

shall be considered to be expenditures by the candidate of such party for the office of President.

"(e) DEFINITION OF IMMEDIATE FAMILY.—For purposes of subsection (d), the term 'immediate family' means a candidate's spouse, and any child, parent, grandparent, brother, or sister of the candidate, and the spouses of such persons."

**PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE CANDIDATES; INSUFFICIENT AMOUNTS IN FUND**

SEC. 302. (a) Section 9006 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to payments to eligible candidates) is amended by striking out subsection (b) thereof and by redesignating subsection (c) and subsection (d) as subsection (a) and subsection (c), respectively.

(b) Section 9006(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to insufficient amounts in fund), as so redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In any case in which the Secretary or his delegate determines that there are insufficient moneys in the fund to make payments under subsection (b), section 9008(b)(3), and section 9037(b), moneys shall not be made available from any other source for the purpose of making such payments."

**PROVISION OF LEGAL OR ACCOUNTING SERVICES**

SEC. 303. Section 9008(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to limitation of expenditures) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) PROVISION OF LEGAL OR ACCOUNTING SERVICES.—For purposes of this section, the payment, by any person other than the national committee of a political party, of compensation to any person for any legal or accounting services rendered to or on behalf of the national committee of a political party shall not be treated as an expenditure made by or on behalf of such national committee with respect to the presidential nominating convention of the political party involved."

**REVIEW OF REGULATIONS**

SEC. 304. (a) Section 9009(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to review of regulations) is amended—

(1) by inserting ", in whole or in part," immediately after "disapprove"; and

(2) by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentences: "Whenever a committee of the House of Representatives reports any resolutions relating to any such rule or regulation, it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. The motion is highly privileged and is not debatable. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to."

(b) Section 9039(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to review of regulations) is amended—

(1) by inserting ", in whole or in part," immediately after "disapprove"; and

(2) by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentences: "Whenever a committee of the House of Representatives reports any resolution relating to any such rule or regulation, it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. The motion is highly privileged and is not debatable. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to."

**ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENTS**

SEC. 305. Section 9033(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to ex-

pense limitation; declaration of intent; minimum contributions) is amended by striking out "limitation" and inserting in lieu thereof "limitations".

**QUALIFIED CAMPAIGN EXPENSE LIMITATION**

SEC. 306. (a) Section 9035 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to qualified campaign expense limitation) is amended—

(1) in the heading thereof, by striking out "LIMITATION" and inserting in lieu thereof "LIMITATIONS";

(2) by inserting "(a) EXPENDITURE LIMITATIONS.—" immediately before "No candidate";

(3) by inserting immediately after "States Code" the following: ", and no candidate shall knowingly make expenditures from his personal funds, or the personal funds of his immediate family, in connection with his campaign for nomination for election to the office of President in excess of, in the aggregate, \$50,000"; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) DEFINITION OF IMMEDIATE FAMILY.—For purposes of this section, the term 'immediate family' means a candidate's spouse, and any child, parent, grandparent, brother, or sister of the candidate, and the spouses of such persons."

(b) The table of sections for chapter 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out the item relating to section 9035 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 9035. Qualified campaign expense limitations."

**RETURN OF FEDERAL MATCHING PAYMENTS**

SEC. 307. (a) (1) Section 9002(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining candidate) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The term 'candidate' shall not include any individual who has ceased actively to seek election to the office of President of the United States or to the office of Vice President of the United States, in more than one State."

(2) Section 9003 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to condition for eligibility for payments) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) WITHDRAWAL BY CANDIDATE.—In any case in which an individual ceases to be a candidate as a result of the operation of the last sentence of section 9002(2), such individual—

"(1) shall no longer be eligible to receive any payments under section 9006; and

"(2) shall pay to the Secretary, as soon as practicable after the date upon which such individual ceases to be a candidate, an amount equal to the amount of payments received by such individual under section 9006 which are not used to defray qualified campaign expenses."

(b) (1) Section 9032(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining candidate) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The term 'candidate' shall not include any individual who is not actively conducting campaigns in more than one State in connection with seeking nomination for election to be President of the United States."

(2) Section 9033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to eligibility for payments) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) WITHDRAWAL BY CANDIDATE.—In any case in which an individual ceases to be a candidate as a result of the operation of the last sentence of section 9032(2), such individual—

"(1) shall no longer be eligible to receive any payments under section 9037; and

"(2) notwithstanding the provisions of section 9038(b)(3), shall pay to the Secretary, as soon as practicable after the date

upon which such individual ceases to be a candidate, an amount equal to the amount of payments received by such individual under section 9037 which are not used to defray qualified campaign expenses."

**TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS**

SEC. 308. (a) Section 9008(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to adjustment of entitlements) is amended—

(1) by striking out "section 608(c) and section 608(f) of title 18, United States Code," and inserting in lieu thereof "section 320(b) and section 320(d) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971"; and

(2) by striking out "section 608(d) of such title" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 320(c) of such Act".

(b) Section 9034(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to limitations) is amended by striking out "section 608(c) (1) (A) of title 18, United States Code" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 320(b)(1) (A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971".

(c) Section 9035(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to expenditure limitations), as so redesignated by section 306(a), is amended by striking out "section 608(c) (1) (A) of title 18, United States Code" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 320(b)(1) (A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971".

Amend the title so as to read "An Act to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide that members of the Federal Election Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and for other purposes."

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 12406) was laid on the table.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 606, ATLANTIC CONVENTION**

Mr. SISK, Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1085 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. Res. 1085**

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 606) to call an Atlantic Convention. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 min-

utes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1085 provides for consideration of House Joint Resolution 606 to create an Atlantic Convention delegation. This is a simple 1-hour open rule with time equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

House Joint Resolution 606 creates an 18-member delegation to organize and participate in a convention of North Atlantic Treaty parliamentary democracies as well as any other parliamentary democracies which the convention might wish to invite. The purpose of the convention is to explore the possibility of arriving at some common goal to create greater unity among the Atlantic nations.

Resolutions to create a delegation and to call an Atlantic Convention have been introduced in a number of Congresses since 1949. In the 94th Congress, 110 Members sponsored or cosponsored House Joint Resolution 606 and its companion measures indicating a broad bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt House Resolution 1085 so that we may proceed to consideration of House Joint Resolution 606.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped, of course, that we might go ahead and adopt this rule rather quickly and permit the Committee on International Relations to discuss the merits of the bill. However, I have had some requests for time; and therefore, apparently there will be some discussion. I would hope that we can stay away from the merits of the bill, though, and discuss procedure, because really that is all we have involved at this particular point, which is whether or not the House should have the opportunity to actually discuss this Atlantic Convention issue.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in view of the late hour, it is with some reluctance that I undertake to discuss the substantive nature of the resolution which would be made in order under House Resolution 1085, namely, the joint resolution calling for an Atlantic Convention. However, I have been informed that there may be an effort to defeat the rule, which would make it impossible, of course, for us to undertake a more thorough discussion of the question.

There, Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes I would hope to explain why I think we should today adopt the rule which makes in order consideration of House Joint Resolution 606, which provides for the convening of an Atlantic Convention.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1085 is a simple 1-hour open rule making in order House consideration of House Joint Resolution 606 which provides for the convening of an Atlantic Convention.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a longtime supporter and cosponsor of the Atlantic

Convention resolutions authored by my good friend and colleague from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), in the past four Congresses. In this Congress, the resolution has been cosponsored by 110 Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution has had rough sledding in past Congresses mainly because there has been considerable misunderstanding and misinformation about what it would do. Contrary to some reports spread about this resolution, the delegates to the Atlantic Convention could not barter away our sovereignty or enter into any binding agreements with other parties to the convention. The language of the resolution is quite explicit in this regard, and I quote:

The convention's recommendations shall be submitted to the Congress for action under constitutional process.

Moreover, the resolution makes quite clear that our delegates will not be acting in an official capacity for the U.S. Government in the sense that they will be acting under instructions from the President or State Department. To quote from the relevant provision:

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

So I think it should be quite clear from any objective reading of the resolution that this will be a purely advisory and recommendatory body, and that any recommendations which flow from the Convention must be submitted to the Congress under normal constitutional processes and procedures.

What then is the purpose of this resolution and the Atlantic Convention it authorizes our participation in? Essentially it is to bring together delegates from North Atlantic Treaty parliamentary democracies and other democracies to explore the possibility of agreement on transforming our present relationship "into a more effective unity based on Federal or other democratic principles." The Convention would be convened to draft a declaration embodying this goal, a timetable for its attainment, and to propose a commission or other means to facilitate this transition.

Mr. Speaker, the question naturally arises, is there a need for such an Atlantic Convention? I think there clearly is. I read with interest an article in last Saturday's New York Times by Drew Middleton based on an interview with Gen. Alexander M. Haig, the commander of allied forces in Europe. General Haig expressed concern about Soviet expansionist policies and said the "important objective" is to develop a Western consensus and "hopefully to achieve some corrective action and policies with respect to these global events." General Haig went on to say, and I quote:

To the degree that the United States is perceived as reliable or hibernated, it's understandable that West Europeans should grope for some other framework, some other structure to provide what they perceive to be their essential security needs.

The general added that the West cannot indulge in competitive arrangements but needs, and I quote:

The collective resources of the entire Atlantic community to meet this growing global Soviet threat.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Atlantic Convention proposed by this resolution can assist in that goal of bringing the Western democracies into closer unity to preserve and protect those cherished democratic principles which we commonly hold.

Mr. Speaker, our former U.N. Ambassador, Mr. Moynihan, often expounded on the shrinking number of democratic nations around the world and the fact that democracy is under attack today. The remaining democratic nations are having significant internal problems as well. I am reminded of a report by the Trilateral Commission's Task Force on the Governability of Democracies which was released in May of last year. The task force concluded that the democratic political systems in the trilateral regions—Europe, United States, Japan—have "entered a more difficult and uncertain phase, particularly in Europe and the United States. The demands on democratic government have grown, while the capacity of democratic government seems to have shrunk." In short, these democratic nations are becoming increasingly ungovernable. The task force recommended seven "arenas for action" in strengthening our political systems and securing their democratic foundations. One of these recommendations was the "creation of new institutions for the cooperative promotion of democracy" so that democratic countries could "learn from each other's experience how to make democracy function more effectively in their societies." To quote from the task force report:

Such mutual learning experiences are familiar phenomena in the economic and military fields; they must also be encouraged in the political field.

Mr. Speaker, I think the proposed Atlantic Convention and the recommendations which flow from it can help to perform this function of achieving the cooperative promotion of democracy which is under stress from without and from within. I find it difficult to comprehend that there are those who oppose this resolution on the grounds that it is somehow going to weaken our democracy or reduce our sovereignty. If anything, it should bring about the opposite effect of helping to shore up and strengthen western democratic institutions and thereby increase their abilities to resist totalitarian advances and to govern themselves more effectively.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate that this resolution is no panacea for solving the problems of Western democracies, I do think it is an important first step in that direction and a very worthwhile undertaking. I strongly support the resolution and urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution and I hope, therefore, that the Members will adopt the rule so that not only the author of the resolution, my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), but his cosponsors as well may have the opportunity of an hour of general debate to further explain their rationale in support of this proposition.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. KAZEN).

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule which makes in order House Joint Resolution 606.

House Joint Resolution 606 offers an idea whose time has come—and passed. There was a time when our Nation looked abroad, when our leaders pondered what course they should follow to gain strength and support from other nations. We sent diplomatic envoys to European capitals, their hats in their hands, asking help. Those events, though, happened 200 years ago. Now we are celebrating the bicentennial of our independence. I believe it is strange indeed, in this Bicentennial Year, that we are asked, in the opening words of this resolution, to work for—and I quote—“a more perfect union of the Atlantic Community.”

I have compared this resolution with one proposed in the 93d Congress, House Joint Resolution 205. The preambles differ, but the bodies of the two resolutions are the same. We in the House refused a rule for consideration of this matter in the first session of the 93d Congress, and I say the arguments for it today are no better than they were then. In fact, in this Bicentennial Year, those arguments are even weaker.

I know that the phrase “a more perfect union” is taken from the preamble to our Constitution. I share with other Members of this House the desire and the obligation to make our United States “a more perfect union.” I respectfully suggest that all the energy we have, all the hours of each day, can well be used in this effort.

This resolution, perhaps carefully, calls for no action now. But is not the call for an Atlantic Convention, the term of the short title of this resolution, actually an expression of intent? Are we not voting support for an idea if, as provided in this resolution, we create a delegation of 18 members, 6 to be named by our Speaker, 6 by the President of the Senate, and 6 by the President of the United States—are we not saying to other nations that the Congress favors—and again I quote, “more effective unity based on federal and democratic principles.”

Where would this language lead us? Are we not asked to open a door and put our Government's foot in it? I see no wisdom in this course.

I am also concerned, in a different way, with another element of this resolution. On line 5 of page 3, subparagraph (d), it states—

All members of the delegation shall be free from official instructions, and free to speak and vote individually at the convention.

We are saying that officially appointed delegates, spending taxpayers' money, are told in advance that they speak only for themselves. This means they would have no stature in an international meeting. On the other hand, if they speak only for themselves, how in the world could they expect the Congress of the

United States or our Government to stand behind them?

I wonder how this sentence got into the resolution. Are the advocates who have pressed for this plan for years expecting to be appointed delegates? Do they want to go to an international meeting with no responsibility to and no instructions from the State Department, the President, or the Congress?

But there is another basic point to be considered here. What evidence is there that other nations seek to be closer to us in this “more effective federal union.” History shows us that back in 1960 the Congress considered this same proposal. The legislation passed and a delegation went to Paris for a meeting. The delegates came home, made their report, and the whole project died, because there was not sufficient interest abroad or at home to keep it alive.

Then in 1962 a meeting was held in Paris, to which Members of this House were invited. The only one to accept was Peter Frelinghuysen of New Jersey, a distinguished member of what we then called our Foreign Relations Committee. On his return, he reported that the only time the question of an Atlantic Conference was raised was when he asked Europeans about their interest. They told him, he said, that they were not interested. That was the situation in 1960. It was the situation in 1963. It is the situation today.

Mr. Speaker, they are suspicious of us and our intentions, and this concept will not work in the world as we know it today. Take into account the economics of inflation, the monetary imbalances, the military situation in the various nations. Remember that France has pulled out of NATO, and other countries are threatening to take the same action if their national needs are not met. It might not be useful to catalogue here the details of this argument, but I believe the facts are known to all of us.

We are told this plan will strengthen NATO, but I say it could encompass far more than the Atlantic community. On page 2, lines 5 and 6, we are told the meeting would be open to delegations from North Atlantic Treaty parliamentary democracies and other parliamentary democracies the convention might invite. Such a plan could easily get out of hand.

Our Nation needs the effort, the energy, and the dedication of every one of us—indeed, of every citizen—if we are to have “a more perfect union” here at home. As we observe our Bicentennial, we have an obligation to rededicate ourselves to the principles of freedom with independence laid down by our Founding Fathers. Let us not be diverted from that obligation. In a spirit of devotion to our duties, let us reject this rule and the resolution.

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

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman on his statement. I think this is a

very serious matter requiring careful attention.

On the one hand proponents of this resolution say we will not lose any of our sovereignty if this resolution is adopted. On the other hand they say this is an important resolution and it will do a great deal toward forging a more effective unity. We cannot have it both ways. Either it does something or it does not. If it does something, I do not think it is something we ought to do. If it does not, why should we bother with it and lead to false expectations on the part of western parliamentary democracies.

Mr. KAZEN. What bothers me about it is that we have not had any indication from other countries that they want this. We have been down this road before. We even sent delegates to this type convention. We were there by ourselves. Nobody else was interested. What makes us think they are interested in it now?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WHITEHURST).

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

I think that much of the difference that divides us is semantic and not of substance. If I thought for one moment that this resolution would lead to compromising our sovereignty one iota I would not be standing in support of it. I do not believe that.

I do believe the joint resolution could lead to a strengthening of the NATO Alliance and the community of interest we have with the nations of Western Europe.

I think it comes at a significant time.

For that reason I stand here in support of the rule and I expect to support the joint resolution with the changes which I hope will allay some of the fears that have been raised about this legislation.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat awkward in appearing in opposition to the point of view expressed by my very close personal friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. KAZEN). There is not another Member of this House whose sincerity and integrity I respect more. In this instance, however, I think the gentleman's apprehensions are unfounded.

Let us read exactly what the resolution would do. It would authorize us to “participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty parliamentary democracies as desire to join in the enterprise, and other parliamentary democracies the convention may invite.”

Certainly in this heterogeneous world those of us who believe in the foundation principles of parliamentary democracy ought to find ways to draw together and cooperate. Is there anything wrong in that?

This convention will be authorized to “explore the possibility of agreement.” Now, is there anything wrong with ex-

ploring the possibility of agreement? Surely, it does not commit us to any agreement. Why would we want to deny our country the right to join with other like-minded countries, those that believe in parliamentary democracy, to explore the possibility of agreement?

Such an agreement might, according to the resolution, develop "more effective unity." Now, what is wrong with more effective unity among those nations of the world who embrace parliamentary democracy?

It seems to me the words that follow have excited and alarmed some people. The words of the resolution describe a more effective unity "based on Federal or other democratic principles." It seems to me that these are the scare words which cause people to see invasions of our national freedom lurking under the veil.

"Federal or other democratic principles." Perhaps some people feel that this presages a kind of suggestion that was made during World War II by Winston Churchill when he offered to the people of France in their hour of darkest need the privileges of common citizenship and common currency with his own people. That would have been one extreme form, perhaps, of an agreement based on Federal or other democratic principles. In behalf of the people of France, their government in exile speaking through General De Gaulle, rejected that offer, so nothing came of it.

NATO itself might be considered an exercise in "Federal or other democratic principles" to achieve more effective unity in common defense. Is there anything wrong with that? Are there Members who would object to our participation in NATO for the military defense of parliamentary democracy for the Western world?

The Common Markets might be regarded as exercises in more effective unity based upon "Federal or other democratic principles" for the purpose of reducing barriers to free trade and promoting interchange of commerce between nations.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, are there those of us who are frightened at the prospects of agreements of that kind? The Organization of American States, of which we are a part and a participant, might be considered as a seeking for more effective unity based on Federal or other democratic principles.

I would remind my friends that there are nations in the world that do not always wish us well which have organized and banded together to seek more effective unity among themselves. I think in terms of the OPEC nations. There is a more effective unity, not necessarily designed for our good.

Mr. Speaker, shall we not organize among those like-minded with us to seek ways of promoting our common in-

terests? Is there anything frightening in that?

I have in my hand a letter sent to many of our colleagues by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, an organization of which I have been a member for the last 30 years and in which I once was a rather active member when time permitted me to be before I came to Congress.

I think they are unduly alarmed. The letter says:

The issue is not to call an Atlantic Convention. The real issue is whether we Americans opt for independence or dependence upon others.

Well, I do not see that this is the issue at all. There is nothing in this resolution that would indicate any particular increase in our dependence upon others. Are we not dependent today upon the OPEC countries? We certainly are dependent upon them for our energy supplies and for the maintenance of our way of life. Shall we not, then, organize with our friends who share common interests with us in reducing that dependency?

Are we not today dependent upon the actions and designs of Soviet Union for the amount of money we have to spend for our defense? Of course, we are dependent upon them. To speak in terms of absolute sovereignty for any nation, utterly independent of the actions of other nations in this world, is to speak in terms of a world that probably never was, certainly is not today and, if it ever was, could never be again. The world is, whether we like it or not, interdependent. The human race is interdependent. The sooner we recognize that fact and find ways of working more effectively with those others who share our problems and our basic ideals of freedom and parliamentary democracy, the stronger and more nearly independent we can be of those who do not share our ideals and sometimes do not wish us well.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS).

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I think this is an issue that many of us can see very clearly, and I think we have some very differing points of view, but it is 5 o'clock on Thursday afternoon, and I think many of the Members have already had an opportunity to study this issue, because this resolution has been before us in recent years, to be familiar with it. It was discussed in the 93d Congress, in the past year, and I understand it came before the House in other Congresses before that.

I would think that it would be very advisable that we have a record vote on the rule, which I will be intending to ask for, and I think we can vote the resolution down and settle the issue. I do not wish to preclude some of my friends such as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) and others who wish to debate the issue, but I think it has been very well aired.

I would say to my friend from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) that as I read the resolution on page 2, lines 7 to 15, it says:

Explore the possibility of agreement on—

(a) a declaration that it is the goal of their peoples to transform their present relationship into a more effective unity based on federal or other democratic principles;

(b) a timetable for transition by stages to this goal; and

(c) a commission or other means to facilitate this transition.

I think the voters of this country can understand this very clearly. I think the gentleman from Texas (Mr. KAZEN) made the point that the time is past for this. America would rather take care of its own problems, and could do better by getting our own foreign policy in order. I think we do not need any future unions with any other countries. What we need, perhaps, is a recommitment to our own goals, our own ideals. We do not need to spend \$200,000 to send a group to discuss the possibility that Americans may want to repeal the Declaration of Independence or some other things.

I think it would be the simple thing for the Members to do, since they have had this before them for the last 2 years, to vote down this rule and this issue and not do any more damage to the American taxpayer or American sovereignty.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT). I thought he made a very fine statement, and it properly presented the argument for this resolution.

Referring to the committee report starting on page 3, for a page and a half of background, and the Members find that it is a very fair statement of the developments in Europe and between Europe and the United States for the last 30 years. But I see the problem, all we have to do is take the existing institutions, which would be NATO, the Common Market, and others, and work to make them more perfect than they have been. The problem with this resolution is that it automatically raises too many doubts in the minds of too many people.

My dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) has been the target of a great amount of heat, but unjustifiably so. There is nothing sinister, diabolical, or dangerous in this resolution. It just is not necessary. It just would not be workable. This is a visionary goal that in principle we all could subscribe to.

When I was a young Member of the House, I cosponsored one of these resolutions. Someone called the issue to my attention, and I studied it more carefully. Since then I have not been a cosponsor. But I really think the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) should not have been criticized as he has been. There is nothing in this resolution except idealism.

Mr. Speaker, what I am interested in, though, is making current institutions that we have truly work. What we do not need is a new visionary approach on top of present complications in the common market and NATO. It would be an unnecessary exercise.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS).

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman think that there is any way that this could make NATO any stronger?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Any time we have more effective communication with people from NATO countries, yes. But the point is—and I think this is where the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) and I would agree—that we should use NATO for that purpose.

Mr. SYMMS. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The existing entity.

Mr. SYMMS. And maybe a little more backbone on the part of the United States might also help.

Mr. DERWINSKI. But backbone in our foreign policy has nothing to do with this resolution. Since this resolution has been around, we have had great Secretaries of State, we have had modest Secretaries of State, and the present immodest Secretary of State.

Basically, I would like to sum this up that this is a wonderful visionary idea, but it is just too impractical to consider.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SIMON).

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I join in commending my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) for his leadership in this matter. My colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) suggests that this is a visionary idea, that it is impractical. I do not think a little vision now and then does us any harm. It may be that it will not do one scintilla worth of good, but it may also be that it could be one of the finer moments of this body and one small step in the direction of doing what is good.

NATO, for example, which the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) talked about, has this liability that this resolution covers, and that is that NATO is strictly a Western European-United States thing. It tends to be a white man's club. This resolution opens other avenues to free countries. I think we are going to have to recognize that we are either going to move toward cooperation or chaos. The day that we could say, "Absolute sovereignty, the heck with the rest of the world," that is a day of the past. The nuclear club is no longer our sole possession. This resolution has the possibility of enhancing freedom. And freedom, whether we like it or not, is a diminishing force right now in our world.

When I was a boy, my father told me what your fathers told you, the story of the stick. You take one stick and you can break it. You take six sticks and put them together and it becomes much more difficult.

I think it makes sense for the free people of our world to work together.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when I supported an idea like this. As a matter of fact, we had such a convention one time, and after 6 or 7 days of debate nothing happened.

We have all sorts of interparliamentary bodies to which this House sends members. We have the Interparliamentary Union, and the North Atlantic Assembly, which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) now apparently proposes to make an even bigger and grander outfit—a 3-year-term outfit with 10 staff members, at a cost of \$200,000 or \$300,000.

We have also the British-American Friendship group, the Canadian-American Parliamentarians, the Mexican-American Parliamentarians, the French-American group, and the German-American group. Besides that, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) has an ad hoc group that he runs to Europe with three or four times a year. They come over here also. They are allied and associated somehow or other with the Council of Europe, of which, by its very name, we are not a member.

That is the Council of Europe; maybe it is called the OECF now, but it used to be the Council of Europe. That organization always invites American delegations over.

We have more organizations in which the NATO nations meet than most dogs have fleas these days, because most dogs now have flea powder. We just do not need another one.

Mr. Speaker, I know it would be gratifying for the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) to have a 3-year tenure as the ranking member in an organization so he can go to Europe three or four times a year and talk about the problems of the North Atlantic nations. But the North Atlantic Assembly also meets and talks about them. In fact, they have subcommittees meeting every year. I cannot keep track of them all.

I attended a dinner with one of them last night. I did not even know they were in the country until I got invited to dinner. They come over here and testify before committees, and our people go over there and testify before their committees.

This is just another resolution to provide for these groups ad infinitum.

I suppose, to be very candid about it, I should point out that one of the members is Clarence Streit. I like Clarence; I have known him for 20 years. He manages to get to Europe one way or another a couple of times a year, and I think he could probably continue to get over there without this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, there was a big furor here last week about spending \$50,000 to get the Magna Carta. This is six times that much. And the money is spent to do what? Nobody knows.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague, the gentleman

from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI). Setting aside all the beliefs that this is somehow some kind of a sinister operation and just considering this legislation on the pure merits of what we are doing here, I do not think those Members who advocate this bad idea have proven that there is a necessity for it.

My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS), has just stated that we have NATO interparliamentary groups running out of our ears. We do not need another group to take a grand tour.

I just think this is a wholly unnecessary expenditure, even though it is, as was stated, "only \$200,000." This is totally unnecessary.

My former colleague, Mr. Frelinghuysen, used to attend some of these sessions, and I have heard my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, mention that they have been there several times and came back, and that nothing happens. Again I say I believe this is unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote down this rule.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I might have left a wrong impression about that Atlantic conference they had in London. There were about 500 participants there. They did meet and talk for about 10 days, and, as I said, nothing happened.

It is not quite true that nothing happened, because they did have a special midnight performance of "My Fair Lady," with the original cast for the delegation. I remember that, and that was a useful cultural experience.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Perhaps today they might have some new movies to show.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the concern expressed by my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT). The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has already been mentioned in terms of the role that it plays in the common defense of the United States and of the free nations of Western Europe.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. In addition these existing organizations discuss economic issues.

Mr. WHALEN. That is true, but let us cite three other organizations. In 1974, the International Energy Agency was created to deal with energy matters. The United States is a partner in that. We are also members of the Organization of Economic Coordination Development, OECD. We are members of GATT, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs.

Mr. Speaker, here are four institutions dealing with the concerns expressed in the joint resolution.

My question is, What does this new institution provide that the four existing institutions do not already cover?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I cannot answer that. I really have listened carefully to-

day to understand ways in which this group is going to perform a worthwhile service, and I still have not heard anything. It just sounds unnecessary.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. MEYNER).

Mrs. MEYNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in favor of the Atlantic Convention resolution.

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues have been saying that this resolution is not necessary, but I think we ought to see that it is.

We have all been dismayed in recent years by the retreat of democracy throughout the world and by the increasing military strength of the Soviet Union and by the dangers of a new neo-isolationism in the United States after the debacle of Vietnam.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, these are real dangers. They highlight the need for greater cooperation among the world's remaining democracies. Historically, the ties between the peoples and governments of the Atlantic community have been very strong. In today's interdependent world, when the West seems to be more and more on the defensive, it is imperative that we make our ties even stronger. The proposed Atlantic Convention is an excellent mechanism for making this happen.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to fear here in this resolution. It does not call for any specific form of greater unity among NATO countries. Any proposal recommended by the convention would have no effect unless it was approved through the constitutional process of the representative States.

This resolution is simple and very important. It merely proposes that representatives from the democracies in the Atlantic community get together and discuss methods of greater cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this resolution deserves the support of every Member of this body who feels that the world's democracies must hang together or they will surely hang separately.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KETCHUM).

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker and Members, I am not a one-worlder. I do not believe in a world federation. I doubt that anyone on this floor would question my patriotism since I have fought in two wars for my country. Yet, I am accused in the mail I have been receiving lately about the so-called Atlantic Union as though there were some devious plot. In fact, many Members have received literally thousands of letters in the last few weeks on the Child and Family Services Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is something that has been so maligned and so lied about that while I think it is a lousy bill, the lies that have been told about it are unimaginable.

Mr. Speaker, this Atlantic Convention resolution has been subject to the same

type of misrepresentation. There is not a thing in this resolution that yields any of our constitutional powers or that yields our Government to a world federation. All it says is, "Let us talk."

I have been interested in listening to what has been said about all of these various organizations and confederations, and so forth, that we belong to. Maybe that is the problem, we belong to so many of them and they are so fragmented and talk about so many different subjects that maybe—just maybe—it is time to sit down and talk about some of the equivalent economic problems that we all face, problems of mutual interest, heavy problems as they confront the NATO countries of the NATO alliance. I doubt that very many people in this country think that the NATO alliance was not a good idea. Since the Berlin airlift we have not seen any Communist advances on a large scale in the NATO countries.

If the Members are concerned about all of these various organizations—and my dear friend, the gentleman from California, who spoke just a little while ago, has been on a few of these trips to some of these meetings and said they did not accomplish a whole lot. If that is the way the Members feel about this then let us get rid of those other organizations. We can do that just as easily as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is attempting to pass this Atlantic Convention resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I am not a one-worlder. I am not a Communist, but I see absolutely nothing wrong with debating this resolution, amending it if that will take away some of the fears of the Members, pass it and let us talk. I have seen a lot of people die in two wars, and I do not mean we should back down to anyone, but I would a whole lot rather talk than bleed.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and that when the Committee of the Whole considers the bill, I may include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, crisis management seems always the order of the day in our Government—Congress as well as the executive branch. We fly from one urgent issue to another, rarely having the time—or taking the time—to look ahead, plan ahead, fix worthy goals, and organize our work so as to achieve them in good time.

One exception was when President Kennedy called upon the Congress and the Nation to accept as a goal the technological feat of putting a man on the Moon by 1980. I recall vividly the day he spoke to the Congress in this Chamber and summoned us all to this worthy goal—one which was achieved years ahead of schedule.

Unlike our forefathers we rarely devote our attention to the needs of future generations. The framers of our Government 200 years ago literally gave their lives and fortunes to establish a system to benefit not so much their own generation but the next.

In our crisis management we seem obsessed almost exclusively with the here and now, with little thought for the effect our policies will have on future generations.

Dwight Eisenhower, reflecting on his own experience in crisis management in the White House and on the merit of this very resolution, observed:

We always seem to deal with urgent problems and leave the important ones for tomorrow.

House Journal Resolution 606, like the lunar mission, is an undertaking worthy of our Nation. It looks to the future, and sets in motion a process through which the liberties of our children can be better secured.

And it is motivated, in great part, by the technology which made possible the lunar achievement. A world that men can encircle in an hour in space is small indeed. No problem on Earth is more than a half-hour by space travel from our shores.

We are all painfully aware of the great changes that are occurring in the international political scene and yet from hearing some of the discussion this afternoon it would almost appear to me that some of our Members are not aware at all of these changes.

No one today looks with much hope to the United Nations as a force for peace, for liberty, and for security. Our most successful alliance, NATO, suffers progressive deterioration, especially on its southern flank.

I want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) for the diligent, long term effort that he has made as a leader of the U.S. delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly. I am sure he has done his very utmost to bring about new strength and vitality to NATO. But his testimony, as well as the testimony of others who have spoken here today indicates that deterioration has occurred and there is no prospect for improvement, basing our estimates on the work of existing organizations including the North Atlantic Assembly.

The British Empire, for all of its shortcomings, maintained for many, many years freedom of the seas and in many respects established and maintained the worldwide rule of law. Of course that empire is gone and no doubt gone forever.

The United States has been stung by Korea and Vietnam and the United States shows little will to fill the void left by the disappearance of the British Empire. The impulse of most liberty loving nations is to look inward and to leave external problems to somebody else to handle. That can be said of the United States as well. But, meanwhile, the Soviet Union has relentlessly increased its military power and influence. Almost every expert observer agrees that the

Soviet Union has had two primary objectives in post war policy. The first objective is to dismantle NATO itself.

The second is to accomplish the isolation of the United States from effective world leadership. With NATO suffering grave setbacks, and with the United States looking inward, the Soviet Union must feel these objectives are within grasp.

The nations of Western Europe, allied though they are with us, must feel in these times a strong impulse to accommodate to these unfortunate trends to adjust to the ascendancy of the Soviet influence worldwide.

Yet despite these forebodings, in some ways the nations of NATO are more united and independent than ever.

The question before us is whether we will take steps now to begin a process through which greater cooperation can be achieved among those who prize liberty above all else. Will we build on the foundations of our experience with NATO, with OECD, and with other trans-Atlantic organizational efforts and through this process find the means for greater and more effective unity in this great community of liberty? If we do, we open the possibility that we can peacefully thwart the rise of Soviet influence and at the same time increase liberty and improve the quality of life within the Atlantic community. Moreover, in the light of the confusion caused by the speculation over the Sonnenfeldt doctrine. I would suggest that rejection of this resolution would be badly viewed, indeed.

The process of building greater cooperation, which this resolution seeks to start, will cost us really nothing politically. The financial outlay, considering other endeavors in foreign policy, is modest, indeed, but it has the possibility of bringing about a new unity of purpose and action, thereby making more secure the liberty of all of our peoples, and especially the liberty of generations unborn.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Can we not all look at ourselves and agree with the assessment made just the other night on television by Henry Steele Commager to the effect that this generation, unlike the leadership of 200 years ago, gives scant attention to the interests of the next generation. The value of the convention will depend in great measure on the quality of the U.S. delegation. If the very best people in the United States are selected—and I am no candidate for the delegation, I assure the Members—then other nations will surely be inspired to send their best.

The convention has no predetermined objectives except the general one of seeking a formula for more effective cooperation of the NATO nations. In order to dispel some of the confusion that has developed as a result of some unjustified attacks made on the resolution, I will certainly endorse, accept, and sup-

port in every way two amendments. One of these will be to strike the word "Federal" from the resolution. It appears only once, but simply to clarify this point, to make it very clear that this convention has no predetermined objective, I will offer an amendment to accomplish that, and my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) will offer one to clarify the status of sovereignty as the convention takes up any proposals it may have.

I am impressed with the support given this initiative by the greatest of our military leaders of the recent past. All three of the most recent Supreme Commanders of NATO are endorsing this enthusiastically. Gen. Matthew Ridgway, a great general in Korea as well as in the Second World War, just today—when notified of the reservations of the VFW—re-stated his strong support for this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ).

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard a great deal of talk during the course of the debate in this legislation about how the passage of this resolution would somehow result in a surrender of sovereignty which would somehow impair the capacity of our Nation to function as an independent entity in international affairs. But I would remind my colleagues, particularly those who sit on the other side of the aisle, of a comment once made by that great American and great Republican, Wendell Wilkie, who, after returning from a trip around the world in 1944 said:

Sovereignty is not something to be hoarded but something to be used.

What is at stake here is not the abstract and academic preservation of our constitutional independence but our ability to forge a more effective partnership with the other democracies around the world.

What I like about this resolution is that it calls for a convention not just of our NATO allies but of all the parliamentary democracies of the world so that we can collectively consult and together determine what we can do to reinvest our democratic ideology with more appeal to all the peoples of the world.

The fact is that today democracy is on the retreat and the forces of dictatorship are on the advance. Unless we do something and do it soon the day will come when we will become an island of liberty in a sea of oppression and the liberty we love will have become compromised in the process.

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

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, what has this Congress done to show that we will do something other than just adopt a milk-toast attitude on some of the problems we face, for instance on the Angola situation or a similar situation somewhere else? Having a conference will not

show our respect of our sovereignty or independence.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the issue of what good might come out of the conference that is contemplated in this resolution.

Let me first acknowledge and even underscore the multiplicity of relationships that have evolved between the United States and Western Europe. This includes not only the OECD, the NATO organization including the NATO parliamentary group, and more recently the International Energy Agency which binds Western Europe to the United States in trying to deal with common energy problems, but also the IMF and GATT for money and trade matters.

The problem is that although we do have a multiplicity of relationships, this is not dealing adequately with our problems.

I would like to call the attention of this body to the pronouncement by our Secretary of State about 3 years ago proclaiming 1973 as the "Year of Europe." We were going to set aside a whole year and devote our attention to Europe. What an astonishing proposition that was. What it reflected was the fact that relationships between the United States and Europe had steadily deteriorated over the past decade; but turn this around and suppose that the European Commission, which is sort of the executive body of the European Community, and said that 1973 was going to be the year of America. Well, we would have said, "What in the world is going on?"

The fact is that we have one Secretary of State and one President who are faced with problems throughout the world. They are unable to concentrate on a variety of problems at the same time. What is so badly needed is to institutionalize our relationships, primarily with Western Europe, so that we do not come to the point of having to set aside a special year for Europe. The year of Europe ought to be every year, because there is where the center of democratic freedom is to be found outside the North American Continent. True, there are other countries that are democratic, but if we look for the center of gravity of the countries that are free of oppression, we will find them in Western Europe. We need links. We need consultative mechanisms. We need to institutionalize our ability to coordinate and cooperate not just on security, not just on money, not just on energy, not just on trade, but on all of these things and all of the time.

I would like finally to make the point that we are faced with one of our most frustrating problems in our troubles today in our relations between Turkey and Greece. Had we been working with our European friends, much of that trouble would have been headed off. It could have been headed off at either of several stages earlier than what has now occurred, because both Turkey and Greece are members of NATO. If we had consul-

tative devices, perhaps we could have headed off the coup in Cyprus which triggered all these problems. We would have understood where our common interests lay and worked out these problems that threaten to blow up the whole southern flank of NATO.

I hope we could lay the groundwork for an institutionalized relationship, not dependent upon whether the Secretary of State happens to be in Washington looking to Europe at a time when the problem emerges. We need to do better in our relations with Europe if we want to defend freedom in this world.

Let me finally just quote a man for whom I have great respect, Dr. Walter Judd. I know him well because I ran against him for Congress, but he makes this point:

Growing Soviet power and influence, together with Western Europe's economic dependence on Middle East oil and America's loss of international prestige and of pre-eminence in power, combine to reinforce my belief—of 30 years standing—that survival of freedom and of western civilization requires greater economic and political integration of the free world.

Dr. Judd supports this resolution.

Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. Speaker, as we debate once again a resolution to call an Atlantic Convention, I believe it is in order that we heed the views of a large group of our fellow citizens—Americans who have been called upon many times over this century to defend the United States.

Two groups—the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States—speak for these men and women, and they speak eloquently for the maintenance of our present independence, for which they gave so much.

I respectfully request that there be printed in the RECORD at this time a statement by Thomas C. "Pete" Walker, National Commander-in-Chief, VFW, and a statement by Harry G. Wiles, National Commander, the American Legion. They state more eloquently than I the case against adoption of this resolution.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
April 1, 1976.

To: Members of the 94th Congress.  
From: Thomas C. "Pete" Walker, National  
Commander-in-Chief, Veterans of Foreign  
Wars of the United States.  
Subject: Independence or dependence.

You all know about the "pig-now-poke-later" proposal embodied in the innocent-sounding, yet deeply insidious, H.J. Res. 606 being rapidly and covertly pushed for floor consideration in the House of Representatives, as soon as its sponsors believe they can put one over on us. The issue is not "To Call an Atlantic Convention." The real issue is whether we Americans opt for independence or dependence upon others; sometimes called "interdependence."

The V.F.W. knows who voted which way on the issue the last time the House addressed it when it lost by an eye lash, 210-197.

Believe me, we will keep score this time around.

Why do we care?

We have in the Constitution of the United

States a document setting forth the "federal principles" under which we order our affairs.

No one has called upon the American people to express their view as to whether or not we should properly "explore" diluting our hard-won liberties by association with any foreign nations in a wider federal system. The answer from our fellow countrymen, if asked, would be a resounding "NO!"

To the argument that H.J. Res. 606 would only set up a "delegation" that would report to the Congress, the \$200,000 thus expended would be a boondoggle of the most obvious type. We aren't about to derogate our sovereignty to any shared federal arrangement with any nation. "Atlantic Union" supporters know they cannot get support if they make an honest disclosure of their real purpose.

"Atlantic Union" is but the latest incarnation of Clarence Streit's 37-year effort—it was called "Union Now" in the 1930s and 1940s—to alter the political arrangement that has kept America free and sovereign for 200 years.

Here are the facts on "Atlantic Union."

What is the Atlantic Union?

The Atlantic Union proposes to establish a limited world government composed of 14 nations that belong to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). It would change NATO from a military alliance into a political organization that would control the political, trade and economic policies of the participating countries.

How would membership in the Atlantic Union affect the United States?

The American people could be forced to support a foreign policy which they oppose. Industry, the farmer and labor would be denied protection against the importation of low-priced European workers. The value of the American dollar would be further destroyed. American citizens would be subject to taxes levied by the Atlantic Union for the benefit of other member nations. The Atlantic Union would control American military forces and dictate the use of American troops abroad in peace or war.

How would membership in the Atlantic Union affect our established form of government?

The surrender of our sovereign powers to the Atlantic Union, or any other international government agency, would weaken or destroy many of the basic rights of the American people as set forth in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

What is the relationship between the Atlantic Union and the World Federation movement?

Atlantic Unionists generally oppose world government. They say it is impossible of attainment, not only because of the existence of Soviet Russia and its satellites, which operate on ethical, political and economic theories opposed to those practiced by the West, but also because of vast cultural differences. Atlantic Unionists believe the best way to insure peace, and defeat the forces of Communism in the event of World War III, is to form a powerful international government, a supernational made up of NATO countries, that have general unity of political, ethical, economic and cultural traditions, beliefs and practices.

What is the difference between the United Nations and the Atlantic Union?

The UN is an association of sovereign nations, that gives the U.S. the right to veto proposed policies and the right to withdraw from membership when it chooses. Atlantic Union would force member countries to surrender their sovereign powers as free and independent nations.

How would membership in the Atlantic

Union deprive the President, Congress and the people of the United States of the opportunity to formulate our own foreign policies?

American delegates to the Atlantic Union could be out-numbered and possibly out-voted by the combined membership strength of other participating nations.

What is the official V.F.W. policy on Atlantic Union?

The V.F.W. is in absolute opposition to all proposed forms of world government—including Atlantic Union.

Once again, Members of the Congress, stand up for our country and kill off this "pig-now-poke-later" once and for all.

Sincerely,

THOMAS C. "PETE" WALKER,  
National Commander-in-Chief.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
March 30, 1976.

HON. DAN DANIEL,  
House of Representatives,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

The American Legion strongly opposes H.J. Res. 606 because it envisions some new form of unidentified union which could relinquish U.S. sovereignty.

The United States stands as a symbol of constitutional government for the other democracies. Any and all nations are completely free to adopt any or all parts of our constitutional system.

The American Legion supports the NATO concept and the continued cooperation among nations for purposes of friendship, defense, commerce and mutual security. We are unalterably opposed to any action, however small, which envisions a transportation of the present sovereign and independent status of the United States.

HARRY G. WILES,  
National Commander,  
the American Legion.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 606, to call an Atlantic Convention. It seems to me the proponents have caught themselves in a logical contradiction. On the one hand, they argue the urgent need to forge more tangible links among nations of the Atlantic community. On the other hand, they emphasize that this resolution will have little or no effect on our national sovereignty. Well you cannot have it both ways. Either it does have a bearing on our national sovereignty, or else it does nothing to accomplish the goal the proponents have set for it—in which case, one might ask, why bother?

I think there are at least two reasons why we should not pass this measure. First, I think the effect could be exactly the opposite of that desired by proponents. Rather than easing our political relations with the Atlantic nations, it could place new strains on those relations. It could be viewed in many capitals as an attempt to assert U.S. control over other states—politically, economically, or otherwise. European unity insofar as it offers a bulwark against communism is important, and—we have supported that unity—as witnessed by the Marshall plan, NATO, and our efforts on behalf of the EEC. But if this is something truly desired by the other Atlantic nations, why have they not taken the initiative in proposing the conference?

From all the evidence before us, the interest is entirely one-sided, on our side.

The second reason is that the resolution does indeed affect our national sovereignty. It establishes an unnamed 18 member delegation, specifies that they are to be free from official instructions, and, authorizes them to develop a timetable for "a more effective unity" with the Atlantic community. To be sure, it specifies that the convention's recommendations shall be submitted to the Congress for action "under constitutional process." But what does this mean? The House as we know, does not have any authority with regard to treaties. Are we assigning to these unnamed 18 delegates the power of final agreement by the House to any accord they may reach?

No, Mr. Speaker, either this resolution holds potentially serious consequence for the future political make-up of the United States, or else it has no effect whatsoever on us. In either case, it ought not to be adopted.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Joint Resolution 606, the Atlantic Union Resolution. Passage of this legislation could lead to a major reduction in American sovereignty.

House Joint Resolution 606 would create an 18 member delegation. The delegation would be authorized to organize and participate in a convention attended by representatives of the North Atlantic Treaty countries.

The long-range objective would be a single, unified central government, an Atlantic Union. According to the bill, the "goal" is to "transform their present relationship into a more effective unity based on federal or other democratic principles."

This point is also brought out in the preamble to the bill. The whereas clause is as follows:

Whereas a more perfect union of the Atlantic Community consistent with the United States Constitution and the Charter of the United Nations gives promise of strengthening common defense, assuring more adequate energy resources, providing a stable currency to improve commerce of all kinds, and enhancing the economic prosperity, general welfare, and liberty of the people of the member nations:

The key issue we are dealing with here is national sovereignty. It would be impossible to establish an Atlantic Union without some reduction in American sovereignty.

I am unequivocally opposed to the United States sharing its sovereignty with other countries. Congress should be spending its time considering American interests rather than wasting time and money on such ridiculous proposals as the Atlantic Union Resolution.

I find it particularly ironic that we are considering this legislation during the 200th anniversary of our war for independence. After fighting so hard to gain and retain our independence it seems incomprehensible that the Congress would now voluntarily yield part of its sovereignty back to Europe.

I firmly believe that most Americans

do not want the United States integrated into a multinational federation. Americans cherish their independence and rightfully so. They want to preserve their existence as a separate and independent nation, not surrender part of their sovereignty to a union of European countries.

I urge that the House repeat its action of 1973 when it defeated a similar bill on a vote of 197 ayes to 210 nays. I urge that the House vote to protect American sovereignty and reject the Atlantic Union Resolution.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Convention resolution currently before us has somehow managed to get caught in the crossfire between supporters and opponents of world government. However useful that debate may be it has little bearing on the content of this resolution.

House Joint Resolution 606 simply creates an 18-member U.S. delegation with a 3-year mandate to organize a conference among our allies to discuss ways of better dealing with mutual problems. These problem areas range all the way from energy and monetary trade policy to the erosion of our military alliances in the face of growing Soviet military power.

The bipartisan U.S. delegation would consist of members appointed by both Houses of Congress and by the President. They would not be directed to advance any particular set of recommendations nor would they have the power to commit our Government to any specific action. At the conclusion of the conference our delegation would simply submit its recommendations to the Congress for consideration.

It is by no means clear that such a conference will be able to achieve these limited but important objectives. There are disturbing signs of growing economic and political instability among some of our key allies. This atmosphere makes this type of conference all the more important but it also makes it more difficult to come up with mutually acceptable recommendations. Hopefully through this exchange of views we will find useful ways to make our Atlantic Alliance more secure.

The need to strengthen our institutions and those of our allies should be of concern to all of us. Certainly we have a stake in helping other parliamentary democracies to withstand pressures from the Soviet Union and its client states. People with impeccable conservative credentials such as Dr. Walter Judd and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER have endorsed this resolution as have Generals Norstad, Lemnitzer, and Goodpaster. Each of these generals served as Supreme Commander of the NATO Forces and each appreciates the need for greater cooperation among our NATO allies.

House Joint Resolution 606 will not lead to the creation of an Atlantic federal union or undermine our sovereignty. On the contrary, it is designed to seek a higher level of cooperation among our

allies leading to a strengthening of our security and our sovereignty. There is no guarantee that such a conference can achieve these objectives but it is important that we make the effort.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of House Resolution 1085, now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 165, nays 194, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

#### YEAS—165

Abzug	Fascell	Mezvyinsky
Adams	Fenwick	Mikva
Addabbo	Findley	Mineta
Allen	Fisher	Mink
Anderson, Calif.	Forsythe	Mitchell, Md.
Anderson, Ill.	Fraser	Moakley
Andrews, N.C.	Frenzel	Moffet
Ashley	Gibbons	Moorhead, Pa.
Aspin	Gonzalez	Morgan
AuCoin	Gradison	Mosher
Badillo	Gude	Moss
Baldus	Hall	Myers, Ind.
Baucus	Hanley	Myers, Pa.
Bedell	Hannaford	Neal
Bennett	Harkin	Nedzi
Bergland	Harrington	Nolan
Bingham	Harris	Nowak
Blanchard	Hawkins	Oberstar
Blouin	Hechler, W. Va.	Obey
Boggs	Hicks	O'Brien
Boland	Holtzman	O'Hara
Bolling	Horton	O'Neill
Brademas	Howard	Ottinger
Breckinridge	Howe	Pike
Brown, Calif.	Hungate	Preyer
Brown, Mich.	Jacobs	Price
Brown, Ohio	Jeffords	Fritchard
Burke, Calif.	Johnson, Colo.	Quie
Burlison, Mo.	Jordan	Railsback
Carr	Kastenmeier	Rangel
Cleveland	Ketchum	Rees
Collins, Ill.	Keys	Reuss
Conte	Koch	Richmond
Conyers	Leggett	Riegle
Cornell	Lehman	Roncaglio
D'Amours	Lloyd, Calif.	Rooney
Daniels, N.J.	Long, La.	Rosenthal
Danielson	Lujan	Roybal
Diggs	McClary	Ruppe
Dodd	McCormack	Ryan
Drinan	McFall	Sarasin
du Pont	McHugh	Scheuer
Early	McKinney	Schneebell
Edgar	Madden	Schroeder
Edwards, Calif.	Madigan	Seiberling
Ellberg	Matsunaga	Sharp
Erlenborn	Mazzoli	Simon
Evins, Tenn.	Metcalfe	Sisk
	Meyner	Skubitz

Smith, Iowa  
Solarz  
Stark  
Steiger, Wis.  
Studds  
Symington  
Thompson

Tsongas  
Van Deerlin  
Vander Jagt  
Vander Veen  
Vanik  
Wampler  
Waxman

Whitehurst  
Wilson, Tex.  
Wright  
Yates  
Zablocki

**NAYS—194**

Alexander  
Ambro  
Andrews,  
N. Dak.  
Annunzio  
Archer  
Ashbrook  
Bafalis  
Bauman  
Beard, R.I.  
Beard, Tenn.  
Bevill  
Biaggi  
Bonker  
Bowen  
Brinkley  
Brothead  
Brooks  
Broomfield  
Broyhill  
Buchanan  
Burgener  
Burke, Fla.  
Burleson, Tex.  
Butler  
Byron  
Carney  
Carter  
Cederberg  
Chappell  
Clancy  
Clausen,  
Don H.  
Clawson, Del.  
Cochran  
Cohen  
Collins, Tex.  
Conlan  
Coughlin  
Crane  
Daniel, Dan  
Daniel, R. W.  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Delaney  
Dellums  
Derrick  
Derwinski  
Devine  
Downey, N.Y.  
Duncan, Oreg.  
Duncan, Tenn.  
Edwards, Ala.  
Emery  
English  
Evans, Ind.  
Fary  
Fish  
Fithian  
Flood  
Florio  
Flynt  
Ford, Tenn.  
Fountain  
Frey  
Fuqua  
Gaydos

Gilman  
Ginn  
Goldwater  
Goodling  
Grassley  
Hagedorn  
Haley  
Hamilton  
Hammer-  
schmidt  
Hansen  
Harsha  
Hays, Ohio  
Heckler, Mass.  
Hefner  
Helstoski  
Hightower  
Hills  
Holt  
Hubbard  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Ichord  
Jarman  
Jarnan  
Jenrette  
Johnson, Calif.  
Jones, N.C.  
Jones, Okla.  
Jones, Tenn.  
Kasten  
Kazen  
Kelly  
Kindness  
Krebs  
LaFalce  
Lagomarsino  
Latta  
Lent  
Levitas  
Littion  
Lloyd, Tenn.  
Long, Md.  
Lundine  
McCollister  
McDade  
McDonald  
McKay  
Maguire  
Mahon  
Mann  
Martin  
Mathis  
Melcher  
Michel  
Milford  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Ohio  
Mills  
Minish  
Mitchell, N.Y.  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moore  
Moorhead,  
Calif.  
Mottl  
Murphy, Ill.

Murtha  
Natcher  
Passman  
Patten, N.J.  
Patterson,  
Calif.  
Pattison, N.Y.  
Perkins  
Pettis  
Poage  
Pressler  
Randall  
Regula  
Rhodes  
Rinaldo  
Risenhoover  
Robinson  
Roe  
Rogers  
Rose  
Rostenkowski  
Roush  
Rousselot  
Ryun  
Russo  
Santini  
Satterfield  
Schulze  
Sebelius  
Shirley  
Shriver  
Shuster  
Slack  
Smith, Nebr.  
Snyder  
Spellman  
Spence  
Stagers  
Stanton,  
J. William  
Steed  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Stuckey  
Symms  
Taylor, Mo.  
Taylor, N.C.  
Thone  
Thornton  
Traxler  
Treen  
Ullman  
Vigorito  
Waggonner  
Walsh  
Weaver  
Whalen  
Whitten  
Wiggins  
Winn  
Wirth  
Wolf  
Wylie  
Yatron  
Young, Alaska  
Young, Fla.  
Young, Tex.

**NOT VOTING—73**

Abdnor  
Armstrong  
Barrett  
Bell  
Blester  
Breaux  
Burke, Mass.  
Burton, John  
Burton, Phillip  
Chisholm  
Clay  
Conable  
Corman  
Cotter  
Dent  
Dickinson  
Dingell  
Downing, Va.  
Eckhardt  
Esch  
Eshleman  
Evans, Colo.  
Flowers  
Foley  
Ford, Mich.

Gialmo  
Green  
Guyer  
Hayes, Ind.  
Hébert  
Heinz  
Henderson  
Hinshaw  
Holland  
Hughes  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jones, Ala.  
Karth  
Kemp  
Krueger  
Landrum  
Lott  
McCloskey  
McEwen  
Macdonald  
Meeds  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Nichols  
Nix  
Pepper

Peyser  
Pickle  
Quillen  
Roberts  
Rodino  
St Germain  
Sarbanes  
Sikes  
Stanton,  
James V.  
Steelman  
Stephens  
Stokes  
Stratton  
Sullivan  
Talcott  
Teague  
Udall  
White  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson, C. H.  
Wyder  
Young, Ga.  
Zeferetti

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Dent.  
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Zeferetti.  
Mr. Hayes of Indiana with Mr. Krueger.  
Mr. Cotter with Mr. James V. Stanton.  
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Sikes.  
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Pickle.  
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.  
Mr. Karth with Mr. Murphy of New York.  
Mr. Holland with Mr. Nichols.  
Mr. Sarbanes with Mr. Teague.  
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Stratton.  
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Breaux.  
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Burke of Massachusetts.  
Mr. White with Mr. Gialmo.  
Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Ford of Michigan.  
Mr. Young of Georgia with Mr. Nix.  
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Rodino.  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Clay.  
Mr. Green with Mr. Eckhardt.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Evans of Colorado.  
Mr. John L. Burton with Mr. Pepper.  
Mr. Corman with Mr. Guyer.  
Mr. Downing of Virginia with Mr. Abdnor.  
Mr. Foley with Mr. Blester.  
Mr. Phillip Burton with Mr. Conable.  
Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Esch.  
Mr. McCloskey with Mr. Udall.  
Mr. Armstrong with Mr. Bell.  
Mr. Eshleman with Mr. Heinz.  
Mr. Hughes with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Kemp.  
Mr. Lott with St Germain.  
Mr. McEwen with Mr. Steelman.  
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Talcott.  
Mr. Wydler with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. PATTISON of New York and Mr. MITCHELL of New York changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."  
So the resolution was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 12203, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT 1976**

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 12203) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

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

**PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE**

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to testify before a grand jury of the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey on Friday, April 2, 1976, while the House is in session. Under the precedents, I am unable to comply with the subpoena, the privileges of

the House being involved, without the permission of the House.

I send the subpoena to the desk.  
The Clerk will read the subpoena.  
The Clerk read as follows:  
[In the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey]

To: Henry Helstoski, Ridge Road, Rutherford 7, New Jersey.

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey at U.S. Post Office and Court House Building, Federal Square, Room 483 in the City of Newark on the 2nd day of April, 1976 at 10:00 o'clock a.m. to testify before the Grand Jury and bring with you any and all tapes, transcriptions, recordings or memoranda, of whatever nature and kind, pertaining to any and all conversations between Henry Helstoski and Franklin Peroff, which were made, produced, constructed or recorded during the period November 1, 1975 to date, as well as any and all letters, correspondence and memoranda between Henry Helstoski and Franklin Peroff during the period November 1, 1975 to date.

This subpoena is issued on application of the United States, Jonathan L. Goldstein, U.S. Attorney,  
By: William W. Robertson, Ass't U.S. Attorney.  
March 26, 1976.

**AUTHORIZING HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI TO APPEAR IN RESPONSE TO A SUBPENA OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 1124) and ask for its immediate consideration.  
The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 1124**

Whereas Representative Henry Helstoski, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpoena to appear as a witness before the Grand Jury of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, to testify on the 2nd day of April, 1976, at 10:00 antimeridian, and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by the order of the House: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Representative Henry Helstoski is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey at such time when the House is not sitting in session; be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpoena, a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**FURTHER LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM**

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce that the program for today has been concluded.

Tomorrow we will bring up H.R. 12572, the Grain Standards Act amendments.

I understand from the chairman of the committee that the bill should take around 3 hours. I mention that so that