White House keeps pretending; it is that OEO was helping too many poor people.

This TAF gang is just the sort of people who put their feet up in the White House and denounce the administration's cruel slandering of the poor; but if he would just get the facts he might at least opt for silence.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ACT EXTENSION

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Racons and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me today in voting for the 1-year extension of the Economic Stabilization Act. I believe that what we do here today will have the most profound effect on the quality of life in America.

For the past few years we have witnessed the spectacle of inflation continuing to grow unchecked while the Government made a few feeble attempts to curb rising prices. What was lacking was a consistent, unified program that would deal with all phases of the economy, a program that would leave no gaps or inequalities.

It was difficult for me to understand how phases I and II could work if prices and wages were controlled, and interest rates and profits were not. The controls of phase III were for the most part either ineffectual or unenforced, and even so, the controls were short lived. We see now the disastrous effects of the President's premature actions.

All through the President's inflation-control program the cost of food continued to rise. It took a nationwide boycott by outraged housewives to get the President to take positive action to control food prices that we needed to assure a full supply of food at reasonable prices.

During phase II, rents were under loose controls. This ended last January 10, and since then I and other members of the New York Delegation have had thousands of letters of complaint from tenants who are being victimized by rent gouging landlords.

In spite of the President's actions, inflation is continuing at the rate of over 5 percent a year. The White House feels that this is acceptable. I do not. My constituents and I have fought inflation is like an additional tax on the wage earners of this country, cutting into their earnings, and decreasing the number of options available to them in the way they can spend their earnings.

It is long past time for a workable system of controls to be imposed on the economy so that inflation will no longer threaten the well-being of the American worker and consumer. The quality of life in this country can no longer be jeopardized by runaway prices that are the basic necessities of life. I feel obligated as a Member of Congress to do all that I can to make it possible for my constituents to live easily. Without being permitted to control inflation the Economic Stabilization Act we are considering today, I believe will be impossible for many of those I represent to maintain their current standard of living.

It is time for a constructive national program of price and wage controls. We need a rollback of prices to the pre-phase III level. This, I feel, is necessary to protect the American worker and consumer. The quality of life in this country can no longer be jeopardized by runaway prices that are the basic necessities of life. I feel obligated as a Member of Congress to do all that I can to make it possible for my constituents to live easily. Without being permitted to control inflation the Economic Stabilization Act we are considering today, I believe will be impossible for many of those I represent to maintain their current standard of living.

If we do not act now, the situation will get out of hand. I am pleased to see that H.R. 6168 contains such provisions. It has become necessary to enact a system of controls to fight inflation when it exceeds 3 percent a year. This may be the most important provision on the bill before us today. It is granted by the new legislation that takes into account the needs of those who do not earn very much money, and that seeks to control interest rates as well as prices. It is the kind of legislation we should have had long ago. I hope that it will be enacted before the economy worsens even more.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1973

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Racons and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Veterans' Administration Accountability Act of 1973. This legislation has already been introduced in the Senate by Senator VARCH HARTKE, who is chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs. It is designed to prevent arbitrary action by the Veterans' Administration, and to restore a proper balance between the VA and the Congress in matters affecting the nearly 30 million American veterans.

Throughout our history, Congress has frequently found it desirable to delegate some of its legislative authority by establishing various regulatory and administrative agencies within the Executive branch.

The amount of authority and power granted to these agencies ranges from extremely broad, as in the case of the Federal Communications Commission, to extremely narrow, as in the case of the Federal Power Commission. But even with autonomous bodies such as the FCC, it is a generally accepted principle that any great shift in policy should come from Congress. When an executive agency goes too far in exercising its authority, Congress is justified in trying to exercise somewhat more control over the department's action.

Such is the present case with the Veterans' Administration. Earlier this year, the VA announced that it was cutting out $160 million from compensation benefits for seriously disabled veterans. Congress was never consulted, and hearings were not held; the VA bureaucrats were able to make this critical—and outrageous—decision without giving any notice to the elected Representatives of the American people.

The Veterans' Administration Accountability Act of 1973 would require that certain major changes in VA policy must be submitted to, and approved by, the Congress. The major changes would include the following: Proposed changes in the disability rating schedule; proposed closings of VA hospitals, domiciliaries, or regional offices; proposed construction or major alterations of VA hospitals; and proposed disposition of the Real property under VA jurisdiction.

As Senator HARTKE pointed out in introducing his bill in the Senate, the Accountability Act would not have the effect of interfering with administrative discretion. It would merely give the Congress the right to be notified of any major changes in VA policy, and to disapprove any changes if they were not in the public interest. The Veterans' Administration Accountability Act of 1973 is yet another attempt on the part of the House of Representatives to exercise some checks and balances on the VA.

SPANISH "SESAME STREET" A HIT IN LATIN AMERICA

(Mr. FASCCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Racons and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCCELL, Mr. Speaker, whether or not television receives more than its fair share of criticism is a matter for debate among critics, networks, the viewing public, and FCC. One show, however, has distinguished itself by being widely acclaimed by virtually every sector of the industry and the public. I refer, of course, to the widely heralded program Sesame Street.

As chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee I was extremely
pleased to learn last year that plans were being made to produce Spanish and Portuguese language versions of the program for distribution throughout Latin America. A mother telephoned Televisa recently, Mr. Page recounted, and even her small 3-year-old son had told her, "Mama, I know how to write 'Plaza Sesamo'.' "Go ahead," she encouraged him. "Write it slowly," he replied, and the toddler scribbled in block letters: "XEROX."

The Mexican program was preceded by the theatrical opening of "Plaza Sesamo" in Puerto Rico in November and in Brazil, with its own original program in Portuguese, in December, both of which are described as "highly successful."

The week following the launching of the series in Mexico City, "Plaza Sesamo," went on the air on national networks in both Colombia and Ecuador and is scheduled to be broadcast in Peru in Latin America without arrangements for its juvenile population to see the programs.

"In Utah, which is a sister state of Bolivia," Mr. Page said, "there is a public campaign now going on to raise funds to provide TV in the educational districts and isolated rural areas of that country so that their children can share in the benefits of the educational broadcast. Contributions are given a metal plaque which reads "Plaza Sesamo" in recognition of their assistance."

Whether the new 130-program series of "Plaza Sesamo," the executive director said, "depends on studies of audience reaction to the current series which is now going on. It will be several weeks yet before our researchers have enough data to tell us precisely how it is doing and what is wrong with what we have done so far."

Dr. Rogelio Diaz Guerrero, director of the Center for Latin American Sciences here, and his assistant, Dr. Raul Banchi, are now analyzing material derived from "Plaza Sesamo," broadcasts in Mexico, Colombia and Venezuela for future productions of the Children's Television Workshop.

Meanwhile, though "Sesame Street" has aroused some controversy in the U.S., the general reaction of Mexican audiences seems to be summed up by Manuel Palaire of the daily El Sol de Mexico: "Plaza Sesamo is a stupendous production. Its function, to educate, is carried out perfectly. It is one of the best gifts children have received from television."

PRESIDENT NIXON SHOULD VISIT LATIN AMERICA

(Mr. FASCCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Recess and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PASCCELL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday in his speech to the General Assembly of the Organization of American States, Secretary of State William P. Rogers announced his attention to travel to Latin America this year. I applaud this visible demonstration of continuing U.S. interest in our neighbors to the south. This visit will help dispel the notion that the United States does not care about the Western Hemisphere.

I am hopeful that based on the results I am sure will be read with interest by the American people and which I am sure will be read with interest by the Latin American countries, the President might be willing to make such a visit.

Since the days of Herbert Hoover, there has been only one U.S. President who did not visit South America properly—Richard M. Nixon.

Mr. Nixon did cross the border briefly to California, but in 1969 he did not extend his visit far as either Central or South America during his Presidency.

There are indications now, with much of Latin America grappling about U.S. neglect or worse, that he will remedy that.

Early this month, the President revealed that both the State Department and the National Security Council had recommended that he make such a visit.

"They feel that going to Peking and going to Moscow indicates that we don't care about Latin America. This administration believes that's wrong with what we have done so far."

Mr. PASCCELL. Mr. Speaker, daily we are plagued with headlines depicting the conflicts, great and small, political and economic, which characterize international relations in this era of powerful nations. Often overlooked are those events which governments generally are working to unite rather than divide mankind.

Some of these trends toward a more interdependent world system were never before recognized as they are there—larger populations and more industrialization, for example, are increasingly requiring joint action to stretch scarce
resources and control pollution. But beyond the almost accidental convergence of such forces there is a great deal that is being done now and will continue in the future to establish a more rational and peaceful world order. An important component of this effort in the United States are the activities and programs of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State.

In an article published last September, Assistant Secretary of State Dr. Herbert Blau underscored the rationale behind his bureau’s programs and detailed its multifaceted efforts to promote international understanding.

The article, printed in the September 4, 1972 Department of State Bulletin was based on address Secretary Reicher made last June 15 to the Rotary Club of New York:

**PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE DIPLOMACY—KEY TO WORLD UNDERSTANDING**

*(By Alan A. Reich)*

Technological advances have made nuclear war a threat to mankind’s very existence. Fortunately, however, new initiatives and agreeable outcomes have been reached that give hope that the deadly cycle of weapons buildup may be broken. Prospects for increased government-to-government cooperation are better now than at any time since World War II. The great powers are focusing on areas of common concern rather than on their differences. The results appear promising.

But while technology has made nuclear annihilation possible, it also has sparked a revolution in communication and transportation which brings increasing numbers of people into contact with each other in an open, and immediate contact. International diplomacy, traditionally the task of men behind closed doors, has become a public matter. Many foreign offices no longer confine themselves to speaking with other foreign offices for peoples; they help and encourage peoples to speak for themselves across national boundaries. People-to-people communication has become a dominant force in international relations throughout the world.

Societies and their problems have become more complex. More and more people are educating themselves in cross-cultural communications. The media reach and stimulate increasing numbers of people. The number of international conferences is rising. The number of conferences, and the number of people attending them, major decisions in every country is growing. This true in international affairs as well as in domestic affairs.

We share the concern of people throughout the world with the serious problems of disease, hunger, pollution, and overpopulation. We also share the frustration and sense of injustice such problems bring and the commitment to find solutions. Our futures are intertwined in the work to improve the quality of life on our planet. If we do not succeed in bringing about peaceful cooperation over the next few decades, neither we nor our children will be able to give the necessary emphasis to solving our domestic problems. Working with our international counterparts and developing better communication and understanding are mutually reinforcing processes. Citizens are involved in and contributing to both.

**When people-to-people communications networks are more fully developed, the opportunity to express differences in order to reduce them, to communicate, to seek accommodation, and to negotiate. The likelihood of international cooperation and the creation of meaningful solutions will be enhanced. This rationale governs the interest of the State Department and the activities of the bilateral programs in the private sector.**

In the past few years, social scientists have increasingly emphasized the importance of informal, non-governmental communications activities. The establishment of networks of communication which cut across boundaries and reduce the likelihood of polarization along political or national lines.

**DEPARTMENT-SPOONDED EXCHANGES**

When you think of the State Department’s conduct of foreign affairs, the emphasis on exchange-of-persons program does not come immediately to mind. It is, nonetheless, a significant contribution. The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs works constantly and quietly to improve the climate for international cooperation. The exciting, challenging job of the Bureau is to utilize its modest funds and manpower to reinforce the work of American individuals and organizations who want to help construct, at a little at a time, a new foundation for relations with the rest of the world. It also coordinates, as necessary, the activities of other government agencies, international organizations, professional associations of doctors, lawyers, journalists, municipal administrators, and others who link their members in the private sector with counterparts here.

We in the Department of State are aware that our programs represent only a portion of the total private interest in developing programs in the public sector. Those who study together in the United States annually and participation in exchanges aimed at furthering international understanding. In addition to service to educational institutions, private and government organizations, and cultural organizations, many of the 150,000 foreign students now studying in the United States are enrolled in extension programs in the private sector. More than 30 American sport organizations carry on international programs involving American athletes in overseas competition and coaching clinics here and abroad; several youth organizations conduct international exchanges; and American businesses sponsor the private studies of some of the nearly 150,000 foreign students who come to study in the United States annually and appreciation in half that number of Americans who study abroad each year. Private American performing arts groups tour other countries; reciprocal opportunities are offered to counterpart groups from abroad. The People-to-People Federation and its various committees actively promote and carry out meaningful exchanges; the sister city program of the Town Association links some 400 American cities with communities in 60 countries of the world.

**PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION**

These programs depend heavily on the willing cooperation of countless private individuals and organizations throughout the United States. The National Association of Foreign Student Affairs, coordinates many of the 150,000 foreign students now studying in the United States and 50 American universities. The Institute of International Education and several private program agencies also work in this area. The Fulbright-Hays exchange program over 25 years has engaged more than 100,000 people in academic exchanges. Annually, some 5,000 professors, lecturers, and scholars are exchanged to and from the United States. The international visitor program brings to the United States each year some 4,000 leaders and potential leaders annually for one- or two-month orientation programs. The exchange of American diplomats and professional, from Cabinet officers to journalists. One out of every 10 heads of state in the world is a participant in the Department’s exchange visitor, have some 250 Cabinet ministers of other nations.

The Department of State and its counterparts in the private sector have an exchange program that is a lasting one. It promotes mutual understanding and contributes to both.

The geometric increase in citizen involvement with foreign affairs has special significance for the diplomat. It is a fundamental, irreversible, and irresistible influence for peace. It is likely to differ in its differences in absolute terms when they communicate and cooperate with each other freely and frequently.

Some 150 prominent U.S. lecturers went abroad for six-week lecture tours in 1971. More than 40% of these U.S. lecturers were selected by their home country and funded by the U.S. and are programed annually by the State Department. The Department currently fields seven groups of American specialists active in the cultural affairs field. Some 150 prominent U.S. lecturers went abroad for six-week lecture tours in 1971. More than 40% of these U.S. lecturers were selected by their home country and funded by the U.S. and are programed annually by the State Department. The Department currently fields seven groups of American specialists active in the cultural affairs field.
Last year the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs set up a special office to respond to the needs of private organizations seeking to establish, expand, or maintain person-to-person programs. This office of Private Cooperation, on request, helps private organizations to become active internationally.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

In government and in the private sector, there are many effective, non-profit, non-governmental organizations, such as Rotary International through its people-to-people programs, are doing a splendid job of international exchange, involving 700 youths throughout the world annually, is a model program with considerable impact.

The Rotary Club matching program, which links Rotary Clubs in 150 countries with counterpart clubs for direct Rotarian-to-Rotarian relationships and shared service projects, is equally impressive. Rotary's world community service program has helped people throughout the world. Through Rotary International's small business clinic program, many individuals in less developed countries have been helped to self-sufficiency and community contribution.

All in all, the overall Rotary International outreach are especially meaningful. First, the mere existence of some 150,000 to 150,000 clubs could be a potent force for mutual understanding. Rotary, like other worldwide service organizations, is Congress or several occasions during the past few weeks the irony of the loss of jobs in this country due to increased imports of such equipment as these cranes. The steady outflow of American dollars along with the fact that the American taxpayer is subsidizing the purchase of equipment used to construct public buildings is deplorable.

I feel that it is imperative that U.S.-produced equipment be used in the construction of public buildings, especially those in which a Federal contract is involved.

It is absurd that within the shadow of the U.S. Capitol we are daily witnessing the erosion of American jobs and the U.S. dollar. As the Congress prepares to debate the important trade bill this year, I will continue to urge my colleagues to resist that which perpetuates the invasion of foreign-made cranes and related construction equipment into America.

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT TO COVER EMPLOYEES OF NONPROFIT HOSPITALS

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this Thursday, April 12th, the Special Subcommittee on Labor will begin hearings on H.R. 1236—a bill sponsored by Mr. Ashbrook of Ohio, and myself. H.R. 1236 would extend to the employees of nonprofit hospitals the coverage of the National Labor Relations Act. As the Members know, an identical bill, H.R. 1135, passed the House in the last Congress by a vote of 235 to 95. No action was taken in the Senate.

H.R. 1236 would be a logical extension of the trend toward covering nonprofit hospitals under other Federal laws. In 1964, they were covered by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act. In 1966, they were brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act. In 1970, they were covered under the Fair Labor Standards Act. In 1970, they were covered under the Employment Security Amendments of 1970. I should add that non-profit-hospital employees were originally covered under the Wagner Act. When that act was amended by the Taft-Hartley Amendments of 1947, coverage was withdrawn from non-profit-hospital employees for only one reason: There was doubt in the mind of Senator Tydings of Maryland that hospitals were in interstate commerce.

The doubt has been removed by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Butte Medical Properties case and in Maryland against Wirtz—1966.

There are two very important reasons why the prohibition in section 2(2) of the NLRA should be removed.

First, the passage of H.R. 1236 will bring stability and order to labor-management relations in the hospital field. Nonprofit hospitals comprise nearly 50 percent of all hospitals in this country—and have 66 percent of all adult beds. They employ 1,337,000 full-time equivalent workers.

Without the protections and procedures of the National Labor Relations Act, these vital segment of America's health care delivery system finds itself embroiled in "recognition strikes." These strikes come about because in most cases nonprofit hospital employees are not required by law to recognize and bargain with organizations representing their employees—even if 100 percent of the employees so desire.

H.R. 1236 would grant to such employees access to the National Labor Relations Board's election procedures and would virtually eliminate the "recognition strike." It should also be noted that, in addition to the protections extended to employees, H.R. 1236 would afford to the employer nonprofit hospitals the same important protections.

The second reason is one of fairness and justice. Why should we continue this unjustified discrimination against one class of hospital employees while the employees of proprietary hospitals are covered, but not those of nonprofit hospitals?

Extensive hearings were held in the last Congress, with the overwhelming majority of the witnesses supporting the removal of this prohibition from the Act. The reason for its original inclusion has been resolved by the courts. To bring stability to labor-management relations in the industry and to insure equity, Mr. Ashbrook and I hope the House will again pass this legislation.

GEORGE FOREMAN—A SUCCESSFUL AMERICAN

(Mr. SAILOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAILOR. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the article entitled, "Don't Knock the American System to Me!" by George Foreman, which was taken from the April issue of Nation's Business. As we all know, George Foreman is the new heavyweight champion of the world. We also realize that this American—a black man—has proven that the "system" can function fairly and profitably for every citizen.

Here is his own description. George Foreman's early youth is like any other. He read the textbook juvenile delinquency. His own words best describe his situation:

Casting about for places to put the blame for the troubles a person has is an old human trait. "They" is an easier word to use than "I," when things don't go right. But in getting by an object trouble, or a problem, the key—and I know this because I've had them all, and still have some—is to look after it, alone, that's the only way.

More times than not, battles have to be fought alone. The problems are into, they're the same. They didn't hunt him up; he went looking for them, whether he always knew it or not.
Finally, George Foreman saw the light and, “laid down the pool cue, and picked up hope.” By taking this first step, he allowed the Job Corps and some dedicated friends to help in his struggle for self-respect and success.

Through talent and fortitude, he found himself in a fighting ring in Mexico City, facing a more experienced opponent. It was so proud.

George Foreman methodically outboxed the Russian and instantly became a world champion.

This victory and his subsequent victory over Joe Frazier was George Foreman’s proof to the world that any man, through hard work and dedication, can learn to make the American system “work for him.”

George Foreman summarized his own success story far better than I could do when he said:

“I can truly say that I worked for it. I worship the opportunity to do this country some good. There’s a lot of people I want to do some good for, and then knock success into this ring, I want to do it, too. It’s in my blood. I want to do it.”

George Foreman was methodically outboxed Ionnis Chepulis. When the bell sounded, he looked me up to talk about it. It was quite a record, if one just wanted to look at the size of it, but it wasn’t sensible or respectable to do it.

Then, like Paul on the way to Damascus in the Bible story, my vision cleared up and the time came to make a right decision. I did it.

It was in an unlikely place, a Houston pool hall, and the TV set was on.

The man on the tube was doing one of those public service spots. It’s a part of America that a man gets famous, is a celebration of the public service spots. The people would watch them and think of all kinds of things. Some are for causes, like fighting cancer, or helping retarded kids, or the way he was saying he was once a down-and-outer himself.

Boy, was he on my wavelength, talking my language! I listened to him, half-like I was in the ring down the lane, I was willing to work for the cause.

Then, after the words which really turned George Foreman around, I heard this: “I like to fight so much,” he told those guys, “put him in the ring down in the rec hall, and let him get it out of his system.”

“In business, you see, they can’t really stand it when something won’t work. They just don’t have the faith. They keep trying until they find the combination.”

Litton Industries had put one of them in that rec hall. His name was Doc Brown. Doc Brown, they hadn’t just hired a man and sent him down there to work in the rec hall when they got off. They had been putting him there for 35 years or more. If I would listen to him and follow his instructions, he said, he’d make me a Olympic Gloves, or a Radiophone, a Radiophone, or a Radiophone team, and then I could turn pro. He said that he thought I could be champion one day, and that I would have to make up my own mind to work for it.

Now down there in Houston in the sum I could’ve, there was just no work, just no work for anything. People get money a lot of the time from being what was called smart—somebody taking advantage of some- body. People walked on both sides of the line, as far as the law was concerned. But Doc said I could get it all, everything that went with it, if I was willing to work for it.

A BIG FOUR-LETTER WORD

Work is such a big four-letter word. I’d known a lot of the other four-letter words and they couldn’t help anybody. This one meant sweat. It meant getting banded around. It meant being more tired than I had ever been in my life. And sure in more places, too. But when I went into Golden Gloves, I found it paid off, and I won. Then there were the Olympic trials in TV’s Ohio, and by a hair, I made the Olympic team. Litton sent Doc Brown and one of its executives, Ed Sargent Shriver, to pick up the victor.

But when I went into Golden Gloves, I found it paid off, and I won. Then there were the Olympic trials in TV’s Ohio, and by a hair, I made the Olympic team. Litton sent Doc Brown and one of its executives, Ed Sargent Shriver, to pick up the victor.

I’ve had them all, and still have some—is my decision, being what I am now. So, I took the first step, and then I don’t want to force that easy. The memory of that

Don’t Force That Easy.

My mind is still my own. Not my mother’s. Not my father’s. It’s my own "thing." I still have to prove it to myself. I’ve got to prove it to everybody else. I’ve got to do it all over again. I’ve got to try again, and, thank God, it is coming naturally.
April 11, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

11831

said: "George Foreman will win the gold medal, and he will be the heaviest weight champion of the world."

It meant a lot to me, finding out such things. I had been getting closer and closer to where I wanted to be in life, and that other people were believing in me, especially the folks around me. I had seen hard times, and I knew I could live with them, and I could take what it's like. And I was standing there out what it's like. And I was standing there.

The whole country kind of together, he'd made the big decision not to say about you than they should. When you the foot of the old training table, got down

I was hurting for money. I wanted to get most of the ones I fought to stand up and be their punching bag any more. I told him the three miles exercises when one. I went to Jamaica, even though my wife, Adrienne, was pregnant, and the baby was
done some of his friends would put together a kind of change. And I was proud of that. And I got down out of the hole he was in, and he did it. He came to a stand end, but in what he did, he showed all things were possible.

Sonny, who had many scrapes with the law during his life, was found dead in Las Vegas, Nev., home in January, 1971. He had been dead for about a week. Drugs were at the scene, but the death was attributed officially to natural causes.

I didn't know until after the fight that President Johnson had died while I was on the way to the stand. It had happened in Jamaica that night. Without his Job Corps, I wouldn't have been there.

I said I might need, that I had meant by work, that I had asked me when I thought I'd be heavy enough to win the title and then argue. It was just the same old things were possible.
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row, on account of official business. Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy. Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business. Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy. Mr. KASER, for today and balance of week, on account of death in family.

Mr. MORGAN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL) for today and April 12, on account of illness.

Mr. BURCHARD of Alaska (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders here-tofore entered, was granted to:

(0f the following Members (at the request of Mr. FORDELL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraordinary matter): Mr. CONABLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STEGGED of Wisconsin, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GUESSEN, for 30 minutes, April 12, 1973.

Mr. SHERFEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. AXON of Illinois, for 50 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Florida, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROTH of New York, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. WHALEN, for 10 minutes, April 12, 1973.

(0f the following Members (at the request of Mr. BEAUX) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraordinary matter: Mr. MCGLAUGHLIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRAZBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FREEMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SUBER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ADEOU, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. VANICK, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HAWKINS to insert his remarks in the beginnings of Remarks of the House, notwithstanding the cost of $425.

(0f the following Members (at the request of Mr. FORDELL) to include extraordinary matter: Mr. STEELMAN.

Mr. COHEN.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. HICKLER of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. FORSYTH.

Mr. QUIST.

Mr. STEGEMON of Wisconsin.

Mr. FLEETINGHUIS.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. FINLEY in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. FROEHLICH in two instances.

Mr. TOWELL of Nevada.

Mr. COLLINS in five instances.

Mr. ROUSKLEO in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. NELSEN in two instances.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEAUX) to include extraordinary matter: Mr. MASSEY.

Mr. FISHER in two instances.

Mr. WALDE.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RABIE in three instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. DUKES in six instances.

Mr. HUNTING.

Mr. McKAY.

Ms. AZIO in five instances.

Mr. RANGER in 10 instances.

Mr. KOCK in three instances.

Mr. GIBSON in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1494. An act to amend section 204 of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees to limit the number of employees that may be retired under such Act during specified periods; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 12, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

788. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise and modernize the statutes relating to the coinage and the Bureau of the Mint; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

749. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide for the use of fee appraisers and construction inspectors and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

750. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to delete the termination date for title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1972; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

751. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on the repayment of reclamation projects, 1902-1969; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

752. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of February 28, 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

753. A letter from the Comptroller General 733. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report recommending the use of the Armed Forces and nursing care bed facilities by the Veterans' Administration could improve health care delivery to veterans, to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FOX: Committee of conference. A conference report to accompany H.R. 378; (Rept. No. 93-119). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALDE: Committee of conference on Unemployment and Civil Service. H.R. 29. A bill to provide for payments by the Postal Service to the Civil Service Retirement Fund for increases in the unfunded liability of the fund; to increase in benefits for Postal Service employees, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NANCE: Committee on Postal Office and Civil Service. H.R. 990. A bill to provide for annual authorization of appropriations to the Postal Service; and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 93-121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 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; (Rept. No. 93-122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAKES: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 6828. A bill to amend section 101 (b) of the Micronesian Claims Act of 1971 to enlarge the class of persons eligible to receive benefits under the claims program established by that act; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 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; (Rept. No. 93-122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FINLEY in two instances.
of Representatives: (Rept. No. 93-128). Referred to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself and Mr. NICHOLSON):
H.R. 6831. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations, and to conduct surveys and resource developments, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6832. A bill to amend the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, title 39, United States Code, to provide for uniformity in labor relations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENTON:
H.R. 6833. A bill to provide that certain changes in the loan and purchase program for the Tennessee Valley Authority Department of Agriculture is contemplated shall not be made; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DU PONT (for himself, Mr. BEVIL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CLEAVLAND, Mr. CONVERSE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DELLALMACK, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FRENNEL, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. LEDGETT, Mr. MCCLYSTON, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MALARY, Mr. MASOLO, Mr. NIX, Mr. POOLE, Mr. SHERIDAN, Mr. SMERCEK, and Mr. WITHEWEHR):
H.R. 6834. A bill to provide for the promotion of public health and welfare and improving the family planning services and population sciences research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:
H.R. 6835. A bill relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to readjust the schedule of ratings for the disabilities of veterans; to the construction, alteration, and acquisition of hospitals and domiciliary facilities; to the closing of hospital and domiciliary facilities and regional offices; and to the transfer of real property under the judgment or control of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6836. A bill to authorize financial assistance for opportunities industrialization centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6837. A bill to establish improved nationwide standards of mail service, require annual reports by public service, and provide for the withholding of postal benefits for the United States, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ASCHER, Mr. BRATTON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROSHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. CHESHEK, Mr. CONSELLE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, Jr., Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DURAN, Mr. ENGBORN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISHER, and Mr. FISHER):
H.R. 6838. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies, to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. FOGGA, Mr. GRASSO, Mr. GRAY, Mrs. GORDON, Mr. GRUSS, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HARTING, Mr. HUBER, Mr. HUNGRAL, Mr. HOLDSWALL, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PICKLE, and Mr. PICEK):
H.R. 6839. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies, to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. POOL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RAILBACK, Mr. ROHDE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROGENTHAL, Mr. SAVIN, Mr. SARKANS, Mr. SCHNEEBILL, Mr. SINKS, Mr. STEEKE of Wisconsin, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio, Mr. JOHN JACOBY, Mr. VIGORIO, Mr. WHITEBURST, Mr. WIND, and Mr. WOLF PAC):
H.R. 6840. A bill to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies, to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 6841. A bill to amend section 401(a)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6842. A bill to provide for repayment of certain advancements made to providers of services under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BREGGINERIE, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CARMAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DE LOUCO, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DEQUA, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GOPPENSTEIN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG of Los Angeles, Mr. LUG优点, Mr. McCALL, Mr. McSPADDEN, Mr. McVAY, Mr. MERRICK, Mr. STINK, Mr. STEED, Mr. THORNTON, and Mr. WRIGHT):
H.R. 6843. A bill to provide that there shall be no general revenue sharing unless the Federal budget is in balance or shows a surplus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BREGGINERIE, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CARMAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DE LOUCO, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DEQUA, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GOPPENSTEIN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG of Los Angeles, Mr. LUG优点, Mr. McCALL, Mr. McSPADDEN, Mr. McVAY, Mr. MERRICK, Mr. STINK, Mr. STEED, Mr. THORNTON, and Mr. WRIGHT):
H.R. 6844. A bill to provide that there shall be no general revenue sharing unless the Federal budget is in balance or shows a surplus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:
H.R. 6845. A bill relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to readjust the schedule of ratings for the disabilities of veterans; to the construction, alteration, and acquisition of hospitals and domiciliary facilities; to the closing of hospital and domiciliary facilities and regional offices; and to the transfer of real property under the judgment or control of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6846. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to cover, under the hospital insurance program established by part A thereof, inpatient hospital services provided on behalf of the United States to individuals covered under such program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6847. A bill to amend section 843 of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of hospitals and facilities to provide health services for persons for whom Federal funds are available; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York:
H.R. 6848. A bill to establish an international center for foreign education and cultural relations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUDEN:
H.R. 6849. A bill to extend through fiscal year 1974 the expiring appropriations authorizations in the Public Health Service Act, the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STOKES (for himself, Mr. BARBOUR, Mr. CZERNICH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONVERSE, Mr. CORBAN, Mr. DELONG, Mr. ENCINITAS, Mr. FISH, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. RANSER, Mr. ROGENTHAL, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):
H.R. 6850. A bill to prohibit psychosurgery in federally connected health care facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. ZWACH):
H.R. 6851. A bill to retain coverage under the laws providing employee benefits, such as compensation for injury, retirement, life insurance, and health benefits, and to empower the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States who transfer to Indian tribal organizations to perform services in connection with governmental or other activities which are or have been performed by Government employees in or for Indian communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WATTS:
H.R. 6852. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the organized services of the United States to similar pay to the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Illinois:
H.R. 6853. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt the interest paid on student loans for the education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6854. A bill to amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of "Indian" in laws enacted in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASKIN of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. KROES):
H.R. 6857. 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 was in the past the result of certain circumstances and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:
H.R. 6858. A bill to authorize modification of the project for Fort Everglades Harbor, Fla., to be made by the Corps of Engineers.

By Mr. DUNCAN:
H.R. 6859. A bill to require that an increase in the rates of Tennessee Valley Authority in its rates for power be made on the basis of proceedings which give an opportunity for a hearing; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FAUNTRY:
H.R. 6860. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to a business property situated in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FAUNTRY (for himself, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. BROTHILL of Virginia, and Mr. FELTINGHUYSEN):
H.R. 6861. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the Columbia Hospital for Women of certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia for the purpose of constructing certain facilities; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GRAY (for himself, Mr. Groves, and Mr. FELTINGHUYSEN):
H.R. 6862. A bill to name the headquarters building in the Geological Survey National Center under construction in Reston, Va., as the John Wesley Powell Federal Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GUBSER:
H.R. 6863. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the 2 percent and 1 percent floors on deductible medical expenses in the case of individuals who have attained age 65 and are not covered for hospital insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6864. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore provisions permitting the deduction, without regard to the percentage of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals 65 years of age and over, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROCH (for himself, Mr. Cronin, Mr. BRITTON of South Carolina, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):
H.R. 6865. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the benefits of allowable splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYROS:
H.R. 6866. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38 of the United States Code to restore entitlement to educational benefits to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:
H.R. 6867. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide a commission of innocent victims of violent crime in financial stress; to make grants to the States for the payment of benefits for the families of violent crime victims; to establish an insurance program and death benefits to dependent survivors of public safety officers; to authorize and to make available to victims of racketeering activities and theft; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGE (for himself, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURSTONE of New York, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLIER, Mr. CONVYR, Mr. CORRAN, Mr. COX of Tennessee, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELFSTEIN, Miss HOLLISMAN, Mr. ROD, Mr. ROYAL of Mississippi, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. WALTS):
H.R. 6868. A bill to provide for the compensation of innocent victims of certain controlled substances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARICK:
H.R. 6869. A bill to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to include within the definition of "Committee" the Interdepartmental Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York:
H.R. 6870. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association", approved May 31, 1939, to include in the governing instrument of such association provisions which meet the requirements of section 508(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RUPPER (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ESCO, Mr. BROWNS of Michigan, Mr. CRUCE, Mr. CONTE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. FELTINGHUYSEN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SWACH, Mr. GRIFF, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. MYERS):
H.R. 6871. A bill to provide for a study by the Bureau of available gas from the Canada oil pipeline to transport petroleum from the North Slope of Alaska to the continental United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):
H.R. 6872. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for educational broadcasting facilities grants; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6873. A bill to amend section 415 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide for a 2-year period of limitations in proceedings against carriers for failure to include overcharges based on overcharges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY:
H.R. 6874. A bill to provide that local educational agencies shall not receive Federal financial assistance unless they provide educational services to all handicapped children at levels of expenditure at least equal to expenditures for such services for the benefit of the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZION:
H.R. 6875. 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. FREY (for himself, Mr. BAFALE, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. HALEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BIKES, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):
H.J. Res. 503. Joint Resolution to redesignate the area in the State of Florida known as Cape Kennedy as a national park; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:
H.J. Res. 504. Joint resolution to designate the month of May in each year as National Arthritis Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. SPEENE, Mr. MARSH of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of South Carolina, Mr. CHAPPELL, and Mr. FLOWERS):
H.Con. Res. 183. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that U.S. Route 219 should be designated as part of the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RODINO:
H.Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution to print a House document the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. ABNOR, Mr. AXED, Mr. ADDARBO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDREW of North Dakota, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BAPALIS, Mr. BARBER, Mr. BARRY, Mr. BOGO, Mr. BRADENES, Mr. BRAMCO, Mr. BRINLEY, Mr. BROOME, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CHAMICKAY of Maryland, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURGEN, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURKE of Florida, and Mr. BYRON):
H.Con. Res. 186. Concurrent resolution to collect overdue debts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. CAREY of Ohio, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CHISOLM, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLAWSON, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. CONVER, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANELS, Mr. DAVIS of California, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DELLEFRECK, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DENT, Mr. DREWINSKI, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DICKINSON, and Mr. DUDS):
H.Con. Res. 187. Concurrent resolution to collect overdue debts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. DORM, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. DRISLAM, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. ELLISBERG, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. EVANS of Tennessee, Mr. FASCALL, Mr. FENELSON, Mr. FISK, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. WILLIAM of Georgia, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. FRAYDON, Mr. GAYDROS, Mr. GETTY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GINS, Mr. GOLDBE, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. GRON):
H.Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution to collect overdue debts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. GRAT, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. GROSS, Mr. GUSE, Mr. GUNT, Mr. GUVER, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HANYA, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARDIN of Arkansas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. HECHLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTON, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HENSHAW, Mr. HOLSTELFRE, Mrs. HOLT, Ms. HOMM, Mr. JAXON, and Mr. JOWA):
H.Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution to collect overdue debts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. HUNGER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. IGUS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KAJAN, Mr. KAPPEL of Florida, Mr. KING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KIROS, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. LATTNER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LIDNER, Mr. LISHMAN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LONG of Maryland,
The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by Hon. Sam Nunn, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER
The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Creator Spirit, in this reverent noontime moment we pray for hearts wide open to the joy and beauty of this universe that Thou hast given us for our home. We thank Thee for the symphony of creation for the arching sky and turbulent winds, for driving clouds and constellations of the night, for buds and blossoms, for flowers and fields, for the salted seas, and for the air, and for the music of nature, and for the variety of people created in Thy image for a worldwide community.

We thank Thee, O Lord, for the senses of seeing and hearing by which Thy gifts are known to us, Awaken the Nation to a new springtime of spiritual life and power which shall set us on our way to the fulfillment of Thy promised kingdom on earth.

We pray in Thy holy name. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE
President pro tempore,

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on essential duty, I hereby appoint Hon. Sam Nunn, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. NUNN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Nunn) laid before the Senate a report from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs. The message is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provision of title I, section 3, of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752), I hereby transmit the annual report of the National Credit Union Administration for the calendar year 1972.

RICHARD NIXON,