Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I demand a record vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye224, noes 172, not voting 34.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I demand a record vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye224, noes 172, not voting 34.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I demand a record vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye224, noes 172, not voting 34.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I demand a record vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye224, noes 172, not voting 34.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I demand a record vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye224, noes 172, not voting 34.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I demand a record vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye224, noes 172, not voting 34.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I demand a record vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye224, noes 172, not voting 34.
simply to remove the ceiling and make it possible for the additional moneys available in this amount to be allotted to category B. If we do not vote for this amendment, $66 million will remain unexpended.

I urge the Members to approve this amendment.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted Representative Mink and I and others organized the effort to discuss this amendment.

I believe these funds can be an absolute necessity for many school districts across this Nation, for without them they will be in extraordinarily difficult situations.

For example, one of my school districts that receives category "B" funds would receive $370,478 under the current plan for providing only 54 percent funding. This is $100,000 short of what is absolutely necessary for this district to continue to function for the remainder of this school year.

How did the situation develop? It developed because these districts were advised that they would receive a certain amount of money under Public Law 874, only to be advised that this money would not be available.

I do not believe this type of action to be fair to the administrators, faculty, or students of these institutions. After all, school budgets had been prepared based on specific funds available and it is inconceivable to me as to how anyone can expect these budgets to be met without providing them.

Teachers salaries will have to be cut, maintenance will have to be cut, and these school districts in general will be forced to discontinue many of their planned programs.

This to me is an intolerable situation in which I do not believe Congress should stand by and see this happen.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think that an erroneous impression has been left here. I am sure not intentionally, but the gentleman from Hawaii said this allows us to affect category A recipients. I can tell the Members categorically and unequivocally that almost certainly if this amendment becomes law, it will reduce category A benefits, and I will explain in detail why.

Under the basic law both category A and category B must be apportioned equally. When the administration increased their budget request last spring, they requested zero for B's, 90 percent for most A's and 100 percent for those districts heavily impacted with A's.

In order to get around the law, if one wants to say that, we must limit the B's in order to give more than that same percentage to the A's, so our committee in reply to the administration, in order to secure more for A's under the basic law, had to limit the B's. So we provided 74 percent to B's and limited them to that in order to give the balance of it to the A's, 100 percent for some and 90 percent for the balance.

The Hathaway amendment was offered on the floor. I struck out the language which limited the B's. Then later that bill was vetoed. Then we passed a continuing resolution and we are operating under that choice. In the law, that stands now there is no limitation on B's and, therefore, the administration was faced with apportioning whatever amount of money they had to spend coming between the A's and B's. They decided they would spend a total of $415 million. It came out 54 percent for category A and B, equally.

They had to limit the B's and could not take more for A's than for B's under those circumstances. When we had the supplemental appropriation bill up about 10 days ago, Mr. Monserrat said, "We will use $415 million for B's, and we will spend it but we would also give 100 percent for the heavily impacted A's and 90 percent for other A's, provided you put a limitation on B's that holds them to the amount we are going to spend anyway, 54 percent."

The only way it could be done is in an appropriation to 54 percent, which is the amount they agreed to spend anyway, and so we went ahead and provided additional language so that they would use 100 percent for some A's and 90 percent for others. Take care of the 54 percent limitation with this amendment and make it 68 percent, the only way they can spend more than 68 percent for any of the A's is to go ahead and spend 68 percent for all the B's.

They have already said that they are not going to spend that amount of money so the net affect it to the distribution for A's. That is the purpose of those bills which were vetoed and we override the veto. Therefore, a perogative of Congress is involved. This is one where we were still negotiating. We arrived at what we thought was the best that could be done under the circumstances by opposing the maximum they agreed to spend on B's and adding language so they could use an additional $35 million on A's.

What is going to happen if this amendment becomes law, it will reduce category A benefits, and I will explain in detail why.

Passage of this amendment would mean that the condition precedent goes back and they would not spend more than that amount on A's. They will probably say, "Then, we go back to our old position where we have to spend the same amount on both—probably 54 percent."

There is no possibility that passage of the amendment will result in more for B's than they are getting right now anyway but it is almost sure to result in less for A's unless they change their minds and spend more total dollars.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated today for reasons entirely unrelated to education.

For 8 years the Congress has been trying to do something about the war in Vietnam and about the war in Cambodia. Today the Congress has.

But if we adopt this amendment, we are going to fuzz it up. The President is still in a position to veto this bill and, if
he does veto it, he will be in a position in which he can use the fact that the Congress passed an amendment as one of the reasons for his action. I do not want to see that happen.

I believe the issue should remain clear. The issue is the amendment which we passed earlier today. There is no other consideration which is nearly as important as that war.

I would urge the Members not to give the President the opportunity to fudge up the question, as he has done on so many other occasions. I urge the Members to turn this amendment down on those grounds.

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

(Mr. PARRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which would amend title I, chapter VII of H.R. 7447, to remove the ceiling on federally connected category B students under the Federal impact aid program. The adoption of this amendment has been mandated by the enactment of Public Law 93-35, which contained a congressional imposition of 54 percent of entitlement for category B children.

Impacted funds for both A and B pupils are an integral portion of the income of school districts that enroll large numbers of federally connected children. Local school districts in fact operate under the expectation that the Federal Government will continue to assume its traditional share of the cost of educating these children. For this reason, the enactment of Public Law 93-35 was most welcome to local school districts in that it increased the A proportion to 90 percent of entitlement. However, we must also take action to remove the inadvertent limitation on funding for category B students if we are to expect public schools in federally impacted areas to continue to provide quality education for the youth of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, for some time I have been convinced that full funding for the impact aid program must continue until such time as an adequate and viable substitute program has been instituted, and I have expressed that opinion publicly on a number of occasions. School fiscal decisions are necessarily made long before annual congressional action on this subject. In view of the fact that the 54 percent limitation has been enacted at such a transitory period for our local school districts, school budgets for the current and forthcoming school year are in serious jeopardy.

The amendment is quite simple, and, I might add, most reasonable in that it requires no further appropriation of funds. Under the Labor-HEW continuing resolution, $635 million has already been appropriated for the impact aid program. If we are to increase funding for category B pupils to 98 percent of entitlement, we could still not exceed the $635 million limitation of already available funds. Further, we would be doing a great service to our local school districts, which are in great need of the $66 million which this amendment would make available.

I intend to cast my vote in favor of remedial action to remove the ceiling on funding for category B students, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

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

I shall take only a moment to urge the Members to take what the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) have said as being an honest presentation of what the facts are. I concur in what they have said, and hope the amendment is defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have sat over here many times in the last 100 years at this hour of night, and when some character stood up, like I am doing now, I was the loudest guy over there yelling "vote." Half the time I made mistakes by doing that, because the guy down here was right and I was wrong.

This time, my friends, I say it is making a mistake. Listen to papa. I am the best friend you have in Congress. If you got some things you have in this thing, and you know it. It is all right for Members to get their names in the paper back home, and die for God, country, and Yale, but let me say that this thing was worked over very carefully with the Senate conferees on the urgent supplemental appropriation bill. We worked it out very, very carefully.

We raised the A's to 90 percent, and 100 percent for those ones 25 percent of enrollment.

When the President's budget came up, there was not a lousy dime in it for the A's, and we put funds in the appropriation bill for them. Under the President's budget, they would have had nothing, not a dime. We put it in at that time, for reasons Members know.

I told the Members the reasons were, and they voted for them, and I got a big hand, "Great guy, Flood." I can tell you Members who did it, you are not going to vote for it.

Now, when we come back here, it is said, "Flood, do not do that.

We have the 100 percent for the A's, as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) has said. We cannot do anything but to sustain the amendment seeks to do and not to clip the A's. What are we going to use for money: Cigar store coupons or rubber bands?

The A's will be hurt—A's, triple A's, I am saying. Now, listen to me. Leave this bill alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 211, noes 178, not voting 44, as follows:
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The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk proceeded the read the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the next to the last word.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. I serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture and Consumer Protection. We have provided in this bill $12,500,000 for emergency and other repairs to flood control works where they have been completed and turned over to the water management districts; $2,500,000 for emergency conservation works. Our Subcommittee on Public Works has recommended that include $70.5 million in additional emergency funds for flood control damage in the Mississippi Valley for the remainder of this fiscal year or until July 1, 1974.

Mr. Chairman, I have here pictures of this highest flood of record. Words cannot describe the devastation. At this time the Corps cannot estimate the eventual damage or cost. The Corps and the Bureau of Management and Budget have agreed to have these figures as soon as the water levels are reduced so they can determine the damage.

I would like to read to you what the Corps of Engineers reported to me on April 25, 1973:

I quote:

U.S. Corps of Engineers Fact Sheet

Subject: Mississippi River Basin Flood of 1973

PURPOSE

This fact sheet is to provide information concerning the present flood emergency in the Mississippi River Basin and to highlight the Corps of Engineers flood fighting activities under the authority of Public Law 99-64 of Congress, as amended.

FACTS

1. In this high water of 1973, stages in the Middle Mississippi River between the Missouri and Ohio Rivers generally reached their highest levels of record. Extensive areas not protected by Federal levees have been inundated. A total of ninety-eight non-Federal levees have failed along the Missouri River and its tributaries. Backwater effect caused flooding on the unprotected Maramee River and along River Des Peres, which flows through St. Louis, St. Charles, and Washington Counties.

2. Approximately 2.3 million acres of the Yazoo Basin in Mississippi have been inundated from headwater flooding, resulting from six months of above-average rainfall culminated by a 10-day storm. Seven non-Federal levees protecting suburban areas of Greenwood, Mississippi, have failed, causing excessive flooding. Flood control reservoirs behind Sardis, Enid, Grenada, and Arkabutla Dams have held back floodwaters from the watersheds. All the spillways of these structures have been used and, except for Arkabutla, have been used for the first time since construction.

3. In the lower Mississippi River, a number of emergency actions were carried out to facilitate usage of the various floodways should Mississippi River water rise. The low areas of the 11-mile long upper louver plug section of the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway was raised to authorized grade. This action provides protection for over 100,000 acres of rich farmland against a stage of 60 feet at Cairo, Illinois, where the floodway reached 58.7 feet. Other actions included partially degrading the forebay levee at Morganza to an elevation satisfactory for flood control operation; and removing siltation from the forebay of Benoit Drainage by dredging to facilitate the proper operation of the floodway. Plans were developed and work is nearing completion for raising low spots in levees.
and levees in the Atchafalaya Basin downstream from the Morganza Floodway and in the Morgan City, Louisiana, area.

4. Subsequent forecasts of the National Weather Service, the effects of wind and waves on high river stages, and the potential detrimental effects of prolonged high stages on the Mississippi River levees, indicated a need to open the Bonnet Carre Spillway to protect the city of New Orleans. This was accomplished on 8 April 1973. Prior to this, the floodway was operated in 1937, 1945, and 1950.

5. High stages and erosive forces caused a serious scour condition at the low portion of the Old River Control Structure, resulting in a portion of the wingwall being toppled into the inflow channel. This problem threatened the integrity of the entire structure. To relieve the pressure, the overbank structure, which passes flood flows from the Mississippi River to the Atchafalaya Basin Floodway, was opened on 15 April 1973.

6. On 17 April 1973, the Morganza Floodway was opened for the first time since its construction in 1953 to relieve the saturated levee conditions and lower stages at the Old River Control Structure to lessen an aggravating situation where emergency remedial work was being severely limited.

7. More than 1,450 Corps personnel are presently engaged in flood emergency activities, including 19 additional Corps officers called for duty from elsewhere in the United States. In addition, two reinforced companies (391 officers and enlisted personnel) from the 624 Engineer Battalion (Construction) are assisting in Morgan City, Louisiana.

8. Total damages incurred to date, are estimated at more than $190,000,000. An estimated 11,000,000 acres have been flooded, and more than 40,000 persons have been evacuated. On the other hand, it is estimated that Corps projects have prevented more than 75,000,000 acres from being flooded. A second crest which is now near St. Louis, will account for an additional 26,000,000 acres. Total additional emergency activities, the total cost of the Mississippi River and Tributaries Project, to date, is $1.6 billion.
of asking the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a question. During the debate on the rule, I had directed this question and I believe I was assured that this bill contained moneys in order to make up for the situation confronting our overseas based servicemen and employees of the U.S. Government. I was very much reassured to hear that it did.

I think our people overseas will be delighted. We have been receiving quite a number of letters from service families and others who are suffering.

My question is, specifically how will that work and how will they receive this money contemplated in the bill? How will it work?

We have the lowly paid people in the Army and secretaries in the embassies in foreign countries who are confronted with as much as 20 or 25 percent devaluation, not just 10 percent.

I am wondering if we can get an explanation of the mechanics of this. I did not come in the bill related to that, and I would just like to know.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Certainly.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, it is true that the gentleman was assured when we were discussing the rule that there were funds in this bill to take care of our troops in Europe due to the devaluation of the dollar, but these funds went out of the bill on the Addabbo amendment and they are not now in the bill. The funds which were designated for this purpose and included in the transfer authority provision are not available, so officials will be hard pressed to meet these requirements.

That is one of the reasons I opposed, as many others did, the Addabbo amendment, because we were concerned about these people.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAMO).

Mr. GIAMO. Mr. Chairman, if those funds were in the bill, that means they were in there earlier, is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. I refer the funds were unanticipated expenditures. So our Committee on Appropriations was asked to approve language and submit it to the House which would permit the Defense Department to take care of this requirement by transferring from unexpended funds in procurement accounts and otherwise. This was in the $450 million package. With that provision having been deleted, the funds are not available.

Mr. GIAMO. Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that if they had not taken some of the funds from other accounts and used them for bombing in Cambodia, they would have had in the bill at least $150 million, if not more, for these other purposes.

Mr. MAHON. No, I would say, if the gentleman will yield further, that the funds used in the bombing in Cambodia were not primary factor. It had been a massive, unpredictable and unprecedented heavy bombing in North Vietnam, especially last December and prior thereto, that expended much of the funds which might have been available.

Mr. GIAMO. Mr. Chairman, as I recall, the testimony quite clearly 2 days ago, the expenditures of December were out of the original $750 million transfer authority which has not been disturbed by the Addabbo amendment.

This legislation, the Addabbo amendment, concerned itself only with the additional $300 million from January 1, 1973, on.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further, the $750 million has already been transferred for the most part. So we are in difficulty in this matter, but there is nothing we can do at this stage of the bill about that.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAMO. It will be interesting to see tomorrow if the Department of Defense can transfer moneys available for bombing in Cambodia but cannot find the funds for the purposes which the gentleman wants them expended, which funds were originally in the act passed in 1973.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7447) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Addabbo amendment and on the so-called Long of Maryland amendment.

Mr. Speaker. The amendment is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Addabbo amendment and on the so-called Long of Maryland amendment.

Mr. Speaker. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Rarick amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the remaining amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: On page 8, strike out lines 9 through 12.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.
The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 51, after line 19, insert the following paragraph:

"none of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in or over coastal areas of the Caribbean Sea or off the coast of Turkey."

The amendment was agreed to. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 51, after line 19, insert the following paragraph:

"Sec. 306. No funds appropriated in this Act shall be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in, or off the coast of Cambodia by United States forces."

The amendment was agreed to. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 51, after line 19, insert the following paragraph:

"Sec. 306. No funds appropriated in this Act shall be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in, or off the coast of Cambodia by United States forces."

The amendment was agreed to. The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to be 284, the nays 96, as follows:

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit. The SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit. The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND OFFERED BY MR. MINSHALL OF OHIO

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit. The SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit. The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND OFFERED BY MR. MINSHALL OF OHIO
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Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the request of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. ADDABBO) and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Long).

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 7208, UNTIL MIDNIGHT, MAY 11, 1973

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill, H.R. 7208, amending the Railroad Retirement Act.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the REA's and this conference report in particular.

A "TONKIN RESOLUTION" ON CAMBODIA

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, in support of my amendment I bring to the attention of my colleagues the finest editorial written on the subject, one which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, entitled: "A Tonkin Resolution on Cambodia," and the other one written by the Long Island Press on Monday, May 7, entitled: "Stopping the Blood Money."

The editorial follow:

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1973]

A "TONKIN RESOLUTION" ON CAMBODIA

The House is about to vote on Rep. Joseph Addabbo's proposal to block the use of defense funds for bombing Cambodia. It is the first vote on the war issue in either house of Congress since the January cease-fire agreement. As such, it is exceptionally important as an indicator to the American people whether he can continue to make war at his own discretion regardless of law, or whether Congress intends to try to stop Mr. Nixon's cruel and capricious standard. Fairly enough, the Secretary of Defense has joined the critics of Mr. Nixon's policy in warning the Congress of the failure to cut off funds for bombing Cambodia will be taken as a gesture of congressional consent to the President's policies there. So no one can be under any illusions as to the significance of the forthcoming vote.

The issue could not be clearer. On June 3, 1970, Mr. Nixon said he would henceforth bomb in Cambodia only "to protect the lives and security of our forces in South Vietnam"; on many occasions, he broadened that rationale to include the release of prisoners held in North Vietnam. Both our troops and our POWs are no longer in need of this support. But he bombs on. His aides contend that under the cease-fire agreement the United States has implicitly conditioned a bombing halt to observation of the cease-fire by the other side. Yet no Cambodians signed on to the cease-fire. And in any event, a statement of Executive intent to bomb, for whatever reason, does not legitimize the bombing: Mr. Nixon's intent to bomb, for whatever reason, does not legitimize the bombing.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Long). The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Long).

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR

WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable commitment, I was unable to be present to offer my vote in support of the conference report on S. 394, the amendments to the Rural Electrification Act.

I have strongly supported the REA's in the past. My district includes eight REA cooperatives, which have been important elements in maintaining the quality of life and improving the economy of northern Michigan. I wish to go on record in support of the REA's and this conference report in particular.

A "TONKIN RESOLUTION" ON CAMBODIA

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, in support of my amendment I bring to the attention of my colleagues the finest editorial written on the subject, one which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, entitled: "A Tonkin Resolution on Cambodia," and the other one written by the Long Island Press on Monday, May 7, entitled: "Stopping the Blood Money."

The editorial follow:

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1973]

A "TONKIN RESOLUTION" ON CAMBODIA

The House is about to vote on Rep. Joseph Addabbo's proposal to block the use of defense funds for bombing Cambodia. It is the first vote on the war issue in either house of Congress since the January cease-fire agreement. As such, it is exceptionally important as an indicator to the American people whether he can continue to make war at his own discretion regardless of law, or whether Congress intends to try to stop Mr. Nixon's cruel and capricious standard. Fairly enough, the Secretary of Defense has joined the critics of Mr. Nixon's policy in warning the Congress of the failure to cut off funds for bombing Cambodia will be taken as a gesture of congressional consent to the President's policies there. So no one can be under any illusions as to the significance of the forthcoming vote.

The issue could not be clearer. On June 3, 1970, Mr. Nixon said he would henceforth bomb in Cambodia only "to protect the lives and security of our forces in South Vietnam"; on many occasions, he broadened that rationale to include the release of prisoners held in North Vietnam. Both our troops and our POWs are no longer in need of this support. But he bombs on. His aides contend that under the cease-fire agreement the United States has implicitly conditioned a bombing halt to observation of the cease-fire by the other side. Yet no Cambodians signed on to the cease-fire. And in any event, a statement of Executive intent to bomb, for whatever reason, does not legitimize the bombing: Mr. Nixon's intent to bomb, for whatever reason, does not legitimize the bombing.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Long). The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR

WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable commitment, I was unable to be present to offer my vote in support of the conference report on S. 394, the amendments to the Rural Electrification Act.

I have strongly supported the REA's in the past. My district includes eight REA cooperatives, which have been important elements in maintaining the quality of life and improving the economy of northern Michigan. I wish to go on record in support of the REA's and this conference report in particular.

A "TONKIN RESOLUTION" ON CAMBODIA

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, in support of my amendment I bring to the attention of my colleagues the finest editorial written on the subject, one which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, entitled: "A Tonkin Resolution on Cambodia," and the other one written by the Long Island Press on Monday, May 7, entitled: "Stopping the Blood Money."

The editorial follow:

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1973]
The administration has stated that, whatever the judgment of Congress, it intends to keep on bombing Cambodia anyway. This is a shocking statement. It suggests to me that the President can no longer argue for the necessity of sealing South Vietnam's border with Cambodia. It was unnecessary and unjustified for Mr. Nixon to claim in his agreement with Cambodia that the United States would not bomb Cambodia if the negotiations were to fail. The President never made a technical one; no knowledgeable person disputes it.

The larger truth is that in Paris Mr. Nixon negotiated the best agreement he could get. But measured in relation to the extravagant promises the President made in South Vietnam—this time in Cambodia—nothing much has been accomplished. The agreement did indeed serve the basic American purpose of giving Saigon a reasonable chance to survive on its own. But it did not and could not provide for the complete withdrawal of American forces. The agreement to end that part of the war is not essential to the American mission in South Vietnam—a mission which has already been accomplished and which will not necessarily be undone if one Cambodian faction rather than another comes to power in Phnom Penh.

The administration has stated that, whatever the judgment of Congress, it intends to keep on bombing Cambodia anyway. This is a shocking statement. It suggests to me that the President can no longer argue for the necessity of sealing South Vietnam's border with Cambodia. It was unnecessary and unjustified for Mr. Nixon to claim in his agreement with Cambodia that the United States would not bomb Cambodia if the negotiations were to fail. The President never made a technical one; no knowledgeable person disputes it.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO VICTORY PARTY

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I was visited last week, as were many other Members, by an impressive group of people who are greatly concerned about the status of those people who are unable to support the Nation's 44 million disabled citizens. They were distressed not only about the President's curtailment of funding for vocational rehabilitation programs in the 1973 Vocational Rehabilitation Act, but also the discrimination and living barriers constantly faced by disabled people. For example, Mr. Speaker, these individuals encountered many unnecessary architectural barriers even as they visited the Nation's Capitol. Faced with narrow doors and unobtainable stairways, these fine people who have the disadvantage of being handicapped could not visit the House visitor's gallery. I have been told by the Capitol Architect's Office that it is actively engaged in a project to remove this and other architectural barriers in the buildings of the Capitol which unreasonably hinder disabled visitors' use of public restrooms, telephones, and other such facilities. I urge the prompt completion of these improvements so that all visitors, including those with disabilities, are able to enjoy the Nation's Capitol.

The visit by these disabled citizens serves to remind us again of the low priority that is being given by some fortunate members of our society to the rehabilitation of those with disabilities. This House overwhelmingly passed a Comprehensive Vocational Rehabilitation Act, only to have that important legislation vetoed by the President. Shortly thereafter, the Washington Post reported that President Nixon threw a party to celebrate the success of his veto.

For one I do not find it appropriate to celebrate the elimination of essential services to disabled and handicapped people. I would like to quote from a letter I received recently from a young woman in Iowa who knows better than most the value of vocational rehabilitation programs.

As a recipient of funds from this agency to continue my education (I was born with a severe birth defect, which has resulted in my being a wheelchair person) I can attest to the usefulness of this program. Due to funds being available from the vocational rehabilitation agency, I have completed four years of college. This would not have been possible without their help.

It seems to me an example of fiscal responsibility to provide a program whereby citizens can become tax-payers rather than recipients of tax funds because of being forced to live on the disabled, welfare, or other tax supported programs. Far more important than the benefit to the government in taxes, however, is the benefit to the people served by this program and to society as a whole.

We will be far wiser to place the people who benefit from vocational rehabilitation programs in a position of being able to contribute to the welfare of themselves and others than forcing them to be like castoffs who can have no sense of pride or accomplishment. The importance of having a feeling of self-worth and dignity cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

Although I support any effort to eliminate waste in government spending, surely there has to be a better way to do this than to penalize those people who are already among the least able to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is even more poignant when one reads an article such as the one appearing in the April 13, 1973, issue of the Washington Post which I insert in the Record:
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STOPPING THE BLOOD MONEY

U.S. troops or air support or something," he added. But last Tuesday he declared: "The choice before us today is whether to allow a military government to roll back Vietnam and its allies, or insist on observation of "We are obliged to the American people to keep our troops and prisoners left Vietnam. Peace with honor," is how President Nixon argues that the attacks are necessary to prevent Hanoi from using Cambodia. And April tonnage is believed to have been higher than in March. The administration can no longer argue that air strikes in Cambodia are necessary to protect American fighting men in Vietnam. There are no more "few weeks" in the argument that so long as there are North Vietnamese in Cambodia, American intervention is permissible. The latest intelligence is that North Vietnam's presence in Cambodia may have been grossly overestimated.

Sen. Stuart Symington, D-Mo., told a record to be made. The President should be told in no uncertain terms that if he continues his obdurate position, South Cambodia is not going to be cast out of the cease-fire, for no purpose that can possibly justify the cost in lives and money. If a President's good name, he will be doing so on his own.

STOPPING THE BLOOD MONEY

Rep. Joseph Addabbo, Ozone Park Demo- crat, lost the first round in the House battle to limit President Nixon's ability to wage war in Cambodia—or anywhere else in Southeast Asia. But, hopefully, the battle will not be over.

The amendment sponsored by Rep. Addabbo to block funds sought by the President to continue bombing—or conceivably to reintroduce ground troops into combat in Southeast Asia—was rejected last week by the notorious House Appropriations Committee. But the Long Island lawmaker has since won important support. The House Democratic Steering Committee, for example, voted to add a provision to a procedural amendment that when it comes to the floor this week.

Moreover, a similar amendment has the support of a majority of members of the 
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Hemisphere, permission to address the House for 1
officials—from the Department of Labor as
amends the Immigration and National-
May 10 to consider HR. 981 which
athan, said, “It takes courage to sustain a
very difficult thing to veto a bill
like the program for the disabled. It is a
very difficult thing to veto a bill like the
water fund, it will be difficult to
to vote against those bills, but it is neces-

Sen. Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) said the Pres-
and emphasized, in his brief address, that
the crucial point at which to hold down fed-
eral spending, and thereby avert economic
difficulties, is the authorization stage.

Stevens said the President went out of his
way to praise those not of his own party who
had voted with him, saying he realized the
political problems of doing so.

The President introduced Joe Waggonner
(D-La.), an acknowledged leader of the
southern bloc in the House, and John L. Mc-
Clellan (D-Ark.), chairman of the Senate Ap-
propriations Committee. McClellan was one of
only a small number of southern Democrats who voted for
Nixon in the rehabilitation vote.

McClellan, according to Stevens, said he
had faced a hard choice on whether to go
along with the President and had concluded that his task as Appropriations Committee
chairman to mold a responsible budget made
him feel he must support the veto.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR DECLARES
TO TESTIFY AT IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY HEARINGS

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

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Mon-
day, May 7, I advised the House that
the subcommittee of the Committee on
Immigration and Nationality, of the Committee on the
Judiciary, would continue its hearings on
May 10 to consider H.R. 981 which
amends the Immigration and National-
ity Act to affect immigration policy
regarding countries of the Western
Hemisphere.

The subcommittee had scheduled offi-
cials from the Department of Labor as
witnesses.

The principal issues before the com-
mittee in considering this legislation are:

First. Should the existing preference
system, now applicable to the Eastern
Hemisphere, be imposed on the Western
Hemisphere?

Second. Should there be a per-country
limitation on the number of immigrant
visas available and, if so, what limitation
should be imposed?

Third. What provisions should be
included in legislation applicable to
refugees?

Fourth. Should the alien labor cer-
tification program be revised and is it
effectively protecting the domestic labor
market?

I am distressed to advise the House to-
day that the Department of Labor has
refused to honor the committee's request
and has declined to send official witnesses
to appear before the subcommittee.

I must further advise the House that
previously, on April 12, representatives
of the Department of Labor were
invited to testify, but at that time the com-
mittee was informed that the Depart-
ment was not prepared to testify and
would need additional time—that addi-
tional time was accordingly granted.

Before the subcommittee can proceed
in a logical and reasonable manner, it is
manifestly important that the subcom-
mittee receive an affirmative policy
position from the Department of Labor
and have an opportunity to question its
officials.

This lack of cooperation will impede the
subcommittee's attempt to bring to
the House this session needed legislation,
establishing equitable immigration pro-
cedures for persons from Western Hem-
isphere countries.

I assure the House that it is the desire
and intent of the committee to report
Western Hemisphere legislation as soon
as possible. Unfortunately, the execution branch of only five Democrats who sided with Mr.
Nixon has 1,351 days left in his term. I fear that we will have to wait
1,352 days to get some cooperation from
the executive branch.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a
previous order of the House, the gentle-
man from New York (Mr. Robison) is rec-
norized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. Robison of New York addressed
the House. His remarks will appear herea-
in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE NEED FOR QUICK ACTION ON
WATERGATE PROBE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a
previous order of the House, the gentle-
man from Connecticut (Mr. Sarasin) is rec-
norized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, I would
like to take this opportunity to call for
maximum feasible speed in the now over-
due investigation of the entire distasteful
pattern of events we have come to refer to under the general term “Water-
gate. I welcome the decision by At-
torney General designate Elliot Rich-
adson to appoint a special prosecutor to
handle this case and I appreciate the need
to select this individual with scrupu-
ulous care, but the health of our politi-
cal system calls for rapid and thorough
disclosure of all the facts surrounding
not only the Democratic Headquarters
bugging incident, but any other illegal
and unethical activities carried on by
people in high places.

Watergate has become a cancer eating
at our political system and only speedy
and thorough inquiry can effect a cure.
The longer such action is delayed, the
further the cancer spreads, eroding pub-
lic confidence in elected officials and
compromising the reputations of honor-
able men.

Until a complete investigation, con-
ducted by a man of unimpeachable cre-
dentials and total objectivity, brings to
light the very facet of the lamentable affair,
the U.S. Government and the honorable
profession of politics will continue to
be sullied by rumor, innuendo and suspi-
cion. Only when the entire story is in
the open and the perpetrators of these
dishonorable deeds are meted out suit-
able punishment will we be able to say
Watergate is behind us.

It has been widely reported that
Watergate is a crisis for the President,
and this is undeniably so. But it is also a
crisis for all of us in government, on
both sides of the aisle. Government in a
democracy can only be effective so long
as it has the confidence of those gov-
erned.

This confidence has been shaken and
only the truth can restore it. For this
reason, it is imperative for our Nation
that an impartial and exhaustive inves-
tigation be completed as rapidly as pos-
sible and that our political system de-
nomates it, it has the ability and the will to cleanse itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a
previous order of the House, the gentle-
man from New York (Mr. Kemp) is rec-
norized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. Kemp addressed the House. His
remarks will appear hereafter in the Ex-
tensions of Remarks.]

CUT IN IMPACT AID FUNDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a
previous order of the House, the gentle-
man from Alabama (Mr. DECRAW) is rec-
norized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise
in favor of voting down the previous
question on House Resolution 389 to al-
lowing Mrs. Mink to offer her amendment
to remove the ceiling on funding for
category B students under the Federal
impact aid program. This amendment
will put the future of education in the
second district of Alabama, as well as
around the country, and I urge the House
to allow a vote on it.

There is a tremendous number of B
students in my district and the cut in
impact aid funds for these students from
73 percent of entitlement to 54 percent
has caused a great hardship for our
school systems. As you know, school
budgets are set in September at the be-
ginning of each school year. At that
time, administrators plan to spend
monumental amount of money for teachers
and operational expenses, and appro-
prated Federal funds are figured into the
budget.

The superintendent of education for
the Montgomery public school system in
Montgomery County, Ala., has in-
formed me that the proposed amend-
ment would keep him from maintaining ap-
proximately a $155,000 loss in funds
which have already been budgeted. He
said that he sees "no hope of any local remedy to replace this loss."

Should these funds not be made available, the school system will have to make up for this loss by cutting back in services this summer and next year, a move which has no precedent. Not only will it impact aid students be penalized but also the other students in the school system will suffer because we will not be able to offer quality education to any of the students.

School systems throughout my entire district, which is heavily impacted by military installations, are in basically rural counties and are more severely and drastically affected by the cuts in category B funds than the Montgomery Public School System. These systems will be forced to cut back in services now, and in fact, they have already been forced to let some teachers go. I urge my colleagues to vote down the previous question in order that they may have an opportunity to see that children who attend schools with large numbers of category B impact aid students will get an adequate education.

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

[Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

EXPERIMENTATION ON HUMAN FETUSES

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the reports last month that the National Institutes of Health was considering financing experimentation on human fetuses born alive after abortions, shocked many people. Certainly it was shocked at this revelation, but I was not surprised. To me, this only further substantiates my argument that once you have declared that an unborn child has no value, then that is a "non-person", as the Supreme Court did in its January 22 decision, you have crossed the Rubicon and anything is possible.

The Court has, in effect, declared that, if a human being is unwanted, he can be eliminated. Where will the line be drawn between those who can legally be eliminated and those who cannot?

Is it really not probable that the next step will be to deliberately try to keep the fetus alive so as to assure a supply of live humans for medical researchers? If the unborn child has no value, then his value is academic what you do with it.

Today I am joining with my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. RONCALLO) and many other Members of the House in sponsoring legislation that makes it a Federal crime to carry out any research activity on a human fetus or to intentionally take any action to kill or hasten the death of a human fetus in any federally supported facility or activity.

This proposal carries a stiff penalty for violators prescribing a minimum sentence of 10 years and a maximum sentence of 20 years.

Despite the fact that NIH has adopted a policy that it will not support live fetus experimentation, the need for this legislation is very real. NIH, having once established a policy for itself, may later change that policy.

Although this legislation only applies to federally funded facilities and research and not to privately funded research, such as may be financed by large tax-exempt foundations, it will serve to make clear the feeling of Congress on the matter and will further serve as a model for individual State's to follow. I would hope that all 50 State legislatures will adopt legislation prohibiting research on a live fetus.

In the final analysis the only way to stop this type of removal is to make the legal and ethical basis that makes it acceptable. The problem of experimentation on human fetuses is merely an outgrowth of a whole series of ethical questions arising in the medical profession that are the direct result of the Supreme Court's decision.

The incidence of aborted babies being born alive is not rare. Let us not deceive ourselves as to what we are talking about. We are talking about human beings. When the U.S. Supreme Court in its decision refers to the "potentiality of life" it is ignoring the medical and scientific facts. What we are talking about is the "reality"—the "actual" life, not the "potentiality" of human life.

Who of us is competent to assess whose life is meaningful? Who has the power and audacity to say that another individual's life is not meaningful and another human being is a "non-person"?

In January we were talking about abortions, the killing of unborn babies; in April the question of experimentation on live human fetuses; and now the media is full of articles on euthanasia propagated under the euphemism of "death with dignity."

Enactment of this legislation to make testing on fetuses a crime is a step in the right direction. We cannot stop there however; we must go even further and constitutionally guarantee the right to life, to health, to the God-given right of life, to the God-given right of life. We cannot stop there; we must also seek to remove the death penalty for those who kill or cause the death of another human being.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to swiftly approve this bill introduced to the House in sponsoring legislation that makes it a Federal crime to carry out any research activity on a human fetus or to intentionally take any action to kill or hasten the death of a human fetus in any federally supported facility or activity.

The time has come for Congress to act to insulate that this country does not fall into a broadening disregard for the dignity of human life. The public outcry over the Supreme Court decision has been great and I hope now Congress will respond to it by restoring our respect for human life.

APPROPRIATION OF AMERICAN ASSETS BY PERU

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

Mr. PEDZER. Mr. Speaker, the Government of Peru has, effective last Friday, expropriated the assets of the fish meal industry within its borders. At least five American companies have suffered losses with no immediate prospect of compensation.

Peru's intentions to pay are unknown to me now. The chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency stated this morning that he believes Peru is shifting from a rather hardline position to a more conciliatory one on payment for the expropriation. I hope he is right.

Until we know Peru's intentions, we have no choice but to use all our capabilities to persuade Peru to abide by international law. Specifically, I have asked the Secretary of State to give the repayment question top priority in his upcoming visit to Lima. In addition, I have asked the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the provisions of law with respect to our votes on the Inter-American Development Bank and other development associations. These actions would be only the beginning.

The United States cannot, and does not want to set domestic policy for other sovereign nations. We must however, insist that all nations, including Peru, live up their international responsibilities.

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

[Mr. METCALFE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

GASOLINE HOARDING

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, major oil companies are hoarding gasoline in an attempt to drive independent dealers out of business.

In response to this drive I am introducing legislation today that would force the major oil companies to continue to supply independent dealers and gas stations. Identical legislation has been introduced in the Senate by my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Mr. SARBEL.

Unless strong congressional action is taken now the major oil companies may be able to force hundreds of independent gasoline stations and distributors out of business as a result of this summer's so-called gasoline shortage. Earlier this
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The cost in human terms in this country is great enough; we can scarcely imagine what it is for the Cambodians. Nearly half a million refugees have been forced out of their homes, and some 200,000 displaced persons, according to Wells Klein of the American Council for Nationalities Service who reported April 29 before the Senate Subcommittee: Of a total population of 6.5 million, refugees or displaced persons number 2,957,000. They are homeless, hungry, and destitute. They are subject to violence and I'm sure, on all of yours. One million dollars of AID money has just been allotted to their relief, but this does not at all amount to having helped to create their misery in the first place.

We are also killing outright an average of 76 Cambodian soldiers each week, and about 700 civilians. Due to primitive communications there are no final statistics. A first-hand report in the Washington Post last week states that it is "more than likely that losses among the civilian population are running 20 times as high" as among soldiers. The estimate is based on population density in the B-52's bombing areas, multiplied by the number of sorties per day.

This, then, is what we do. Next we must ask, why? Why do we continue behaving in Indochina, as though we were not agreed to get out? All the old excuses are removed: the troops are out of Vietnam and the prisoners are home. Although "the attainment of an honorable settlement in Vietnam" Mr. Nixon acknowledges that "the peace remains fragile".

What the cease-fire only an election play? Even as the agreement was signed, Mr. Nixon stated that he recognized the Thai government as "the sole legitimate government of South Vietnam" — in direct contradiction of the agreement. We can only conclude that the peace was deliberately made fragile.

President Thieu knows that his government would not last a week without U.S. support. Why do we continue to support him? The rationalizations given by the Administration obviously are not the real reasons, and I suggest that we examine both.

It is clear that the Cambodian bombing exists to prop up not only the Lon Nol government, recently reasserted by General Haig, but to continue bolstering the Thieu regime.

In his recent statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Secretary of State William Rogers justified our continuing bombing of Laos and Cambodia by saying that the agreement "does not provide for a settlement of the January 27th four-party agreement. Article 20(b) provides as follows:

(b) Foreign countries shall put an end to all military activity in Cambodia and Laos, totally withdraw from and refrain from reintroducing into these two countries troops, military advisors and military personnel, arms, munitions and war material."

The January 27th agreement includes no enforcement mechanism or procedures with regard to Article 20. However, the United States is also a signatory of the March 2nd agreement among 13 nations on the subject of the January 27th agreement and protocols. Article 7 of the March 2nd agreement provides as follows:

"(A) In the event of a violation of the agreement or protocols which threatens the peace, the independence, sovereignty, unity or territorial integrity of Vietnam, or the right of the South Vietnamese people to self-determination, the parties signatory to the agreement and protocols individually or jointly, consult with the other parties to this act with a view to determining necessary conciliatory or other measures.

(B) The international conference on Viet­nam shall be reconvened upon a joint re­quest by the Government of the United

The Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Foreign Affairs Committee began its second day of hearings on legislation to terminate our involvement in Southeast Asia once and for all.

We must assert our constitutional respon­sibility to control the basic foreign and military policies of the United States, and we must effect the desire of the American people to end our military in­volvement in Southeast Asia— not only the presence of our troops, planes, and bombs, but also the presence of our fi­nancial and military aid to the government in the Philippines.

I urge my colleagues in the House— and particularly those on the Foreign Affairs Committee—to take the next step and to approve legislation to end all American military involvement in Indo­china.

The text of my testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSWOMAN BELLA S. ABZUG

Mr. Chairman: Before we proceed with the discussion of Cambodia, I believe we must ask what is it that we as a nation are really doing and why are we doing it. Stripped of rationalization, the stark truth is that:

We are spending millions of dollars each day to bomb a tiny Asian country;

We are killing thousands of innocent civilians;

We are creating thousands of miserable refugees;

We are propelling governments ad­mittedly weak and temporary;

We are incurring the world's wrath for such continued barbarism;

We are violating the Peace Agreement and the Constitution;

We are committing ourselves to years of continuing war.

Let us look first at the financial cost of what we are doing. On April 25 the Air Force estimated another 342 gasoline stations have closed, and 930 are threatened with closure. According to the Office of Emergency Preparedness, this number has grown to 562 closures and 1,376 stations threatened with closure.

I fear that by mid-August thousands of independents will be forced to close unless legislative action is taken.

My bill would force major companies to cut back all their cutbacks, especially in places where shortages develop. At present, major oil companies have cut independents off completely and holding on to gasoline for their own service stations. The result of this boardroom could be catastrophic for the American consumer.

Once the independent cutrate gasoline station which sells gas 1 to 2 cents cheaper is forced out of business, the major companies can jack up their prices at will— billowing consumers for $1 billion each time they raise gasoline prices a penny. In any attempt to support gasoline sales we must make sure that independents are not forced out of business this summer.

In addition, this legislation would pre­vent the oil companies from increasing wholesale prices to independent dealers and distributors any higher than the average price increase across the board for all companies. I have already received reports of several gasoline stations in my own congressional district that are being forced out of business and some distributors being faced with gas cutoffs from major companies such as Texaco and Sun Oil Co.

Mr. Speaker, to be perfectly blunt, this squeeze is nothing less than a conscious effort to eliminate gasoline competition and it must be stopped through Federal legislation.

LOCK THE DOOR TO INDOCHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle­woman from New York (Ms. Abzug) is recognized for 10 minutes.

MS. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacif­ic Affairs of the Foreign Affairs Com­mittee began its second day of hearings on legislation to terminate our involve­ment in Indochina. At the invitation of Representative Rommert R. C. Nix, the chairman of the subcommittee, I had the privilege of presenting my views on the subject, and I include the text of my statement at the conclusion of my remarks.

Also this morning, the Democratic Caucus here in the House voted 144 to 22 to support the Addabbo-Flint-Giamano amendment which would delete from the second supplemental appropriations bill a provision giving the Defense Depart­ment an additional $500 million in trans­fer authorizations for the current fiscal year. After this afternoon, by votes of 219 to 188 and 224 to 72, the full House for the first time in the decade since our troops landed in Indochina voted against our military presence there.

These are great and momentous steps, but they are not enough. As I stated to
States of America and of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam on the basis of respect for the rights and liberties of the American people. This is a treaty with the United States and is subject to ratification by the United States Senate.

Read together, these two provisions mean that even if there are North Vietnamese personnel in Laos under the guise of the North Vietnamese Air Force or any other part of the North Vietnamese military, there is absolutely nothing in our Constitution or laws which authorizes Mr. Nixon to bomb Cambodia or Laos. The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution wasgrossly unconstitutional and is a spurious and without foundation. There has been no congressional appropriation of funds for this activity and Mr. Nixon has been charged with breaking the law.

The agreement aside—and it is obviously not a "treaty" within the meaning of the Supremacy Clause (art. VI, cl. 2) because it hasn't been submitted to the Senate for ratification—there is absolutely nothing in our Constitution or laws which authorizes Mr. Nixon to bomb Cambodia or Laos. There has been no declaration of war by Congress. The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was void and the President is not authorized to provide a legal basis for our activity.

The agreement aside—and it is obviously not a "treaty" within the meaning of the Supremacy Clause (art. VI, cl. 2) because it hasn't been submitted to the Senate for ratification—there is absolutely nothing in our Constitution or laws which authorizes Mr. Nixon to bomb Cambodia or Laos. The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was void and the President is not authorized to provide a legal basis for our activity.

The agreement aside—and it is obviously not a "treaty" within the meaning of the Supremacy Clause (art. VI, cl. 2) because it hasn't been submitted to the Senate for ratification—there is absolutely nothing in our Constitution or laws which authorizes Mr. Nixon to bomb Cambodia or Laos. The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was void and the President is not authorized to provide a legal basis for our activity.
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The People's Republic of China has made great leaps forward in terms of international stature and internal well-being. Its gains, however, should in no way serve to isolate or weaken the Nationalist government and the Taiwanese people. Nationalist China is an independent, proud, and peaceful nation.

No people who number over seven hundred million should ever be left outside of the protection of friendly nations. No people, merely because of their small size or lack of military prowess, should be forgotten.

And no people who have placed their confidence in the most powerful country on earth should be betrayed.

America seems at the point of breaking up a long and necessary alliance and, even more important, she is at the point of destroying her image as a trustworthy and honest defender of freedom and of the oppressed. To do either would be a serious mistake.

FUQUA SUPPORTS STRONG DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. FUQUA, Mr. Speaker. I am today introducing the "Federal Drug Abuse Enforcement Rehabilitation Act of 1973." The proliferation of narcotics and dangerous drugs is the Nation's No. 1 law enforcement problem and the abuse of these drugs has endangered the Nation's No. 1 health problem. It is high time that we face up to this serious threat and muster every resource available to us in dealing with the problem. The first necessary step is, as the President has recommended, the realignment of current Federal law enforcement function. There is little question but that Federal law enforcement in the field of drug trafficking has suffered as a result of the duplication of efforts and diffuse nature of the present drug law enforcement effort.

I, therefore, introducing this bill today to provide a mechanism for the coordination of Federal drug law enforcement. The measure will promote more effective management of certain related law enforcement functions of the executive branch by reorganizing and consolidating those functions in a new Office of Drug Abuse Investigation and Enforcement in the Department of Justice. This bill provides a mechanism for improved performance, coordination, and evaluation of drug enforcement functions at the Federal level, more effective coordination between Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies, and the development of innovative approaches to the problems of controlling international and interstate commerce in licit and illicit drugs.

Presently the Federal fight against drug trafficking has been fragmented and less effective than would otherwise be possible by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, the Office for Drug Abuse Law Enforcement and the Office of National Narcotics Intelligence are involved in this fight within the Depart-

SERVICE-CONNECTED SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would provide social security coverage for those who have a service-connected disability incurred or aggravated while on active duty in a combat zone and served by the Veterans' Administration at 50 percent or higher, and for those who die as a result of disease or injury incurred or aggravated in such duty before September 15, 1940.

I have received a number of letters from my constituents who have expressed to me the difficulties they have encountered as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty, especially in this period of tremendous inflation, and I believe this coverage is essential to their well-being.

As disabled veterans they were unable to find or keep a job, but ineligible for social security assistance because of insufficient quarters. The disabled veteran is caught in an unfair situation which he otherwise would not suffer if it were not for his dedication and service to his country in time of need. Now that he is in a position of need I strongly feel we should come to his aid. I believe this bill is a practical measure and hope that it can be enacted into law to help those who have served our great Nation.

UNITED STATES RELATIONS WITH REPUBLIC OF CHINA

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in recent years our Government has made great strides in attempting to normalize or defuse relations with the People's Republic of China. However, these advances have been made at the expense of our loyal and trusted allies—the Republic of China. Since 1945, the United States and these nations have been close and cooperative friends. Now, recent actions on the part of our Government are threatening to terminate that friendship at a time that it made in the continuation of Taiwan as a national entity.

Our Government has always accepted the obvious fact that the Republic of China cannot, without outside aid, protect herself or advance her far larger and historically hostile neighbor, the People's Republic of China. Therefore, we acted as best we could to ensure Nationalist China's safety. In the Congress passed by overwhelming margins the Mutual Defense Treaty, and the "Formosa Resolution," which promised U.S. protection should any of Nationalist China's islands be attacked. These two documents were of a solely defensive nature; they promised no support for any conceivable counterattacks against the mainland and they were made in the spirit of understanding, documents which look into account the troubles of a small nation and its endangered people.

Our Government has maintained the commitments and functions at the Federal level, more effective coordination of Federal, drug law enforcement. The legislation has recommended the realignment of current Federal law enforcement function. There is little question but that Federal law enforcement in the field of drug trafficking has suffered as a result of the duplication of efforts and diffuse nature of the present drug law enforcement effort.

I, therefore, introducing this bill today to provide a mechanism for the coordination of Federal drug law enforcement. The measure will promote more effective management of certain related law enforcement functions of the executive branch by reorganizing and consolidating those functions in a new Office of Drug Abuse Investigation and Enforcement in the Department of Justice. This bill provides a mechanism for improved performance, coordination, and evaluation of drug enforcement functions at the Federal level, more effective coordination between Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies, and the development of innovative approaches to the problems of controlling international and interstate commerce in licit and illicit drugs.

Presently the Federal fight against drug trafficking has been fragmented and less effective than would otherwise be possible by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, the Office for Drug Abuse Law Enforcement and the Office of National Narcotics Intelligence are involved in this fight within the Depart-
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WATERGATE AND PROTECTION OF NEWS SOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, because of the Watergate scandal, there has been a fresh spurt of interest in the newsmen, pending in the House and Senate. These bills are to preserve the inviolability of the confidential relationship between newsmen and their news sources. This is an issue of crucial importance in a democracy, and last week I was invited to speak on this subject at the annual convention of the Ohio Press Women, in Huron, Ohio. For the information of my colleagues, I would like to reiterate some of the points I made in my presentation to the newswomen.

I started out by saying that the pending bills suffer from a number of handicaps. There is no getting away from one of them—and that is the identity of the people who are promoting the legislation. The most vocal proponents happen to fall into two groups: they are professional news persons, or they are politicians, and unfortunately, others might view us as having a vested interest in these bills.

One time the newspapers demand a free flow of information, their critics begin reading between the lines—and they come up with what they regard as the real reason behind the stories and editorial stance. This is in a democracy, and last week I was invited to speak on this subject at the annual convention of the Ohio Press Women, in Huron, Ohio. For the information of my colleagues, I would like to reiterate some of the points I made in my presentation to the newswomen.

I started out by saying that the pending bills suffer from a number of handicaps. There is no getting away from one of them—and that is the identity of the people who are promoting the legislation. The most vocal proponents happen to fall into two groups: they are professional news persons, or they are politicians, and unfortunately, others might view us as having a vested interest in these bills.

One time the newspapers demand a free flow of information, their critics begin reading between the lines—and they come up with what they regard as the real reason behind the stories and editorial stance. This is in a democracy, and last week I was invited to speak on this subject at the annual convention of the Ohio Press Women, in Huron, Ohio. For the information of my colleagues, I would like to reiterate some of the points I made in my presentation to the newswomen.

I started out by saying that the pending bills suffer from a number of handicaps. There is no getting away from one of them—and that is the identity of the people who are promoting the legislation. The most vocal proponents happen to fall into two groups: they are professional news persons, or they are politicians, and unfortunately, others might view us as having a vested interest in these bills.

One time the newspapers demand a free flow of information, their critics begin reading between the lines—and they come up with what they regard as the real reason behind the stories and editorial stance. This is in a democracy, and last week I was invited to speak on this subject at the annual convention of the Ohio Press Women, in Huron, Ohio. For the information of my colleagues, I would like to reiterate some of the points I made in my presentation to the newswomen.

I started out by saying that the pending bills suffer from a number of handicaps. There is no getting away from one of them—and that is the identity of the people who are promoting the legislation. The most vocal proponents happen to fall into two groups: they are professional news persons, or they are politicians, and unfortunately, others might view us as having a vested interest in these bills.

One time the newspapers demand a free flow of information, their critics begin reading between the lines—and they come up with what they regard as the real reason behind the stories and editorial stance. This is in a democracy, and last week I was invited to speak on this subject at the annual convention of the Ohio Press Women, in Huron, Ohio. For the information of my colleagues, I would like to reiterate some of the points I made in my presentation to the newswomen.

I started out by saying that the pending bills suffer from a number of handicaps. There is no getting away from one of them—and that is the identity of the people who are promoting the legislation. The most vocal proponents happen to fall into two groups: they are professional news persons, or they are politicians, and unfortunately, others might view us as having a vested interest in these bills.

One time the newspapers demand a free flow of information, their critics begin reading between the lines—and they come up with what they regard as the real reason behind the stories and editorial stance. This is in a democracy, and last week I was invited to speak on this subject at the annual convention of the Ohio Press Women, in Huron, Ohio. For the information of my colleagues, I would like to reiterate some of the points I made in my presentation to the newswomen.

I started out by saying that the pending bills suffer from a number of handicaps. There is no getting away from one of them—and that is the identity of the people who are promoting the legislation. The most vocal proponents happen to fall into two groups: they are professional news persons, or they are politicians, and unfortunately, others might view us as having a vested interest in these bills.

One time the newspapers demand a free flow of information, their critics begin reading between the lines—and they come up with what they regard as the real reason behind the stories and editorial stance. This is in a democracy, and last week I was invited to speak on this subject at the annual convention of the Ohio Press Women, in Huron, Ohio. For the information of my colleagues, I would like to reiterate some of the points I made in my presentation to the newswomen.

I started out by saying that the pending bills suffer from a number of handicaps. There is no getting away from one of them—and that is the identity of the people who are promoting the legislation. The most vocal proponents happen to fall into two groups: they are professional news persons, or they are politicians, and unfortunately, others might view us as having a vested interest in these bills.

One time the newspapers demand a free flow of information, their critics begin reading between the lines—and they come up with what they regard as the real reason behind the stories and editorial stance. This is in a democracy, and last week I was invited to speak on this subject at the annual convention of the Ohio Press Women, in Huron, Ohio. For the information of my colleagues, I would like to reiterate some of the points I made in my presentation to the newswomen.
Mr. Speaker, let me give you a few examples:

The administration bill makes it a felony for a Government employee to hand over to an "unauthorized person"—which means to a newspaper or newswoman—certain Government documents. When I say "certain documents," I mean those that are classified secret or classified top secret. There are 20 million such documents laying around Washington, some of them dating to World War II. Of course, it is the Government itself that classifies its own documents. Reporters who reveal the classified information would be guilty of a felony. And Government officials who knew about such a transaction between one of their colleagues and a reporter would be guilty of a felony, too, unless they reported the incident—identifying both the reporter and the news source—to the authorities.

As Jack Landau of the Newhouse News Service wrote:

The Nixon proposal flatly counters American tradition that government reports and studies belong to the public and cannot be owned by the government.

The whole business recalls the admission issued by Justice Douglas when he joined Justice Stewart in dissent last year.

Douglas warned:

The reporter's main function is going to be to pass on to the public press releases which the various departments of government issue.

Now, against this background, where do we stand on newswomen's protection legislation? Dozens of bills have been introduced on this subject, including one by me, H.R. 3725. Hearings have been held by the Judiciary Committees in both chambers.

The chief difficulty so far, in addition to administration opposition, is the fact that proponents cannot agree on the type of bill they want. On account of this, we might end up with a situation where neither Committee reports out any bill favorably. Of, if one is reported, it is doubtful whether a majority could be mustered in favor of any particular version. And beyond this obstacle, of course, looms the possibility of a Presidential veto.

I do not think that this is the time and place to examine the pros and cons of the individual bills. However, I think it is sufficient to say at this point that the bills fall into two broad categories.

One group of bills—which includes my own—would confer absolute immunity on members of the news media. Under no circumstances could they be forced to disclose the identity of their news sources to officials of the Government.

A second group of bills also confer immunity, but the protection is abridged by various qualifications, depending on which bill we are talking about. For example, one of the principal so-called qualified bills has been introduced by my distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable CHARLES WHALEN. It has some 70 cosponsors. One of its qualifications is that a news source would have to be identified when a Federal judge decides that there is "an overriding national interest" in favor of the disclosure.

I would like to explain my own preference as a reporter, as a lawyer—for absolute legislation.

As a politician, I think I know something about human nature—at least the proclivities of public officials. I think they do things they think will remain anonymous when this is what they want—and, as we know, we generally want to be anonymous unless the news media happen to be singing our praises.

Therefore, if it were enacted a law saying that news sources are shielded except under certain circumstances—a law qualified by a list of "hewvers"—I think the news media and newsmen are going to lose a lot of news sources. These sources simply are not going to run the risk of examining the law to determine whether or not it applies to them in a particular instance. Rather than analyze the law and try to figure it out, the news source will tend to play it safe—to adopt a personal policy that would boil down to this:

When in doubt (which could be most of the time), keep quiet. Be nice to the news media, but volunteer nothing.

I would add, as a lawyer, that when we are dealing with issues of constitutional proportions, it is best to formulate proposals in absolute terms. I refer you, for instance, Mr. Speaker, to the first amendment, which is stated as an absolute. This does not mean there can never be exceptions to it. As Justice Holmes has said, the absolute right to free speech does not guarantee to a person the privilege of yelling "fire" in a crowded theater.

Under an absolute newswoman's shield statute, circumstances probably would arise where, in a particular case, some other public interest would override the statute. When that occurs, a court would so find on a case-by-case basis.

However, there are plenty of absolutes in the Constitution and in our law books, and I do not think we have ever found that there are too many of them. We live with constitutional tensions day by day in our country. On the one hand—to cite a re-

The point made by Justice Stewart is especially important today because of the attitude of the administration that presently holds power.

That administration opposes any kind of newsmen's shield legislation. The President's spokesmen have come up to Capitol Hill, and they have testified that there is no legal basis for such legislation. The President's spokesmen have been quoted as saying that journalists were engaged in "frivolous activity." They are quoted as saying that the news media are not true "partners" of the administration. They are quoted as saying that the news media are "never entitled to shield information that a government official thinks is confidential.

And this, of course, is what I meant when I said that there is an added handicap. It is not just that there are other ironies in the fire.
I do not think we need to be concerned that a grant of absolute immunity to the press is going to let some criminal go free—in cases where a reporter, say, has spoken confidentially to a numbers operator. We ought to have confidence that, over the long run, justice will be done—and that justice is more likely to prevail when the public is fully informed.

There will be a temptation to take the position that the public is, in any event, to be protected. But on this issue I honestly believe that it would be better to have no legislation than limited legislation. I want to reiterate that we are confronted here with an issue of constitutional dimensions, and to accept any limitations whatever on the newsman's right to protect his news sources will simply dilute that right—and to invite future and more severe limitations.
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LAWTON M. CALHOUN
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lawton M. Calhoun of Savannah, Ga., is a man who stands as a giant among Americans by virtue of his unselfish dedication to community service and his tireless efforts to insulate that city and its State continue on a path of achievement.

Mr. Calhoun has retired as president and chairman of the board of the Savannah Foods and Industries, Inc., the only major industry in Savannah that is home owned. He has recently been honored by the presentation of the Dyer Memorial Award as the “Sugar Man of the South” for 1972. I would like to take this opportunity to add my congratulations to the many salutes which Mr. Calhoun has received.

Lawton Calhoun is one of those hardy men of our country who can make a difference in the daily life of his community. He has the heart, the skill, the energy, and the foresight to be a leader and a mover. His loss to the daily...
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business world has been a great gain for my congressional district because he is now freer to devote even more time to the life of his community. At this point, I would like to introduce into the Record an article from the Savannah Morning News, an editorial from the Savannah Evening Press, and the citation which Mr. Calhoun Memorial Award Committee issued that all provide a wonderful insight into Mr. Calhoun's role in the life of the State of Georgia.

DYRE MEMORIAL AWARD "SUGAR MAN OF THE YEAR 1972" TO LAWTON M. CALHOUN, CITATION FOR SIGNIFICANT AND MERITORIOUS SERVICE TO THE SUGAR INDUSTRY

For his significant and meritorious service to the sugar community during his nearly 40 years in the industry, Lawton M. Calhoun is hereby commended.

As Chairman of The Sugar Association, Inc., he early recognized that sugar must be actively promoted as a wholesome nutritious source of energy.

As Chairman of The Association's Ad Hoc Committee, he was instrumental in organizing Colorado Sugar Refineries Association, initiating and conducting investigations on sugar sufficiently into the results.

Active in directing the affairs of the United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, his knowledge of the industry and his integrity helped make him welcome in the hallowed halls of Congress as he was among the peers in the commercial arena.

More than his accomplishments was the man, possessing the highest integrity with a great appreciation of human relationships and an understanding of other individuals' problems.

His wise counsel and forthrightness are appreciated by a grateful industry which long will remember his outstanding contributions in its behalf.

LAWTON M. CALHOUN, who retired last year as chairman of the board, president, and chief executive officer of Savannah Foods and Industries, received a giant silver cup, presented at a luncheon in New York City Monday.

The presentation was made by John B. Bunker, president of Holly Sugar Corporation of Colorado Springs, Colo., who was chairman of the three-man judging panel. Other judges were H. B. Marshall, president of the California and Hawaiian Sugar Co. of San Francisco, Calif., and Robert A. Port of the Imperial Sugar Co. of Sugarland, Tex.

The citation for the 15th annual presentation of the award noted that Calhoun during his nearly 40 years in the industry served for a period as chairman of the Sugar Association, in organizing the International Sugar Research Foundation, a worldwide body dedicated to initiating and conducting investigations on sugar and disseminating the results. "The Sugar Man of the Year" award was established in 1959 as a memorial to the late B. W. Dyer, a founder of B. W. Dyer and Co., sugar economists and brokers of New York City.

Calhoun joined the Savannah office of Lamborn and Co., general brokers for the sugar refining industry, in 1924. In 1940, he accepted a job as assistant sales manager for the sugar refinery.

CAMBODIA AND THE KENT STATE TRAGEDY

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCFALL). Under a previous order of the House, the member from Ohio (Mr. STEINBERG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEINBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some observations in connection with the action of the House today.

It has been less than a week since the third anniversary of the shooting of the four students at Kent State University, which happens to be in my congressional district. The tragedy that occurred on May 4, 1970, at Kent State, was the direct result of the invasion of Cambodia by the U.S. military forces, an action which was taken without any prior consultation between the President and any of the leadership in Congress, let alone any authorization from the Congress.

Today, after over 3 years, the House of Representatives has finally taken action toward ending the last vestiges of that illegal action.

What a tragedy it is that as a result of the Cambodian misadventures, not only many soldiers had to die, not only many civilians had to die, not only thousands were wounded, not only were our own students and our young people in uniform pitted against each other, but our Nation's economy has been damaged, our country divided and the strength of Congress weakened. Now it is possible to begin efforts to redress these losses. The House took the first step today. The second step required is that we restore the tradition in which our Nation's economy be not weakened.

There was a grand jury investigation, by the State of Ohio, of the Kent State tragedy, and it resulted not in action against any of the persons responsible for pulling triggers who fired the bullets, but in an indictment of students and members of the faculty.

I might say that those indictments were later thrown out by the federal court, and the report of the grand jury was ordered destroyed by that court.

The Scranton Commission, in its report on the Kent State tragedy, did not ask the students, National Guardmen, and others watch all the questions they could have asked, for the reason that they were given an understanding that the Department of Justice had decided there would be a Federal grand jury investigation. As it turned out, there was no such investigation, despite the fact that the FBI was conducting a very thorough inquiry which certainly raised the possibility that there was a basis for further investigation by a grand jury.

The then Attorney General, Mr. Mitchell, finally stated to the press that there would be no grand jury investigation, but he advanced no substantive reasons why. Ever since then, some of us have been trying to get from him and his successors a statement of the reasons why there was no such investigation.

Now, nobody is anxious to see our young men and women put through that kind of an experience, but the people of this country are entitled, especially in situations as serious and as crucial as the Kent State tragedy, to have the normal processes of law applied to all cases of suspected violations of the law, or they are entitled full explanation from the responsible officials as to why the normal processes cannot be followed.

The entire country is now rightly demanding that the Justice Department act, with respect to the "Watergate" incidents, to be sure that there are no reasonable doubts that full justice has been done. Certainly the people of our country, especially the young people are entitled to no less with respect to the Kent State incidents.

Now we are about to get a new Attorney General, and I am going to go to him and make one more effort to get either a statement that there will be an investigation by a Federal grand jury or a statement as to the reasons why that is not necessary or desirable. We must be able to tell the world that justice is still evenhanded in this country.

There is one final thing that we must do, and that is going to devolve upon the Congress. We must consider proper legislation to restore the constitutional use of military troops in civil disturbances, so that that kind of a tragedy will not be likely again. The tradition of a position under the Constitution, martial law cannot supplant civil law except when the courts and civilian government are not able to function. Furthermore, the courts have held
that when troops are used to augment civilian law enforcement resources, they must at all times be subject to the civilian authorities and take their orders from the civilian authorities.

The National Guardsmen were put in a most untenable position by the Governor of the State of Ohio when they were sent in to Kent State 3 years ago. They were sent in as a result of the courts and the civilian authorities being functioning as normal. Nevertheless, the Governor instructed the commanding officer that he was not to make all the decisions as to what action the troops would take and that he was wrong as a matter of law. It was wrong as a matter of policy. It was wrong for the soldiers and wrong for the civilians. And it resulted in the unnecessary and unwarranted shooting of civilians.

Mr. Speaker, I intend at the appropriate time to introduce legislation to prevent this sort of abuse in the future. In the meantime, Henry Kissinger’s plea to the attention of my colleagues two newspaper articles on the anniversary of the Kent State tragedy: one from the New York Times by James A. Wechsler, and one from the New York Times by Peter Davies.

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

The newspaper articles are as follows:

KENT STATE TO WATERGATE

(By James A. Wechsler)

On this third anniversary of the Kent State shootings, it is appropriate to consider the role of the Federal Government in the tragedy.

This anniversary is tinged with unusual poignancy and irony. Mr. Nixon had portrayed the Cambodian action as designed "to protect our men who are in Vietnam and to guarantee the success of our withdrawal and Vietnamization process." Now, with the Vietnamese withdrawal presumably completed, the rain of U.S. bombs over Cambodia is heavier and more ruthless than ever before.

Meanwhile, the "blood-splattered pages of our national tragedy" that reappeared in the newspapers last week as a result of the National Guard’s attempt to disperse a demonstration that had gathered outside Kent State University, killing four students and wounding nine others, one of whom may never walk again. The bloodshed climaxd a series of student protests across the nation over President Nixon’s chilling announcement of the U.S. "incursion" into Cambodia.

This anniversary is tinged with unusual poignancy and irony. Mr. Nixon had portrayed the Cambodian action as designed "to protect our men who are in Vietnam and to guarantee the success of our withdrawal and Vietnamization process." Now, with the Vietnamese withdrawal presumably completed, the rain of U.S. bombs over Cambodia is heavier and more ruthless than ever before.

The Kent State tragedy, steady and relentless pressure for a grand jury inquiry has been mounted with no result. Especially now, as the nation’s conscience is exposed on a wide front and its spokesmen pleading for mercy and tolerance for transgressors in its rank who were being treated by the Administration as criminals.

"... One clung to a faint hope that the shock [of the deaths] would elect some shred of truth in Washington places. Instead there emerged the lines of Presidential ‘sadness’ accompanied by the President’s statement judgment that ‘when dissent turns to violence it invites tragedy.’ Nowhere was there even a hint of Presidential resolve to seek punishment for those who had shot down the students.”

Subsequent inquiries and disclosures dramatized the contempt of both justice and truth that has governed the Administration’s response to the slaughter of innocents.

A newspaper investigation showed that a detailed FBI report, describing "fabricated" testimony by the police, had been suppressed and "placed under lock and key for 75 years.”

Five months after the shootings, a special report by the President’s Commission on Campus Disruption, headed by former Gov. Scranston, declared: "The rally was peaceful, and there was apparent impending violence. Only when the Guard attempted to disperse the rally did some students resist violently... The indiscriminate firing of rifles into a crowd of students... The described were unnecessary, unwarranted and inexcusable.”

Like the reports of other federal commissions, it did not point out or blame the Administration as if it had never been submitted.

Now, after the day of horror, it is appropriate to consider the role of the Federal Government in the tragedy.

A BITTER ANNIVERSARY

(By Peter Davies)

Three years ago today several hundred students gathered at noon on the campus of Kent State to protest the invasion of Cambodia and the continued presence of Ohio National Guard troops. Twenty minutes later a fusillade of gunfire left four students dead and nine more wounded, all victims of military ammunition.

Before that day, there had been a clear picture of events. President Nixon reacted to the massacre by saying that whenever dissent turned to violence it "invited" tragedy. In other words, he had approved it. This hasty and ill-advised statement not only set the tone for public condemnation of the students, regardless of the fact, but so politically charged the incident that one of the two girls killed by the guardsmen immediately faced obstruction of justice by the Nixon Administration.

Today his fears have proven to be well-founded.

In October, 1976, a lengthy Justice Department summary of the FBI investigation raised a multitude of questions concerning President Nixon’s statement to a conduct of a few Ohio Guardsmen that it appeared inevitable that a federal and county jury would have to be convened to discover the political sensitivity.

Ten months later, on Aug. 13, 1971, John N. Mitchell, then Attorney General, calmly announced his decision to bury these questions, unanswerable. He said, was “unnecessary, unwarranted and inexcusable,” there was insufficient evidence to warrant a grand jury investigation. He even went so far as to say he was satisfied “that the Department of Justice has taken every possible action to serve justice.” That, perhaps, was the most contemptible remark Mitchell ever made on the Kent State case, and today we have a clearer understanding of how he had to say it.

If John Mitchell can participate in meetings at which plans are discussed and recommended in the conduct ofburglarizing the Democratic party headquarters at the Watergate—as it is said he did— and do so as Attorney General of the United States, then anything such a man says is suspect. If Mitchell can so emphatically tell people Americans that he had no prior knowledge whatsoever of the Watergate burglarizing operation, when he knew plenty, then he can just as emphatically fool us on Kent State with his ridiculous claim that there is not enough evidence just to convene a grand jury inquiry.

A SALUTE TO AMERICA’S ALIY—

THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I have been pleased over the recent easing of tensions between ourselves and the People’s Republic of China, especially the opportunity it has given us for new diplomatic initiatives in dealing with the Communist world, for example, the cease-fire agreement in Vietnam, and the new opportunities for a relaxation of tensions between the Soviet Union in the Middle East and elsewhere.

Nevertheless, in recognizing these positive achievements of the new Nixon-Kissinger foreign policy, it is extremely important that we do not get so carried away with these new departures that we forget our long-time friends, especially the Chiang government. The free Republic of China on the island of Taiwan.

I had the unique opportunity to visit Taiwan in July 1971 at the invitation of the Chinese Government for the annual Captive Nations’ Week observance in Taipei. I wish all my colleagues might have such an opportunity so that they could see for themselves the achievements wrought by the Chiang government. This has been nothing short
of an economic miracle, and it has been made possible in part by the support and assistance of the United States. Our commitment to Nationalist China has been a longstanding one which has been beneficial for both our countries. Unfortunately the new Asian diplomatic policy has given us a false sense of security.

The remarkable thing is the continuing vigorous, strength, and resiliency demonstrated by the Chinese Government as well as by the Chinese people themselves. Though shocked—more so than the Japanese—by the abrupt change in American diplomatic direction in 1971, the Republic of China has not allowed its relations with us to become embittered, which one might well have expected. And even the diplomatic rupture with Japan, as I understand it, has not damaged too much of that very powerful economic relationship which had grown up between those two countries in the years since the end of World War II.

But what of the future? Of course the Peking agreement refers to some closer future relationship between us and the government of mainland China. But it is not very specific and in any event it is something left for a distant and vague future. That is as it should be, Mr. Speaker, because the present relationship between ourselves and the People's Republic of China does not need to be based on Taiwan in any way. It is based on the harsh reality of over 40 Soviet combat divisions stationed on the northern border of mainland China; and our cooperation with China is profitable to us as a counter and a deterrent to that Soviet military threat quite apart from any commitment to push Taiwan into her orbit.

So let there be no talk, Mr. Speaker, of "turning over" Taiwan to the mainland government. The government of the Republic of China has shown it can stand strong and tall on its own two feet. Its future must be decided by its own people, not settled in any diplomatic smoke-filled room agreement. Let us reaffirm that conviction today.

CONCERNING AN ASIAN STUDIES INSTITUTE IN HAWAII

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, a college-age friend told me something when he was joking with me a few days ago which reminded me of the Federal Government's approach to Asian studies.

"My friend said that whenever he is tired of studying he just "lays his head on the book, takes a nice nap and relies on good old osmosis."

Osmosis, as you recall, is the principle that liquids diffuse across one memran into another until each holds an equal amount of the other's contents. It seems to me too many Americans in our Government now rely on a miracle of "intellectual osmosis" for the vast cultural heritage of Asia. It is something left for a distant and vague future, that conviction today.

As is well known, this Nation is at a peak of interest in the present history, science, and arts of Asia. Yet those of us who were educated in American schools find ourselves sadly lacking in knowledge of even the most basic facts about Asia. After all, we were taught that the root of our civilization is in the West.

Educated in this system where Asian countries were passed to us part of the undeveloped world with little to offer, we found ourselves poorly prepared to understand and learn from the many Asians who know so much more about us than we know of them.

We give such promise to American educators, but were never appropriated. The act still awaits us, a hollow shell without the funds to fill its promise.

My bill proposes to establish an Asian Studies Institute administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to parallel in Asian education the current extensive Asian library of American scholars, libraries and facilities, free of charge to American and to Asian scholars.

The bill also authorizes the construction of a national Asian Studies library which is long overdue. We are in the midst of an information explosion internationally. Information is coming into our centers of learning faster than these centers can equalize or even provide books to house the growing shelves of voluminous data.

The current extensive Asian library of over 300,000 volumes at the University of Pennsylvania, at the University of Colorado, at the University of California, to name only a few, students are spreading from undergraduate to graduate work which will bring to this Nation the expertise it so badly needs.

But scholarly resources for students of Asian humanities and cultures are badly scattered across the Nation. There is no single center to gather these resources and give students a library and faculty to centralize the needs of the advanced scholar. Neither is there a national center to develop a curriculum of Asian studies for elementary and secondary educators.

However, the framework to begin a center does exist. In 1966 this Congress passed the International Education Act to revitalize our entire foreign studies effort. The objective of this act was:

"That strong American educational resources are a necessary base in strengthening relations with other countries; and that with this base and future generations of Americans should be assured of ample opportunity to develop to the fullest extent their intellectual capacities through contacts with other countries, peoples, and cultures."

We showed such foresight in passing the act. We anticipated the future needs. We gave such promise to American educators and were never appropriated. This act still awaits us, a hollow shell without the fund to fill its promise.

The Institute would not be designed to provide isolated experts in Asian studies, but to pool the collected competence of scholars, libraries and facilities, free of charge to American and to Asian scholars.

The bill also authorizes the construction of a national Asian Studies library which is long overdue. We are in the midst of an information explosion internationally. Information is coming into our centers of learning faster than these centers can provide shelves to house the books and files to hold the scholarly papers.

The current extensive Asian library of over 300,000 volumes at the University of Pennsylvania is crammed into basements, scattered in quonset huts and packed into overflowing shelves thus reducing the books valuable availability to scholars from throughout the world coming to Pennsylvania these volumes.
in the United States. This tragic waste could be stopped if our Nation built a library with centralized files to keep up with the rush of information coming to us from Asia.

This point leads me to another disturbing problem. Asian heritage children attending American schools find themselves without knowledgeable teachers to inform them of Asian past and present which constitutes the children's particular ethnic identity.

These children of Asian heritage are joined in their desire to know about the eastern world by their Western, African, and Latin American heritage classmates. We must depend on developing the interest of our children into the intellectual commitment to provide us scholars and informed adults in the future.

A weakness of the present East-West Center established at the University of Hawaii in 1960 is that it lacks this element of further dissemination of Asian studies to the elementary and secondary students across our Nation. The center concentrates on disseminating technical information to Asians, but does little to educate Americans about Asia.

The administration of the East-West Center by the Department of State and Agency for International Development has not provided a framework to expand cultural knowledge of Asia to our citizens. I can think of no one in this Congress who would disagree with me that it would be inappropriate and strongly undesirable to invest the education of our own citizens in an arm of the Department of State.

My bill provides for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to disseminate a knowledge of Asia throughout our education system on par with a knowledge of Western civilization.

The East-West Center now operates on the limited assumption that Asia has the problems and we are here to educate them with our solutions. My bill would be a new, more useful assumption: all nations of this world have some valuable knowledge for Americans.

The bill calls for aiding some of the 145,000 foreign students currently across our Nation. They have much more to share than a single day of singing and dancing where they are exhibited like oddities from a human zoo.

The bill would give training grants to teachers willing to teach Asian languages in high schools and grade schools. How else except through shared languages can our citizens commingle with the rest of the world with something other than the big stick of militarism?

The bill calls for curriculum development to investigate the study of Asian history, art, literature, music, sciences, culture, sociology, religion, philosophy and science into general course. For adults scholars regular seminars, visiting professorships, community service, workshops, and experimental projects in Asian studies would be supported by Federal funds and Federal acknowledgment of our need to close the gap between Asia and ourselves.

Only by understanding the achievements of Asia will the next generation be able to live intelligently and compassionately without the periodic internationals and Asians on battlefields of shared bigotry.

HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION ACT

(MRS. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Race and to include extraneous matter.)

MRS. MINK, Mr. Speaker, in 1921, Congress passed the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act to help rehabilitate the people of Hawaiian ancestry, socially, economically and educationally through homesteading. After 52 years of the Commission's existence, it is interesting to read how this act is affecting the people of Hawaiian ancestry today and how it will affect future generations.

In a recent prince Kuhio essay contest sponsored by the State Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs, Miss Victoria Kai would have received a substantial increase in the Hawaiian Homes Lands at Midpoint, Its Problems, Progress and Prognosis. Miss Kai is a senior at St. Joseph High School in Hilo. Hawaii, prince Kuhio Kalaianaloa, as you know, was one of Hawaii's delegates to Congress from 1903 to 1922. He was the author of the Hawaiian Home Commission bill.

I am proud to insert in the Raceo her winning essay which provides us with factual and critical comments regarding this vital program for the Hawaiian people.

THE HAWAIIAN HOMES LANDS AT MIDPOINT
(My Victoria Kai)

The Hawaiian Homes Program under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1921 was intended for the rehabilitation of the Hawaiian people. It was determined that the Hawaiian people should be given the opportunity to earn a living and live independently by homesteading.

The Hawaiian Homes Program under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1921 was intended for the rehabilitation of the Hawaiian people. It was determined that the Hawaiian people should be given the opportunity to earn a living and live independently by homesteading. The Hawaiian Homes Program was designed to assist the Hawaiian people in their struggle to achieve self-sufficiency.
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