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Interest Christmas Clubs into plans which yield capital and interest at Yale. The problem is that the savings account in the banking community, free checking is becoming more common, as people ask, "If the Mellon Bank is it's customers check for free, why don't your bank?"

But it's a long way from free checks to a square deal at the bank. The average man must now go back to the quaint question:

"Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL REFORM: PEAKING AHEAD TO '77

(Austin C. Wehrwein)

New York—Let us suppose that it is 1977. Richard M. Nixon by then, by one means or another, is out of the White House. No longer will the kick the constitutional bug be

"Let us suppose that, by then, there is a mood of reform: a real sense that we can't slip back to "normalcy" but must, regardless of who is then president, make changes in the "presidency" that will prevent its being manipulated the way Nixon did.

In view of all the emotion, is it fair to ask what we can expect in the "post-Watergate" presidency?

A symposium at Columbia University Law School on that subject last weekend reached a consensus which was both engrossing and disquieting, depending upon your viewpoint. It was that in basic, institutional terms, there isn't much that could or should be done.

But upon the lecture platform were Prof. Louis Henkin, author of "Foreign Affairs and the Presidency," Prof. Arthur Schlesinger Jr., Sen. Clifford P. Case, R-N.Y., and Thomas C. Mann, former American Bar Association president.

In truncated, indeed perhaps simplistic, form, the discussion can be summarized along these lines:

"are dealing not only with the post-Watergate but the post-Vietnam War presidency. In retrospect, was the problem usurpation or was it simply that the Constitution didn't work very well?"

"In the area of foreign affairs the Constitution says very little about presidential powers. The specific references are to the president's power to "make treaties" with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the senators voting... and to "appoint ambassadors (and other public ministers) and consuls."

That's all.

The controversy, you see, is about what's missing.

The ability to run the foreign affairs of this country with a free hand is the result of an interplay of so many things, one of which is the president having, for instance, the power to send troops into any country at any time, and another is that the president has, whether he wants it or not, the power to set the U.S. foreign policy. That began, not with Nixon, not with the United States, but with George Washington.

Through the ambassador (actually, now the State Department) power, a president gets a monopoly on communication. Too, of course, only the president "speaks for the United States" in the world community. And unlike Congress, the presidency is always in session.

Delegation of any of this power serves to increase rather than diminish this presidential role.

Moreover, it is unrealistic to contend there is a clean line between foreign policy (to be made by Congress) and foreign affairs (to be made by the president). Simply by conducting those affairs a president makes policy. A dramatic example: Nixon's embrace of a newly compliant China.

The question, if Congress has the guts it can curb the president. It could have ended the Vietnam War, for example.

Supreme Court to let Truman seize the steel mills under "war powers."

While it is often impossible to disentangle the parts of the presidency, it is absolutely clear that not all foreign affairs involve "national security." Congress must force that issue.

Separation of powers does not do itself enlarge presidential powers, as Nixon contends.

Oil Money and Starvation

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the international monetary shifts which are occurring due to the rise in Middle Eastern crude oil prices will have many worldwide effects. As a developed country, we have been concerned primarily with our balance of payments, domestic implications of more expensive petroleum products, and initiating efforts to become self-sufficient in supplying our petroleum needs.

The world's underdeveloped countries are feeling these effects in other more drastic ways. Chester L. Cooper describes these effects in "A New York Times" article on April 4 entitled "Oil Billions for the Few—Sand for the Starving." That article is deserving of our attention and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

If there being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OIL BILLIONS FOR THE FEW—SAND FOR THE STARVING

(By Chester L. Cooper)

WASHINGTON—With the grace of Allah, a few Middle Eastern nations have become rich beyond even the wildest dreams of the fabled potentates of ancient Araby. Through little effort and no outlay of the oil they have earned over $7 billion, or about $23,000 for every one of its inhabitants. Furthermore, the oil has brought results which exceed expectations. For example, the Arab League, with all its members of Arab League voting... and to "appoint ambassadors (and other public ministers) and consuls."

That's all.

The controversy, you see, is about what's missing.

The ability to run the foreign affairs of this country with a free hand is the result of an interplay of so many things, one of which is the president having, for instance, the power to send troops into any country at any time, and another is that the president has, whether he wants it or not, the power to set the U.S. foreign policy. That began, not with Nixon, not with the United States, but with George Washington.

Through the ambassador (actually, now the State Department) power, a president gets a monopoly on communication. Too, of course, only the president "speaks for the United States" in the world community. And unlike Congress, the presidency is always in session.

Delegation of any of this power serves to increase rather than diminish this presidential role.

Moreover, it is unrealistic to contend there is a clean line between foreign policy (to be made by Congress) and foreign affairs (to be made by the president). Simply by conducting those affairs a president makes policy. A dramatic example: Nixon's embrace of a newly compliant China.

The question, if Congress has the guts it can curb the president. It could have ended the Vietnam War, for example.
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THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it has been 25 years since the first nation signed the Genocide Convention. At that time the United States was one of the two front running nations, those who sought to make genocide an international crime. In the intervening years over 75 nations have ratified this treaty, but this body has yet to give it implementation. It is vital that we do so today, as it was 25 years ago.

Throughout history, the United States has been known for its leadership in the field of human rights. Our concern with preserving the right of religious, racial, and ethnic groups to coexist dictates that we sign the Convention. The fact that we have not yet signed the treaty puzzles me, our allies and delights our enemies. In fact, former U.S. Ambassador Charles Y. Colt testified that our refusal to ratify the treaty was one of the most difficult and embarrassing things he has ever had to explain.

The psychological impact of our ratification of this Convention should not be underestimated. International law grows out and extends the unambiguous support of the entire community to become established. Thus it is hard to see how any international understanding can become binding without the convention receiving support of the United States.

Mr. President, if the United States adds its signature to the treaty, it could well prompt new nations to join in support of the convention. It is imperative that we here in the Senate give our consent to this treaty.

DÉTENTE: SOME QUALMS AND HARD QUESTIONS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, in today's New York Times an article by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway voices some of the questions regarding détente that have been of some concern to me.

I ask unanimous consent that this article entitled "Détente: Some Qualms and Hard Questions" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DÉTENTE: SOME QUALMS AND HARD QUESTIONS

(By Matthew B. Ridgway)

PITTSBURGH—"Détente," I believe, poses the potentially gravest danger to our nation of all the problems we face. Whether it is to prove a siren's call to lure us to our destruction, or to the first long step toward defusing the terrible threat of nuclear warfare and worldwide holocaust, no man can today predict with any assurance.

But what any reasoning person can clearly perceive is the distinct possibility that treaties can be abrogated or ignored, that solemn undertakings by the Soviet leadership can be deliberately flouted or repudiated and that an overnight reversion to the hard-line policies of a former Soviet Government can take place.

Against these possibilities this country must have ample safeguards, for we are dealing not with the fate of our own nation, though that may well be what we are doing, but with the fate of all of humanity. It is our task to discover and state the fundamentals on which our nation and the free world have built that civilization through two millennia.

What must be done is to critically and coldly examine and analyze every facet of this problem through the widest practicable public debate and then to make basic decisions as a free people.

Fortunately, it appears that an assessment of where we may be going, for what reasons, and what we have done, is being made constructively, by highly qualified individuals, in and out of Government, whose intellectual honesty, integrity, and devotion to our country command respect.

There can be no real lessening of tensions, except in an atmosphere of mutual trust, much less confidence, and even less security, for the Soviets promise to let us share them at fair prices the years hence; to furnish technology that we have developed and that the Untermans lack and eagerly seek; to continue and to pare our military strength while the Soviet Union continues to augment its own in the name of protection. In the last five years, the Congress has been on the verge of unilaterally extending and increasing the redline budget, so long as the United States and the Soviet Union maintain their present level of arms.

Would it be in our national interest to extend long-term credits to the Soviet Union for the development and marketing of oil? Does this country want the American people to take on an immense foreign debt for Soviet promises to let us share them at fair prices the years hence; to furnish technology that we have developed and that the Soviet Union lacks and eagerly seeks; to continue and to pare our military strength while the Soviet Union continues to augment its own in the name of protection? In the last five years, the Congress has been on the verge of unilaterally extending and increasing the redline budget, so long as the United States and the Soviet Union maintain their present level of arms.

These are hard questions of immense significance to us and to the free world. They demandward thinking.

Under the vision of those who established our form of government, mankind's fires of imagination were kindled. They burned with an intensity and power that much of the world. They have yet to be extinguished. But now in the continuing erosion of morals and culture, and in the spathy and muddy thinking of many of our own people today, they have been allowed to burn dangerously low.

We now have before us in our greatest hour for two centuries, an opportunity to show the world whether we are determined to keep those fires burning; whether we shall be found too lacking in integrity, too weak in purpose, too unrelent in execution to set before Almighty God and mankind an example of those principles, faithfully adhered to, on which our Founding Fathers staked "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor." Whether we will show the world an example of what in our hearts we know is eternally right.

In this Bicentennial era, the choice is ours to make.