formula, quotas could have been relaxed only once in the last ten years.

I also believe that the United States must avoid imposing excessive restrictions on our trading partners who supply us with meat. H.R. 11545 would impose those restrictions by stipulating a minimum access level for meat imports of 1.2 billion pounds, instead of the 1.3 billion my Administration recommended. I am concerned that the bill's lower level could harm our trade relations with the meat exporting countries and thus impair their long-term reliability as sources of additional meat supplies when our own production is low, particularly at a time when we are negotiating for greater access to foreign markets for both our industrial and agricultural products.

If the Congress had enacted H.R. 11545 without these objectionable provisions, I would have been pleased to sign it, as my advisers make clear repeatedly. The bill would have amended the Meat Import Act of 1964 to provide a new formula for determining meat import quotas. The new formula would have adjusted meat import quotas up when domestic production of meats subject to the quota went down. Under the 1964 meat import law, quotas are adjusted in the opposite way, so that as domestic production declines, the limits on meat imports are tightened, at exactly the wrong time. This defect has often compelled Presidents to increase or suspend the meat import quota, in order to ensure supplies of meat at reasonable prices. The new counter-cyclical formula would, in most years, automatically make the necessary adjustment in the meat import quota, without involving the President in the normal operation of the meat trade.

This Administration supports such counter-cyclical management of meat imports; in fact, the Department of Agriculture was instrumental in developing the formula which the Congress approved. But for all the advantages of the new formula, it is still an untested mechanical formula which may not respond ideally to all future situations. This is why I find the restrictions on the President's discretion to increase meat imports so objectionable and why my Administration's support for H.R. 11545 was so clearly conditioned upon removal of those restrictions and on increasing the minimum access level for meat imports to 1.3 billion pounds annually.

I am prepared to work with the Congress next year to pass a counter-cyclical meat import bill which will provide the stability and certainty the cattle industry requires, while preserving the President's existing discretionary authority and setting an acceptable minimum access level for imports.

JIMMY CARTER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 10, 1978.*

H.R. 9937

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I have decided not to sign into law H.R. 9937. This bill is an amendment to the Bank Holding Company Act which would authorize the General Services Administration to sell certain silver dollar coins at negotiated prices. I have determined that this legislation would not be in the national interest because of an unrelated amendment which exempts all textile and apparel items from any tariff reductions in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations (MTN) now underway in Geneva.

I am determined to assist the beleaguered textile industry. We are committed to a healthy and growing textile and apparel industry. This legislation would not advance that cause, and could even harm the entire U.S. economy.

This bill would not address the real causes of the industry's difficulties. In return for any transient benefits, the bill would prompt our trading partners to retaliate by withdrawing offers in areas where our need for export markets is the greatest—products such as tobacco, grains, citrus, raw cotton, paper, machinery, poultry, and textile-related areas such as mill products and fashion clothing. The loss of these export areas is too high a price for our Nation to pay.

The cost of this bill might be even higher; at best, it would cost us many opportunities for exports; at worst, it could cause the collapse of the trade talks and further restrict the growth of the world economy. If the two and a quarter million workers in the textile and apparel industry are to survive in their jobs, we must work to keep the world economy strong and international trade free.

Just within the last year we have taken a number of steps to improve the condition of the U.S. textile and apparel industry:

—We negotiated a renewal of the International Multifiber Arrangement through 1981, providing more responsive controls over disruptive imports.

—We have negotiated 15 new bilateral export restraint agreements which are firmer and fairer than earlier versions, covering 80 percent of all imports from low-cost suppliers. And we are negotiating more.

—We have improved our monitoring of imports and implementation of restraints, through steps such as the new legislative initiatives I have approved.

—We have, despite the proposed small reduction in tariffs, the highest textile and apparel tariffs in the developed world.

—We have begun discussions with exporting countries not now under restraint to seek appropriate levels for their shipments.

—We have established a pilot program to improve productivity in the men's tailored clothing industry, and we have begun an export promotion program for the entire textile and apparel complex.

—And we have begun a review of existing and proposed Federal regulations affecting this industry to assess their impact.

This, however, is not enough. I pledge that we will do more;

—We will intensify our review of existing bilateral restraint agreements to be sure they really work, and if there are harmful surges we will work promptly to remedy them.

—We will not allow the effectiveness of our restraint agreements to be undermined by significant increases in shipments from uncontrolled suppliers, and we will maintain a worldwide evaluation of the imports of textile and apparel into the U.S. and seek appropriate action, country-by-country, where warranted.

—We will be prepared to expand the pilot project underway in the men's tailored clothing industry so that other sectors may benefit from that experience, and we will speed proposals for a similar program in the ladies apparel industry.

—We will negotiate strenuously for removal of non-tariff barriers to U.S textile and apparel exports, including restrictive "rules of origin."

—The Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations will begin a new policy review and report to me quarterly on developments in the domestic textile and apparel industry, with special emphasis on imports and exports, so that appropriate actions can be taken more promptly.

These steps, like those of the past year, will not be the limit of our assistance to this vital industry. But each step that we take must be directed toward the long-term health of this industry and the United States economy as a whole—unlike H.R. 9937 which on balance is detrimental to the textile industry, to its two million workers, and to the Nation as a whole.

JIMMY CARTER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 10, 1978.*

H.R. 9370

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I have withheld approval from H.R. 9370, "A bill to establish new Federal programs and assistance for the development of aquaculture in the United States."

While the underlying purpose of the bill, development of an active aquaculture industry, is sound, I am concerned that the numerous broad-reaching programs established under the bill are premature. H.R. 9370 would establish a National Aquaculture Council to assess the state of aquaculture in the U.S. and to prepare a National Aquaculture Development Plan—a detailed set of Federal activities to expand the commercial potential of certain aquatic species. It would establish substantial new programs of Federal assistance to carry out the plan and undertake demonstration projects in aquaculture. The bill also would create a Federal Aquaculture Assistance Fund to provide financial assistance and support to the aquaculture industry through a new Federal loan guarantee program and a new Federal insurance program.

The Administration recognizes the importance of aquaculture, the need for effective programs to support this, and the concept of an assessment of the aquaculture industry. In fact, many of the actions that the bill would require are already underway. Federal agencies are now involved in a wide variety of aquaculture activities, and they already have the legislative authorities they need to provide research and technical and financial assistance to the aquaculture industry. For example, the Small Business Administration can assist small business concerns which are engaged in aquaculture. The Department of Commerce, through its aquaculture research activities and the Sea Grant program, is supporting marine research, development, and advisory services. The Department of the Interior spends about $15 million yearly on freshwater aquaculture at its fish hatcheries, research and development laboratories, and cooperative fishery units. The Agriculture Department provides a complete range of information and technical assistance related to aquaculture. Additionally, the Farm Credit Administration is authorized to extend credit to harvesters of aquatic products.

We also have in place a way to coordinate the aquaculture programs of the Federal Government—namely, the Interagency Subcommittee on Aquaculture of the Federal Council on Science and Technology.

Given this array of Federal activities, I believe we should more carefully assess the need for additional programs in this area. In particular, I am concerned about offering major new government subsidies such as the loan guarantee and insurance programs unless and until a clear need for them has been established. Accordingly, I must withhold my approval of the bill.

My Administration will continue to assess the needs of aquaculture and the effectiveness and adequacy of the Federal programs in this area. We look forward to reviewing these programs next year with the sponsors of this measure in the hope we can agree on additional improvements in the government's aquaculture program.

JIMMY CARTER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1978.*

APPOINTMENTS BY THE SPEAKER

Pursuant to the provisions of 22 United States Code 1928a, as amended, and the authority granted by the House on October 15, 1978, the Speaker did on Wednesday, November 15, 1978, appoint as members of the U.S. Group of the North Atlantic Assembly to be held in Lisbon, Portugal, November 25 to November 30, 1978, the following Members on the part of the House:

The gentleman from California, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Chairman;

The gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HAMILTON, Vice Chairman;

The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. RODINO;

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. BROOKS;

The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ANNUNZIO;

The gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. ROSE;

The gentleman from Florida, Mr. IRELAND;

The gentlewoman from Ohio, Ms. OAKAR;

The gentleman from Arizona, Mr. RHODES;

The gentleman from California, Mr. BOB WILSON;

The gentleman from Michigan, Mr. BROOMFIELD; and

The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. FINDLEY.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

[Omitted from the Record of October 14, 1978]

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (H. Con. Res. 758) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 15, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

[Resolutions omitted from the Record of October 15, 1978]

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. Con. Res. 758. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 15; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Con. Res. 759. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 4018, H.R. 5037, H.R. 5146, and H.R. 5289; considered and agreed to.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER

HON. JOHN B. BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 14, 1978

● Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the third and concluding part of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's proposal for the creation of the Temporary National Economic Committee, sent to the Congress on April 29, 1938, to investigate the concentration of economic power and the growing influence of monopoly over the American economy and the life of its people.

The last part of President Roosevelt's proposal follows:

PATENTS

Hearings on patents demonstrated the various kinds of uses—good and bad—to which patents may be put by various industries. The automobile industry, for example, is an industry in which there has been no substantial restriction achieved through patent monopolies. Since the first cross-licensing agreement in 1915, practically all automobile patents have been readily accessible to any manufacturer, though some of them have been on a royalty basis. In sharp contrast is the use made of patents in the glass container industry in which only two firms, closely bound by cross-licensing contracts, controlled 96.6 per cent of the glass containers produced in 1937 through licensing manufacturers and leasing machinery to them.

LIFE INSURANCE

The enormity of the life insurance business is indicated by the fact that in 1937 there was $109,600,000,000 of life insurance in force, and the total income of life insurance companies was 7.5 per cent of the entire national income. The high degree of concentration in life insurance business is demonstrated by the fact that in 1937, 5 companies controlled 54.4 per cent, 16 companies controlled 80.6 per cent, and 25 companies controlled 87.2 per cent of all assets of the 308 life insurance companies. In 1937, there were $20,600,000,000 of industrial insurance in force, and of this amount ten companies had 92.04 per cent, with the two largest having 73.26 per cent between them.

HOUSING

The failure of the private construction industry in the United States to build homes in price ranges proportionate to the various income groups is demonstrated by the fact that in 1930–37 only 10.5 per cent of homes built were within the reach of those with annual incomes of $1,000 and less, while 36.5 per cent of our population is in this income group. At the other extreme, 51.3 per cent of homes built in the same period were within the reach of those with incomes of $3,000 and more, but only 8.0 per cent of the population is in this income group.

The concentration of control in the building materials industry is revealed in the attached exhibit (No. 910 before the committee), which shows the percentage of production controlled by the four leading companies.

SAVINGS AND INVESTMENT

From 1923 to 1929 business enterprise financed more than 75 per cent of their annual average expenditure of $8,500,000,000 for plant and equipment from internal sources; from 1935 to 1937 they financed 92 per cent of their annual average expenditure of $5,800,000,000 from internal sources. Total savings in the twenty years, 1910–30, increased 382 per cent, while in the same period the population of continental United States showed a growth of only 33½ per cent.

The concentration of control over this vast fund of savings in the principal reservoirs of the nation is shown by the attached exhibit (No. 611 before the committee).

PETROLEUM

Between $11,000,000,000 and $15,000,000,000 are invested in the petroleum industry in the United States. Of this total amount, only twenty of the major integrated companies had assets totaling about $8,000,000,000 in 1938; and the five largest companies alone had over 60 percent of this amount. Other evidence of concentration in the industry was: the ownership of 94.2 per cent of the stocks of crude petroleum and six selected petroleum products by the twenty major companies in 1937 (see attached committee Chart X); the fact that 71.8 per cent of crude oil pipeline mileage (trunk and gathering) and 96.1 per cent of gasoline pipeline mileage in 1938 was owned by the twenty major companies; while fifteen major companies alone owned 87.2 per cent of all the dead-weight