

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself and Mr. PRESSLER):

H. Res. 397. Resolution directing the House Commission on Information and Facilities to provide for radio and television coverage of proceedings in the House Chamber during the first session of the 94th Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 398. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that July 4, Independence Day, is the foremost national holiday; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. FENWICK (for herself and Mr. KEMP):

H. Res. 399. Resolution concerning the safety and freedom of Valentyn Moroz, Ukrainian historian; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. HOLTZMAN (for herself and Mr. JOHN L. BURTON):

H. Res. 400. Resolution directing the President to provide to the House Representatives certain information respecting U.S. nationals who are presently in South Vietnam; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. COHEN, Mr. STARK, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. KRUEGER, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. DODD, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr.

McDADE, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. GINN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. TSONGAS, and Mr. SARBANES):

H. Res. 401. Resolution establishing a select committee to study the problem of U.S. servicemen missing in action in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STARK:

H. Res. 402. Resolution providing for additional staff members for certain Members of the House of Representatives, whose duties shall relate to certain legislative responsibilities of such Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island:

H.R. 6093. A bill for the relief of Maria D'Arpino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIP BURTON:

H.R. 6094. A bill for the relief of Gustavo Hada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER (by request):

H.R. 6095. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benedicto Principe and his wife, Erlinda Madula Principe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

84. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mary Lou Capps, Tahlequah, Okla., and others relative to preschool child day care; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

85. Also, petition of Marilyn Cline, Terre Haute, Ind., relative to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

86. Also, petition of Judy and Jim Fielding, Terre Haute, Ind., relative to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

87. Also, petition of Vera Miller, Terre Haute, Ind., relative to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

88. Also, petition of Joseph F. Spenner and others, Stayton, Oreg., relative to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

89. Also, petition of the board of supervisors, San Bernardino County, Calif., relative to the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1975; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

90. Also, petition of the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Vietnam, relative to providing assistance to South Vietnam; to the Committee on International Relations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MARYLAND'S BIRTHPLACE

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, Maryland's "Mother County" is St. Mary's, located at the mouth of the Potomac River, just a short drive from the Nation's Capital. It is the land of not only pleasant living, but a place steeped in historic charm.

For those who may be interested in traveling to "the land of the fiddle and the flask," I include an article from the Maryland Travel Scene, April edition, which more fully describes the attractions of St. Mary's County. Those who might desire further information, may contact my office. We extend an invitation to enjoy the great hospitality of southern Maryland.

The article follows:

ST. MARY'S COUNTY—"WHERE COLONIAL MARYLAND IS AS NEAR AS YESTERDAY"

For the Bicentennial traveller tired of our Nation's Capital hustle-bustle, there lies only 40 miles south a land of tranquil charm, steeped in colonial history—St. Mary's County, the Mother County of Maryland. It was here in 1634, British colonists crowded into two tiny ships called "The Ark" and "The Dove", landed on Blackstone Island an established settlement dedicated to religious tolerance and "equality for all".

That story will be re-enacted this summer on the same ground where history was made nearly 350 years ago. "Wings of the Morning", an outdoor drama written by Dr. Kermit Hunter, is not only a play about Maryland's historic beginning, but a moving, compassionate re-telling of Catholics and Protestants alike struggling to survive in an alien New World.

Under the leadership of Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore, this tiny band of colonists established what was to become the first capital of Maryland—St. Mary's City. Today, a reconstructed courthouse marks the spot where colonists fought for equal representation, where religious freedom was granted under the Act of Toleration, and where Margaret Brent, perhaps America's first woman liberationist, won citizen rights for women.

Produced by Ed Atkins in conjunction with the St. Mary's County Outdoor Drama Association and the St. Mary's County Bicentennial Commission, "Wings of the Morning" spans 14 years between 1633 and 1647 with action taking place at the Isle of Wight in Cowes, England and ending at the St. Mary's City site.

While listening to the pageantry and songs, the audience can feel the cool river breezes and watch a cast of 50 dance and perform on a new floating stage from shoreside seats nestled in a natural amphitheatre. Tickets for Thursday through Sunday performances beginning July 3 through August 31 are available by writing:

"Wings of the Morning," Box 36, Dameron, Maryland 20638. 301-863-5650.

But why not spend a weekend in St. Mary's? Just drive down historic Pennsylvania Avenue past the White House, around the Capitol, and turn right at the Branch Avenue and Rt. 5/301 signpost. Thirty miles south at Waldorf, Md., Rt. 5 branches left towards St. Mary's and within minutes you're driving through some of the most beautiful countryside the East has to offer. St. Mary's County offers all the pleasures of a tidewater peninsula, including some of the best charter-boat sport fishing in the world. For those who enjoy spicy Maryland steamed crabs and delicate flaky rockfish, the delights of the Chesapeake Bay are offered at every crossroad.

Or how about seeing a working 17th Century plantation complete with a manor house lost centuries ago over a game of cards? Sotterley Plantation is a living, touchable museum where days of long ago vividly come to life.

And of course, there is "Wings of the Morning" dramatically enacted on a waterfront stage in historic St. Mary's City where one of the oldest Episcopal churches in the Nation stands. Or wander through the St. John's archeological dig while blossoming tobacco waves in the background.

In Southern Maryland colonial America is as near as yesterday, but modern accommodations there make you glad for the 20th century. For additional information, call or write: St. Mary's Economic Development Commission, Leonardtown, Md. 20650, tel: 301/475-2411.

FREEDOM FOR VALENTYN MOROZ

HON. MILLICENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, April 15 marked the 39th birthday of Valentyn Moroz, the Ukrainian historian who has been imprisoned by Soviet authorities because of his defense of Ukrainian civil rights. I am today introducing with Representative KEMP of New York a resolution urging the President to express U.S. concern over Moroz to the Soviet Government.

I would also like to enter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time a description of Valentyn Moroz' alleged treatment by Soviet officials, prepared by the privately sponsored Committee for the Defense of Valentyn Moroz:

## VALENTYN MOROZ

Valentyn Moroz was born on April 15, 1936, in the village of Kholoniv, the Ukrainian SSR. He attended the University of Lviv, majoring in history. After graduating in 1958, Moroz taught history and geography in Volyn Region until 1965. At that time he was also working on his doctoral dissertation.

## FIRST ARREST AND IMPRISONMENT, 1965-69

Moroz was unable to defend his dissertation because on September 1, 1965 he was arrested for reading and disseminating "samizdat" literature and foreign publications. He was formally charged with "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation" and put on trial in January 1966. At his trial, Moroz refused to denounce his actions and was sentenced to 4 years in strict-regime labor camps. During his confinement in the Mordovian ASSR, Moroz wrote "A Report from the Beria Reservation", an expose of the persistent legacy of Stalinism in the Soviet Union today.

## NINE MONTHS OF FREEDOM

Upon his release on September 1, 1969, Moroz was unable to secure employment because of his "criminal record". During the next few months, he wrote three essays: "A Chronicle of Resistance" dealt with the deliberate destruction of Ukrainian culture; "Moses and Dathan" dwelt on the theme of an individual's loss of national consciousness; and "Amid the Snows" criticized a leading Ukrainian dissident writer for giving in to official pressure and compromising his views.

## SECOND ARREST AND TRIAL, 1970

These essays precipitated his second arrest on June 1, 1970. Again the charge was "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation". The trial took place on November 17-18, 1970, in Ivano-Frankivsk. The government built its case around the four essays Moroz had written. He himself acknowledged that he was the author, yet denied that they were anti-Soviet and demanded an open trial. On the grounds that a closed trial was illegal according to Soviet law, he refused to testify. Most of the witnesses called in the case either did the same or testified in Moroz's favor. Nevertheless, the court delivered a verdict of "guilty" and sentenced Moroz to 6 years special prison, 3 years in a special-regime labor camp, and 5 years exile.

## SECOND IMPRISONMENT, VLADIMIR PRISON

Reports began coming out of the prison which indicated that Moroz was being put under intense pressure to renounce his views. In November 1971, he became ill with a liver condition. In addition, it was learned that Moroz was being subjected to forced injections of drugs and his food was being contaminated with chemicals. In November 1972, Amnesty International reported that in July Moroz had been attacked by criminal inmates, sustaining four stab wounds, and had been taken to the prison hospital in grave condition. He was later put in solitary confinement where he remained for nearly two years.

## HUNGER STRIKE

In an attempt to save himself from conditions which he believed were intended to drive him to insanity, Moroz began a hunger strike on July 1, 1974. He declared that he would refuse food until he was either transferred to a hard-labor camp or until he died, death being preferable to insanity.

To keep Moroz alive, prison authorities began force-feeding him. The tube used abraded the lining of his throat and esophagus, being covered with blood every time it was withdrawn. Moroz became frighteningly emaciated; his heart and liver conditions worsened. On their part, Soviet authorities denied him medical attention and until the 128th day of his hunger strike, refused to allow Moroz's wife, Raisa, to see him. Finally on November 5, 1974, his wife, father, and

son were allowed to visit Moroz on the condition that they try to persuade him to terminate his strike. At this meeting, Moroz informed his family of his intention to continue his fast until the New Year, and if by that time his demands were still unmet, to find a way to end his life.

## WORLD PROTEST

An international movement in defense of Moroz was initiated in July 1974. The first voices of protest were raised by prominent individuals and groups in the Soviet Union. Andrei Sakharov, the Soviet nuclear physicist who heads the civil rights movement in the USSR, has repeatedly appealed to Soviet and world leaders on behalf of Moroz. Outside the USSR, groups such as Amnesty International, the writers' organization P.E.N. International, the International Commission of Jurists, the AFL-CIO, United Auto Workers, and the Canadian Jewish Congress have all spoken out in defense of Valentyn Moroz. Hundreds of prominent private individuals from all over the world have voiced their concern, among them Nobel prize winners Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and Heinrich Boell, Arthur Schlesinger, Eric Fromm, Jean-Paul Sartre, Pavel Litvinov, and Noam Chomsky. Members of the British, Canadian, and Australian parliaments have taken a stand in defense of Moroz; the Canadian government twice officially intervened. In the United States Congress, over 60 senators and representatives either introduced or co-sponsored resolutions urging that the US government make known its concern over Moroz's imprisonment. Additionally, many members sent individual letters of protest to the Soviet government. On December 10, 1974, Harvard University offered Moroz a fellowship in history.

## END OF HUNGER STRIKE

On November 22, 1974, after 145 days of fasting, Valentyn Moroz ended his hunger strike. Soviet authorities promised they would ease his prison conditions and that he would be taken out of solitary confinement, but Moroz would not be transferred to a labor camp nor would there be a reduction of his prison term. On December 7, 1974, Raisa Moroz received a letter from her husband informing her that he was in a new cell block with another political prisoner. Informed sources have reported, however, that Moroz is suffering from the debilitating effects of his hunger strike and long prison internment, that pressure on him is still intense, and that harassment of his family continues.

## USDA NOW ADMITS DAIRY COST ESTIMATES WERE MISLEADING AND FALSE

## HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the emergency farm aid bill which has just emerged from conference contains, with respect to the dairy provision, a determination of public policy based on what is now acknowledged to be a massive error of economic calculation by the Department of Agriculture. It is incredible to me, therefore, that either the House or Senate, being apprised of that fact, could in conscience still embrace the conference report.

I, for one, will not support, and I urge Members to reject the conference report.

At stake is nothing less than the integrity of the process by which we in the Congress must rely on the accuracy and candor of the technical information sup-

plied to us by executive departments and agencies. Outside of Congress, there is an equally important stake: The ability of those influential segments of our society who mold public opinion, write editorials, mobilize their constituents, to aid or defeat legislative proposals, and to help substantively mold public policy to similarly be able to place trust and reliance in the kinds of information supplied by the executive branch.

Three weeks ago, based on the original Agriculture Department estimates of increased consumer prices, if support levels for dairy products were fixed at 85 percent of parity, a not insignificant coalition of labor, consumer, public interest and other groups and of newspaper editorial writers and urban lawmakers joined to narrowly win adoption of the Richmond amendment which eliminated from the emergency farm bill the original provision raising the minimum support price from 80 to 85 percent. The bill now recommended by the conference committee still contains that lower figure.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture now admits, however, that the figures which sparked the opposition to the 85 percent support level were wrong.

What is the size of the now confessed error in estimating economic impact of an 85 percent price support level made by USDA? We were told in a barrage of lobbying by USDA against that figure and in the flood of newspaper editorials by the Washington Post and the New York Times and others, and in the sheafs of memos sent out by Common Cause or the Consumer Federation of America, and in conversations with AFL-CIO representatives, that 85 percent support would raise the price of drinking milk by 8 cents a gallon.

The revised USDA figure is now 4.5 cents a gallon.

We were told the price of cheese would increase 10 cents a pound. USDA now acknowledges the price would increase by only 5.25 cents a pound.

We were told the price of butter would increase 20 cents a pound. USDA now acknowledges the increase would be not 20 cents, but 5.3 cents a pound.

In fact, USDA now acknowledges that a milk support price at 85 percent of parity under the revised figures would actually result in consumer increases below—below—the cost estimated for the bill with the 80 percent figure.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a minor or insignificant or meaningless difference. On a monetary scale, the differences between the old and the revised figures are so broad that it is incredible that such false and incorrect and totally misleading figures should now turn out to have served as the economic rock on which public policy has been determined by both the administration and the Congress; on which vigorous—but incorrect—editorials were written in some of our leading national newspapers; on which whole lobbying efforts intended to serve the consumer and public interest were launched.

The USDA explains quietly at this late date that its original figures were mistaken because of a misreading of the quarterly adjustment provision contained in the legislation and which led

to a wildly exaggerated projection of consumer costs at a price support level of 85 percent of parity. Now that USDA has caught its mistake and read the provision correctly, it acknowledges that the revised actual cost projections under 85 percent are something massively less than the Frankenstein for consumers they originally claimed to see.

It is all very well to discover one's mistakes and correct them, Mr. Speaker, but what every Member of this Congress ought to be seriously troubled about, as should the Washington Post, the New York Times, Common Cause, the Consumer Federation of America, the AFL-CIO, and others, is that it was not USDA which troubled to pass the word when the mistake was discovered and to set the record straight.

It was a Republican colleague of ours in the House, JAMES M. JEFFORDS, of Vermont, who discovered through persistence and hard work and some luck that the whole cost estimates originally provided by USDA and which were serving as the basis for all the House and Senate and conference consideration of the dairy section of this bill, were all a big mistake, miles off the mark, and completely misleading, and were all being revised by USDA itself.

That mistake was clearly discovered at least as early as last week, if not a good deal earlier.

But in the flood of propagandizing against 85-percent support, at the time Congress was making its determination, USDA, conscious of its own mistake, did not call any press conferences, issue any reports, or otherwise make known to the public and concerned groups and the rest of us that we were legislatively proceeding on economic assumptions and information that USDA knew to be totally and wildly wrong. The editors of the Washington Post and the New York Times were not contacted to set the record straight, nor were the groups supporting the USDA position, and who, with whatever noble intentions, allowed themselves to be used by it after many of us had warned there was something very basically wrong with what USDA was telling them.

It would perhaps be charitable to ascribe the serious omission committed in not notifying Congress and the public of the changed figures to Secretary Butz's preoccupation with planning to attend the State funeral of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in Taiwan. But experience suggests other motives may be involved in a Department which, under Secretary Butz, has unfailingly demonstrated any lack of interest in maintaining U.S. self-sufficiency in dairy production or in doing anything to prevent dairy farmers going out of business in droves day after day.

The first public word of this massive error by USDA was provided in a news release issued jointly last Thursday by Mr. JEFFORDS and Senator HUMPHREY. It is a matter of no small regret to those like myself who represent dairy farmers that one of the same newspapers which editorialized so fluently against 85 percent of parity—the Washington Post—has yet to find this item of news value

or interest. Nor has the New York Times, which editorialized so strongly against 85 percent of parity, yet found the news of this colossal USDA blunder which misled not only Congress and groups like Common Cause, but the Times itself, fit to print.

Thus has public policy on this issue been fashioned and determined and the House been persuaded to legislate.

I suggest the House, now having been apprised of the wholly erroneous and wildly misleading assumptions on which it has been led to act, should make it clear it will not legislate under such a circumstance, by rejecting the conference report. And I suggest that those groups who were willing to provide assistance to dairy farmers at a level which the original USDA figures claimed would be provided at 80 percent of parity should now support 85 percent—which under the corrected figures would result in no greater cost to the consumer than would 80 percent under the old, now discredited figures.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have printed at this point in the RECORD a summary prepared by our colleague Mr. JEFFORDS showing the vast discrepancy between the new corrected figures from USDA compared to the previous figures by which the House and the public were persuaded. And I would like to suggest that these finally discovered real costs are a small price to pay to prevent this Nation from losing its self-sufficiency in dairy products by 1980.

**SUMMARY OF PRICE PROJECTIONS (FOR MANUFACTURING MILK PER HUNDREDWEIGHT-PAID TO FARMERS)**

[Present support price based on 80 percent of parity as of Jan. 1, 1975—\$7.24. Departmental projections are based on quarterly adjustments]

	As previously released by USDA	Incorrect reading of farm bill new comparable figures by USDA	Correct reading of farm bill new figures by USDA
<b>At 80 percent of parity:</b>			
April	\$7.42	\$7.31	\$7.31
July	7.59	7.45	7.37
October	7.76	7.51	7.35
January 1976	7.93	7.51	7.31
<b>At 85 percent of parity:</b>			
April	7.91	7.76	7.76
July	7.98	7.91	7.82
October	8.13	7.97	7.79
January 1976	8.19	7.97	7.76

**IMPACT ON CONSUMER PRICES (MAXIMUM PROJECTED)**

[In cents]

	At 80 percent of parity		At 85 percent of parity	
	Incorrect reading of bill old projections	Correct reading of bill new projections	Incorrect reading of bill old projections	Correct reading of bill new projections
Fluid milk (per gallon)	6	1.1	8	5
Cheese (per pound)	7	1.3	10	5.7
Butter (per pound)	15	1.3	20	5.8
Nonfat dry milk (per pound)		.9		3.9

The plain fact is that because the House had the wrong information last

month, its action on the dairy section of the emergency farm bill was wrong.

I hate to say I told you so, but—

**LONG ISLAND PRESS BACKS LOBBYING DISCLOSURE LEGISLATION**

**HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the editorial appearing in the February 26 Long Island Press which supports the purposes of H.R. 15, the Public Disclosure of Lobbying Act of 1975.

**NEED FOR TOUGHER LOBBYING CONTROLS**

Eight members of Congress, four from each side of the political aisle, have joined Common Cause campaign to put real teeth in the Lobbying Act of 1946. Since its inception, this well-intentioned but weak law has been laughed at and ignored by the very special interests it is supposed to control.

John Gardner, chairman of Common Cause, itself a citizen's lobby—calls the old act "a sham and a hoax." Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass. says it is "a disgrace." They're right. While lobbying serves a useful purpose when properly pursued, it has been subverted by too many special interest groups that try to influence lawmakers and administrators in secret, deceive the public and in Mr. Gardner's words, "corrupt the political process."

The need for tougher controls is urgent. Worsening economic and energy problems call for decisive government action of direct concern to many diverse groups, such as energy producers and distributors, labor unions, businesses, and the most concerned group of all, tens of millions of consumers. But government must do more than act decisively, it must also act in the open so that no one legitimate interest group gains at the expense of the others.

This can only be done by changing a law that is laughed at, into one that is respected.

This is exactly what eight lawmakers have in mind in the bill they have co-sponsored to amend the old act. Joining Mr. Kennedy in the Senate are Sens. Robert Stafford, R-Vt.; William Brock, R-Tenn.; and Dick Clark, D-Iowa. House sponsors are Reps. Tom Rallsback, R-Ill., and Robert Kastenmeier, D-Wis.

The legislation would require lobbyists who spend \$500 or more annually to file quarterly full-disclosure reports with the government on their activities and finances, including the identification of everyone seeking to influence not just Congress, but federal agencies as well. Each lobbyist would be required to maintain personal records of income and expenses of \$10 or more. Violators could receive two years' imprisonment and be fined up to \$10,000, with enforcement carried out by the new Federal Election Commission.

These new rules would correct deficiencies in the 1956 law, particularly through the extension of controls over lobbying of agencies and departments in the Executive Branch as well as Congress.

Lobbying reform is crucial to public understanding and support of the many other tough decisions Congress must make this year. Let's hope the old lobbying law is updated and strengthened within a matter of weeks.

## H.R. 46, YOUTH CAMP SAFETY ACT

## HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the Youth Camp Safety Act, H.R. 46, will shortly come before this body for consideration.

The bill has the backing of organized camping groups, the National Parent Teachers Association, and the National Safety Council. One of the most active of these associations in behalf of youth camp safety over many, many years, has been the American Camping Association, a private and voluntary association of approximately 4,000 youth camps.

The American Camping Association has its own certification and inspection program and makes every effort to insure that member camps provide adequate protection to youngsters.

However, the ACA cannot do the job alone. Without minimum Federal safety standards and effective Federal or State enforcement of standards, the ACA is powerless to protect all children in all youth camps.

I want to bring to my colleagues' attention a memorandum from Alan J. Stolz, national legislative chairman of the ACA which strongly endorses H.R. 46 and rejects any attempts to weaken the bill. The text of the memorandum follows at this point:

H.R. 46, YOUTH CAMP SAFETY ACT  
(By Alan J. Stolz, National Legislative Chairman, American Camping Association)

I have been pleased to review H.R. 46, as reported from the House Education and Labor Committee, which we have helped develop over recent years.

The bill as stands today is very acceptable to the American Camping Association, and on behalf of our National Board of Directors and Executive Staff, I wish to commend your efforts in sponsoring this legislation for the protection of all children in all camps in all states.

As a voluntary professional organization in youth camping, the American Camping Association can have only minimal effect on non-member camps. The same would be true if a youth camp safety act was left to become voluntary on the part of individual subscribers or states as recommended by Mr. Anderson in his substitute amendment.

The basic concept of protecting children in all camping situations as offered in H.R. 46 can only have validity if subscribed to across the nation. Only then can all parents of all youngsters in any camp rely upon the protections offered for their child's basic health and safety. There is no reason why all youngsters should not be entitled to these basic considerations of health and safety regardless of which camp they attend, and only a national guideline can establish such regulations.

In today's rapid transit and interstate society, the American Camping Association recognizes that a child's camp experience is not limited to his own community and hence the need for basic health and safety regulations, regardless of the camp's location.

Accordingly, the American Camping Association is pleased to support your effort in H.R. 46 as being in the interest of Good Camping For All across the nation. Cer-

tainly our own members have nothing to fear in this legislation. We recognize that with the passage of H.R. 46, enforcement and responsibility for the Youth Camp Safety regulations will take place on the local, state level where each camp operator will have full opportunity for participation.

On behalf of the American Camping Association, I wish you well in these efforts and would urge support for H.R. 46 from your Colleagues in Congress.

## CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION OPPOSES LIMITATIONS ON RIGHT TO ABORTION

## HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a report recently issued by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission charged that a constitutional amendment to restrict access to abortion would undermine the 1st, 9th, and 14th amendments. The report also advocated the repeal of all those statutory provisions which limit the right to choose or obtain an abortion, and urged the defeat of any future attempts to limit this right through legislation.

I concur with these findings of the report, and recommend it to my colleagues. At this point, I ask that two articles describing the content of the report be inserted in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, April 15, 1975]  
RIGHTS UNIT ASSAULTS ANTI-ABORTION BILLS  
(By Stuart Auerbach)

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission charged yesterday that proposals to amend the Constitution to bar abortions would "undermine the First, Ninth and 14th amendments to the Constitution."

In a 101-page report to the President and Congress, the six-member commission said proposed anti-abortion amendments have proliferated since the Supreme Court, in January, 1973, limited the rights of States to the abortions.

The commission also called on Congress to repeal five anti-abortion laws currently on the books.

The commission report was immediately challenged by Terrence Cardinal Cooke of New York, chairman of the Catholic Bishops' Committee For Pro-Life Activities.

Cardinal Cooke said the Civil Rights Commission "has apparently joined the ranks of those who would violate the rights of the most powerless among us—the unborn child."

The Civil Rights Commission was founded in 1957 to study problems of discrimination in America. Its original charge concerned racial, religious and ethnic discrimination. The commission has no enforcement powers; it can only make recommendations to the President and Congress.

The commission said it issued its report on abortion under its charge to check federal laws and policies on sex discrimination. It said its recommendations are concerned only with supporting "each woman's constitutional right as delineated by the Supreme Court" in its abortion decision.

The report was signed by all members of the commission, which is headed by Arthur S. Flemming, the 69-year-old Republican who was Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare under President Eisenhower. He replaced the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh,

president of Notre Dame University, as chairman about a year ago.

In its report, the commission said anti-abortion amendments would violate the First Amendment by giving government sanction to one set of religious views; the Ninth Amendment by taking away the inherent right of American women to an abortion, and the 14th Amendment by denying equal protection to poor women, most of whom belong to racial and ethnic minorities.

"To prohibit abortion," the commission said, "would infringe upon the fundamental liberty to limit childbearing."

Moreover, the commission stated, constitutional amendments barring abortions would "jeopardize the professional judgment" of doctors and lead to an increase in maternal deaths, especially among the poor, because of illegal, unsafe abortions.

Proposals have been introduced in Congress to amend the Constitution to forbid abortions, but no House committee hearings have been held on them. The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights held hearings this year and last.

The amendments were introduced in an attempt to override the Supreme Court decision by imposing a ban on abortions. The Supreme Court ruled that states could not prohibit abortions through the first three months of pregnancy and could regulate abortions in the second three months only to protect a woman's health.

Besides moving to amend the Constitution, anti-abortion forces have attached riders to a number of bills. The riders seek to limit federal funding of abortions and bar research on fetuses.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1975]  
U.S. RIGHTS PANEL OPPOSES ABORTION RESTRICTIONS

WASHINGTON, April 14.—The United States Commission on Civil Rights stated today in a formal report on its opposition to a constitutional amendment or legislation restricting the freedom of women to obtain abortions.

The commission's unanimous report said that a constitutional amendment restricting access to abortion would "undermine the first, ninth and 14th Amendments."

An antiabortion amendment would come into conflict with the First Amendment, the report said, because it would have the effect of "compelling every woman to accept the view that a constitutionally protected "person" exists from the moment of conception, even when such a view conflicts with an individual woman's religious views."

The commission's report was attacked by Cardinal Cooke of New York, who called it "shocking." He said that the report "raises serious questions about the role of the Commission on Civil Rights and its fidelity to the legal mandate under which it was established."

"We have come to think of the commission as a defender of the powerless and oppressed," his statement continued. "However, in this instance it has apparently joined the ranks of those who would violate the rights of the most powerless among us—the unborn child."

The commission has statutory authority to study essentially any subject in the whole area of civil rights, and to make reports. It has no authority to require compliance with its views by any individual or organization.

The commission's report noted that the Supreme Court had asserted a woman's unlimited right to abortion in the first three months of pregnancy and a right limited only by some medical considerations in the second three months. The decision was made essentially under the 14th Amendment.

In addition, the commission said that an

anti-abortion amendment to the Constitution would "undermine the ninth Amendment which reserved to the people of the United States certain rights that were not enumerated in the Constitution."

A right to abortion was generally accepted at the time of the adoption of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution, and thus is among these guaranteed rights, the report said. Restrictions on an abortion on medical grounds were not enacted until the 19th century.

The commission's report also cited a number of attempts, through legislation, to limit the access of women to abortion. It said all those that had been enacted should be repealed and those not yet enacted should be defeated.

It singled out for special mention, in this particular, the Legal Services Corporation Act, which prohibits use of any of the corporation's funds to litigate a woman's right to an abortion.

This Provision particularly discriminates against low-income women, the commission said, since they "have no other access to legal assistance in attempts to vindicate their rights."

The commission also warned that establishing a legal principle that a fetus, from the moment of conception, was a "person" could lead to conflict and chaos in several areas of the law including inheritances and taxes.

A MEMORIAL TO PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of President Chiang Kai-shek of the Republic of China is a deep and historic tragedy. Today, the Embassy of the Chinese Republic is holding a memorial service for its President at the National Cathedral and I know that many of my colleagues join in that memorial in spirit, if not by their presence.

President Chiang was more than his nation's leader. He was a living symbol of the freedom and determination, the courage and idealism, of the Chinese people through the centuries. As history judges our time from the perspective of years, he will most assuredly loom large as one of the men whose impression upon the world was indelible and lasting.

It was fated that Chiang Kai-shek assumed the leadership of his people at their most pivotal, crucial moment. The ancient, centuries-old, dynastic tradition of China had collapsed and a new Chinese Republic was emerging and struggling to achieve identity and support. Chiang is immutably associated with the Republican movement in China, having been one of its founding fathers and its greatest exponent.

The 20th century was a time of struggle in China as the Chinese people cast off the yoke of feudalism, striving to find their place in the modern world. Chiang Kai-shek has left his mark in that modern world through his dedication and the zeal with which he fought for the freedom of his people.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many of our

colleagues and citizens join in mourning the loss of Chiang Kai-shek and in extending to the Chinese people our deepest sympathy.

GROWING STRENGTH OF SOUTHERN BLACK MAYORS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, we in the Congressional Black Caucus are especially proud of the strides which have been made over the past few years in the election of more black mayors in the South. This increase in representation is, in large part, a product of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 which has encouraged fuller participation by all citizens in political affairs.

The success black mayors have been making in improving community services and increasing the responsiveness of local government to the needs of the poor and the forgotten is heartening. It is a positive sign of the type of progress we can work for if the Federal Government meets its moral commitment to renew the Voting Rights Act. As both the House of Representatives and the Senate debate renewing and strengthening this landmark legislation, we in Congress should keep in mind the fact that the Voting Rights Act has had a significant impact in protecting the rights of all our citizens.

It is not a theoretical piece of legislation. It has proven itself in such ways as enabling Federal aid to small cities and rural communities to be spent in a nondiscriminatory manner and funneling more money into the creation of jobs and construction of housing.

The newly formed Southern Conference of Black Mayors, chaired by Mayor Jay Cooper of Prichard, Ala., was organized to maximize their collective ability to attract badly needed funds and people to their community. The Congressional Black Caucus hopes to continue working closely with these mayors.

At this time I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Roanoke, Va., Tribune on the establishment of the Southern Conference of Black Mayors and the problems they face.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Tribune, Mar. 27, 1975]

SOUTHERN BLACK MAYORS COMING TO LIFE

GRAMBLING, LA.—Black mayors of Southern cities and towns with black majorities are coming to life. They are moving swiftly organizing, planning and implementing programs to breed new life into their once obscure and obsolete communities.

The 11 Southern states are now made up of 76 black mayors, and more than 1,500 black elected officials from justice of the peace to Congressman.

The mayors have formed the Southern Conference of Black Mayors, and they met here last week to explore ways of interdependence, to talk about the formation of coalitions with whites and others (already

in progress), but mostly about attracting money and people with money to their "mayordoms."

Individually, and as a group, many of these black mayors have gained national reputations, and some have been successful in getting huge chunks of Federal greenbacks in their backyards.

Jay Cooper, for example, Mayor of Prichard, Ala., with a population of 45,000. He is president of the Southern mayors' group, has already gotten \$10 million in Federal funds, mainly for urban renewal in the two and a half years he has been at the helm of the city.

But all is not roses. True, there has been some success, but there are also difficulties ahead, especially for the smaller communities.

"The smaller cities are the ones we're worried about," said Cooper. "I'm talking about those of 5,000 population and under. That's where 60 to 80 percent of our membership is."

Mayor Cooper is also concerned about those townships and saving those governments that were inactive or were struggling to survive and are now under black leadership.

"If those towns are not saved," he said, "people will despair and fear that government, at any level, has no reason existing."

He explained that one stumbling block to "saving" these cities was a lack of understanding and sympathy among white officials and bureaucrats in state and Federal government, to whom the mayors must turn for help.

He cited his own city as an example. He said he had asked the Farmers Home Administration for a \$3 million loan to finance an industrial park. He was denied, because Prichard is too near Mobile's "urban and urbanizing area" to qualify under FHA regulations. Furthermore, Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz, who has the power to waive that regulation, has refused to do so.

"I believe that if I were a white mayor, Butz would have exercised his discretion," Cooper added.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of financial disclosure legislation for Members of Congress and following my policy of publicly disclosing my personal finances, I am submitting for the RECORD a listing of Mrs. Biester's and my assets and liabilities:

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN AND MRS. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

1974 TAXES	
Federal .....	\$8,568.86
Pennsylvania (combined State) ..	1,066.39
Pennsylvania (local) .....	1,600.48
District of Columbia .....	1,425.88
Total taxes .....	12,661.61
ASSETS—AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1974	
Savings account .....	\$305.00
U.S. Savings Bonds .....	3,621.53
Cash on hand in checking accounts ..	400.00
Personal notes due us .....	22,243.38
1971 Camaro, 1969 Ford, and 1965 Mustang .....	2,700.00

Real estate (appraised value):	
House in Furlong-----	50,000.00
House in Washington-----	87,500.00
Stocks and bonds:	
6 shares Xerox-----	309.00
12 shares A.T. & T.-----	535.50
50 shares General Motors-----	1,537.50
Bucks Republican Headquarters, Inc., bond-----	1,000.00
Household goods and miscellaneous personal property-----	14,000.00
U.S. Civil Service Retirement Fund-----	24,235.39
<b>Total assets-----</b>	<b>208,387.30</b>
LIABILITIES—AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1974	
Mortgages and loans secured on real property:	
House in Furlong-----	\$17,084.23
House in Washington-----	40,452.79
Personal notes and loans-----	9,737.39
<b>Total liabilities-----</b>	<b>67,274.71</b>

#### SENTENCING FOR CRIMINALS IN THE COMMISSION OF A FEDERAL CRIME

### HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. BEARD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today for appropriate referral legislation which increases mandatory sentencing for criminals who carry a firearm in the commission of a Federal crime.

My bill differs from existing law in two principal areas—first, it increases penalties for offenders in both cases of first and second convictions; and second, it gives the Nation's Federal prosecutors the right to have the trial courts' sentencing reviewed if the sentencing judge fails to exercise proper discretion in determining the terms of sentencing.

Under the provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act Amendments of 1970, strict sentences are imposed upon felons using or possessing a firearm in the commission of Federal crimes. The 1970 amendments provided a separate and additional penalty for the mere act of carrying a firearm in committing a crime—specifically separate and in addition to the sentence for the crime itself.

The legislation being offered here today would preserve some latitude in the case of first offenders. However, this discretion is intentionally restricted by the addition of language authorizing the United States the right to seek review of sentences received by first offenders if the trial court judge fails to exercise discretion in meting out penalties in such cases.

The need to maintain discretionary status in sentencing a first-time offender is not to imply that the individuals should be treated with leniency, but in recognition of the state of the Nation's penal system. In too many cases our Federal penitentiaries are breeding grounds for the schooling and training of even more determined criminals. The conditions prevalent in many Federal prisons force the internee to react with bitter-

ness and vengefulness on the society which interned him. Therefore to confine a first offender in every instance means there is little hope for rehabilitation.

However, there are many cases where first offenders deserve imprisonment. While judges have the authority to mete out a sentence to these individuals, they often do not. My legislation, if adopted, would offer remedy in the case where the Federal prosecutor determined that suspension, probation or terms of sentence were unreasonable. This added tool would operate in both first and second offenses. Yet, in the case of the second offense, the additional penalty is truly a mandatory sentence which may not be suspended by the court, nor may probation be granted.

My bill provides for new terms of sentence. In the case of a first offense, the penalty can be up to 10 years. For second offenders the term of imprisonment cannot be less than 5 years and up to 25 years. In both cases, the sentence is in addition to the penalty for the underlying crime.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Justice Department to make a thorough investigation of the Government's experience with the type of sentencing enacted in 1970. Unfortunately, the mandatory sentencing provisions are not widely known by the general public and therefore, by the criminal as well. Of course, in order to be an effective deterrent to the potential criminal, these provisions must be publicized. If and when my bill is enacted, I will seek widespread publication of its effect and intent, and I will work to see that its use by the court is closely monitored.

With the passage of my legislation, the criminal who thinks to use a firearm in perpetrating a crime will have final notice that this society will not have even the slightest sympathy in the case where a firearm is used.

#### STATEN ISLAND IS STATEN ISLAND

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to state, today, that New York City has taken a step to reunite itself with its historic past. Effective April 9, 1975, the borough of Richmond changed its official name to the Borough of Staten Island, County of Richmond.

This step may not appear to hold much significance to non-New Yorkers, but to city dwellers it comes as a move long overdue. The borough of Staten Island, though probably the least known of the five boroughs of New York, is virtually a city in its own right. With a population of about 300,000 people, Staten Island is larger than the great majority of cities in this great land of ours.

Staten Island first received its name from the explorer Henry Hudson in 1609. It was by this name that the island was known to the Dutch settlers of old New Amsterdam, and it is by this name that

the island is known to all New Yorkers. Yet, its official name has been Richmond County for as long as I can remember.

By changing its official name to the borough of Staten Island, while keeping its old designation of the county of Richmond, the borough has placed itself closer to both its past and to the hearts of the people of the city of New York, while still keeping intact the link with its past as the county of Richmond.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in applauding the action taken by Staten Island, a community with its feet firmly rooted in its colorful past, but with its head looking bravely on to the future.

#### LET US JUNK "JUNK FOODS"

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, April 17, Food Day, will be a day of action and education around food issues. One of the most personal of those food issues is the problem of the deterioration of the American diet. One reason for that deterioration is the ready availability of "junk foods." Campaigns to remove junk foods from vending machines are part of Food Day plans in many parts of the country.

Vending machines and junk food have been a successful team for over 30 years. In 1973, 85 percent of the \$5 billion spent on vended food was devoted to items low in vitamins, minerals, and protein—soda pop, coffee, candy bars, chewing gum. The dollar volume of vending machine sales has skyrocketed from less than \$1 billion in 1953 to \$5 billion in 1973.

Vending machines can, and should, be used to sell good foods. But unfortunately, as the vending machine population increases, so does the availability of junk food. Vending machine customers deserve to have some say about the products they buy, because until good food becomes as available as junk, the quality of our diets will continue to deteriorate.

Organizing a local "good vend" campaign is a worthwhile Food Day project. Successful campaigns to get junk food out of school vending machines have been conducted in Dallas, Tex., and Bloomington, Ind. The following suggestions will help citizens launch an effective "good vend" project.

First. Choose a specific target. Work toward getting soda pop and candy bars banned from school vending machines, or getting at least half of the slots of every vending machine in the community stocked with nutritious products.

Second. Solicit the support of health professionals before announcing the campaign. Doctors, nutritionists, and particularly dentists, should be willing to publicly support the project. Also, contact such organizations as the PTA and consumer groups.

Third. If a project concerns schools, the school board will have to vote on the

proposal. Lobby individual board members prior to the meeting at which the issue will be raised. Stress the harmful effects of consuming too much sugar. The average American consumes more than 100 pounds of sugar every year. Degenerative diseases such as heart disease, some intestinal diseases, and obesity are caused, in part, by diets high in sugar, fat, and calories. Sugar is also the leading cause of tooth decay. Fluoridated water supplies do not totally prevent cavity formation.

Fourth. Citizens working on a communitywide "good vend" program should inform vendor(s) that they definitely want to have better foods. Point out that good foods are available in vendable forms. Unsalted nuts; whole grain snacks, such as granola; fruit; hard boiled eggs; yogurt; milk; and fruit juices can be easily purchased by the local vending company. These wholesome products cost about the same as products currently vended. Suggest that nutrition information be posted on vending machines. This will help to promote sales of the new offerings. Remind the vendor that favorable publicity will probably accompany the stocking of good foods.

Fifth. When plans are well formulated, citizens should contact local newspapers and radio stations. The press has shown a great deal of interest in the "good vend" campaigns that have been launched in the past. The public should be encouraged, through the press, to support "good vend" projects.

Attacking junk food vending machines in schools and communities will help make people sensitive to the junk food problem. It is also an issue where citizen pressure has a good chance of being rewarded with success.

QUESTION OF IMPORT TARIFFS

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the question of import tariffs becomes increasingly significant as the international market continues to grow and develop. The goals of fairness to American business and of an open world market often seem to conflict on this point, and no easy answer is available. I would like to add to the discussion a statement filed with the International Trade Commission by W. E. DeCaulp for the Fafnir Bearing Co. of New Britain, Conn.

NEW BRITAIN, CONN.,  
April 8, 1975.

HON. ANTHONY J. MOFFETT,  
Longworth Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOBY: Thanks for sending me a copy of the Joint Economic Committee Report "Achieving Price Stability Through Economic Growth." I found it most interesting.

I am enclosing a copy of the statement which I filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on behalf of Fafnir, in connection with the forthcoming international trade negotiations. These negotiations are of extreme importance to Fafnir

and the entire U.S. bearing industry. The flood of imports from Japan of specific sizes of ball bearings has caused extremely serious injury to the ball bearing industry.

Last January I was elected chairman of the Industry Sector Advisory Committee (ISAC No. 17) for Machine Tools—Other Metal-working Equipment and Other Non-Electric Machinery. As a member of ISAC 17 I submitted a report regarding the antifriction bearing industry in the United States with respect to these forthcoming international trade negotiations. I am enclosing a copy of that report, hoping that it will be of information and other assistance to you and your staff.

Cordially,

BILL.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION INVESTIGATION RE PRESIDENT'S LIST OF ARTICLES WHICH MAY BE AFFECTED BY INTERNATIONAL TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

NEW BRITAIN, CONN.,  
April 7, 1975.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C.

Attention: Mr. Kenneth R. Mason, Secretary.

DEAR SIR: The Fafnir Bearing Company, (hereinafter "Fafnir"), a Division of Textron Inc., is happy to have this opportunity to submit its recommendations to the United States International Trade Commission, (hereinafter "ITC"), concerning the articles which may be affected by the Tokyo Round of international trade negotiations.

Fafnir is one of the largest ball bearing manufacturers in the United States. It ranks as one of the largest bearing manufacturers (not limited to ball bearings) in the Free World. Fafnir is an active member of The Anti-Friction Bearing Manufacturers Association and supports fully the statement to be filed by AFBMA with the ITC.

INTRODUCTION

Although the industry is called the Anti-Friction Bearing Industry and much of the published data are an aggregation of the data for the several segments of this industry, nevertheless it is vitally important to remember that there are two basic types of antifriction bearings and that these two basic types have significant differences. Therefore, the collective data often is misleading and, when applied proportionately to one of the basic segments (sub-industry), can in fact be incorrect.

The two basic types of antifriction bearings are ball bearings and roller bearings. The principal differences between them are in the rolling elements (balls as opposed to rollers), and in their respective abilities to carry load and to operate at high speeds. Ball bearings and roller bearings are not interchangeable because each bearing type has characteristics which make it the required choice for a certain application. A replacement must be made with the same type bearing; i.e., a ball bearing with a ball bearing.

The Ball Bearing Industry and the Roller Bearing Industry were developed in separate countries at separate times for different applications. The types of plants and types of equipment used for manufacturing each type are different.

The U.S. Industry has led in establishing international dimensional standardization of the most common sizes of ball and roller bearings. Specifications for bearing quality steels are virtually standard the world over. The bearings manufactured at plants in the European Community and in Japan are interchangeable, to a significant degree, with bearings manufactured in the United States.

Historically, there has existed a relatively small but important international trade in antifriction bearings among the Western European nations (including the United Kingdom), Canada, and the United States.

Each country would import those bearings which because of usage volume, original equipment design, or technological characteristics were not readily available domestically. It has been estimated, for example, that a ball bearing manufacturer would export to these industrialized nations about 5 percent of his production.

In the last decade the ball bearing manufacturers in Japan have captured large portions of the U.S. market by predatory tactics which have led to actions taken by President Nixon, the ITC, the Department of Defense, and the Treasury Department. This captured market share illustrates the fact that the aggregate data for the industry incorrectly states the factual situation existing; Department of Commerce figures show that in 1972 all imports represented 10 percent of the apparent U.S. consumption of ball and roller bearings; however, other published data show that ball bearing imports from Japan alone had captured over 35 percent of the consumption of important segments of the market.

DOMESTIC MARKET

The huge increase in imports of ball bearings from Japan has caused the U.S. Ball Bearing Industry to lose a significant share of the domestic market. During periods when the domestic consumption has decreased, imports from Japan have increased.

The Bearing Industry is both capital intensive and labor intensive. Production workers are highly skilled. Employment has declined from the highs of the 1967-69 years. Because of long-term uncertainties arising from the Japanese imports, domestic manufacturers have been unwilling to invest in sufficient new production capacity to keep pace with growth in the U.S. market. Additional capacity added by domestic producers is primarily for special ball bearings not subject, yet, to the Japanese penetration. Other new capacity is provided by U.S. subsidiaries of Japanese companies for assembly of components made in Japan. Plant closings due to inability to compete with the Japanese imports offsets much of the new capacity.

Competition within the U.S. market is intense, not only among the U.S. manufacturers but also from the foreign-based manufacturers. Almost all the major foreign ball bearing producers have manufacturing or assembling, and sales affiliates in the United States.

FOREIGN MARKETS

Fafnir exports to all countries in the Free World. Data for the domestic Bearing Industry indicate that Canada is the largest customer, taking about one-third of the total exports; France, the United Kingdom, Mexico and Brazil are the next largest customers.

Among the industrialized nations, Japan is the smallest customer. It is believed that the government of Japan, as a matter of policy, prevents imports of antifriction bearings except for bearings which are not available from Japanese manufacturers, and also prevents non-Japanese manufacturers from setting up operations to compete in Japan.

In a few markets outside the United States, bearings from government-owned plants in Communist countries are beginning to appear. Much greater volume is expected from this type of source as new manufacturing plants recently completed or under construction go into production.

KEY COMPETITIVE FACTORS

From the viewpoint of the U.S. Industry the world's markets and the competitive factors in these bearing markets may be divided into four groups:

1. The United States: The world's largest market open to all the world.
2. The Communist countries: Government owned and controlled; closed except for licensed imports on a "need" basis.

3. Japan: Government controlled: imports only by license; practically no competition with Japan-made bearings.

4. Other countries: Varies from almost as open as the U.S. market to restrictively protectionist for domestically-made bearings. (Many of these countries, including European, have some restriction on bearing imports from Japan.)

Key competitor factors are inherent in the market groupings listed above. In addition, the export push of Japan and the nature of the 15 principal manufacturers are important factors.

The U.S. companies are investor-owned, publicly held corporations subject to the pressures and accountability imposed on such corporations by the American public and our modern society. The foreign competitors are in a different status; they have different objectives. To them, market share, maintenance of employment and dumping excess products into world markets rather than curtailing operations, plus adherence to nationalistic planning policies are more important.

The ITC found injury to the U.S. Ball Bearing Industry as a result of imports from Japan. (TEA-I-27). The increased imports damaging the domestic industry resulted from concessions granted under trade agreements.

The President's Proclamation resulting from the Commission's findings of injury became effective May 1, 1974. Import data for the last eight months of 1974 and for January, 1975, are available to Fafnir. These data confirm the information Fafnir has learned from the marketplace: The increase in duties established by the Proclamation have not diminished the flood of imports from Japan; the injury suffered by the U.S. ball bearing producers continues unabated. Fafnir has seen no important increase in the sales prices of the Japanese imports. Apparently the Japanese manufacturers and their U.S. sales affiliates are willing and able to absorb the cost of the increased duties, or at least appear to do so as a "holding action" until such duties expire.

In the Federal Register of December 23, 1974, the Treasury Department announced that, having conducted a summary investigation, the U.S. Customs Service was instituting an inquiry into whether radial ball bearings with an outer diameter of 9mm and over but not over 100mm were being imported from Japan in violation of the Anti-Dumping Act.

In 1971 the Department of Defense recognized the serious threat to the national security resulting from the injury suffered by the U.S. ball bearing manufacturers which was caused by the Japanese imports. DoD issued a purchasing directive, (now ASPR 7-104.38), requiring all ball bearings 30mm or less O.D. for defense needs be purchased from U.S. or Canadian manufacturers.

#### OUTLOOK

Consumption of ball bearings in the United States is expected to increase in direct proportion to the real growth in GNP. Because of the price depressing effects of the bearing imports from Japan, it is likely that the growth stated in dollars will not be as great. The same forecasts could be made for the markets in the industrialized nations.

Higher rates of growth are anticipated in the less industrialized nations, including the "beneficiary developing countries" (formerly called "LDC's"). Costs of manufacturing bearings in the Western European countries and in Japan are approaching the high U.S. costs. In the near term, some sizes and types of American made ball bearings can be competitive with the foreign made bearings, both in the U.S. market as well as in other countries which do not restrict or discriminate against imports, especially imports from the United States.

That competitive status will be lost by

the early 1980's. The major producers will seek lower cost sources. Also, the protect-domestic-manufacturers policy of countries such as Brazil and Mexico will encourage the establishment of factories within their borders.

The U.S. market is the largest and most open market in the world. If MFN status for the Communist countries and preferential (zero) duty for the LDC's are granted, Fafnir must anticipate that the domestic market will be overwhelmed with foreign made bearings. Already there are new Japanese bearing plants in Taiwan, South Korea and Brazil. There are new bearing plants in Eastern European countries, built with Japanese know-how. The results are predictable: A substantial loss of jobs; inability of U.S. producers to invest in additional productive capacity; and, possibly, a movement of the manufacturing and engineering technology out of the United States.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

For the reasons stated above, Fafnir strongly urges that all ball bearings be removed from the list of products for possible negotiations. The injuries resulting from prior concessions have been well documented. Why should products so vital to the national security—classified by the Department of Defense as a pacing component—be sacrificed as an aid to the possible or wished-for increase in exports of some other product?

One fact must be remembered! A tariff concession, whether by the United States or by another nation, on ball bearings will not increase to any material degree the normal international trade in antifriction bearings. The only result of further tariff concessions will be a planned predatory increase in ball bearing imports. As the domestic industry proved to the ITC, only the Japan manufacturers, concentrating on a few carefully selected high volume sizes of radial ball bearings, were the real beneficiaries of prior concessions—not the U.S. industry!

It should be noted that the British and German bearing manufacturers supported the U.S. Bearing Industry before the ITC. It should also be noted that several of the E.C. member countries impose some type of effective restriction on the importation of bearings from Japan.

For many years Fafnir and the U.S. Bearing Industry have supported the concept of Fair Trade. We urge that the import restrictions imposed by Japan and a few other nations be removed. Tariff concessions by the United States in the past have not accomplished that result. No optimism can exist for the result of further bearing concessions.

The foregoing reasons for excluding antifriction bearings from the negotiations list also are reasons why, in the alternative, Sectoral Negotiations would be appropriate. True Sectoral Negotiations could lead to removal of import restrictions—whether penalty-rate-tariff or nontariff or a combination—and thus lead, on a country by country basis, to Fair Trade for antifriction bearings.

If Fafnir can be of any further assistance to the Commission or its staff, or provide any data, we would be happy to do so.

Respectfully yours,

W. E. DECAULP,

Assistant to the President and Division General Counsel.

#### GENOCIDE AGAINST THE ARMENIAN PEOPLE

### HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to remind

my colleagues that this month marks the 60th anniversary of the height of the genocide against the Armenian people. In 1915, as a "final solution" to the "Armenian problem," the Ottoman Empire uprooted and then exterminated millions of Armenians. This precedent was used by Adolph Hitler to justify his own extermination programs.

I believe all Americans should take note of and remember these tragic events. I sincerely hope that the memory of this terrible genocide will serve to prevent the recurrence of other future brutalities.

#### ROCKEFELLERS FUND MAOIST REVOLUTIONARY

### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, one of the more diligent promoters of a new world order, the Rockefeller Foundation, announced the awarding of 34 "humanities fellowships" in a new \$600,000 program "to illuminate and assess the values of contemporary society."

I find it outrageous that one of these grants, which average at over \$15,000 for 1 year, has been awarded to H. Bruce Franklin, an avowed Maoist Communist revolutionary, for a study of "literature created by persons who became writers through prison experiences."

The public record of Bruce Franklin's activities indicates Howard Bruce Franklin was born February 28, 1934, in Brooklyn, N.Y. He attended Brooklyn Friends High School where he was student body president, and Amherst College from which he graduated magna cum laude in 1955. After graduation, Franklin worked for a short time as a mate on a tug boat in New York harbor before enlisting in the U.S. Air Force. In the Air Force, Franklin was a navigator and intelligence officer in the Strategic Air Command.

Franklin left the Air Force in 1959 to study for a Ph. D. at Stanford University. Stanford hired him as an assistant professor of English as soon as he was awarded his doctorate. He retained that post for 3 years.

In 1964, Franklin moved to Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Md., where he held the post of assistant professor. He became involved in Democratic Party politics to the extent of serving as a precinct captain during the 1964 Presidential election. The following year, he returned to Stanford and was promoted to associate professor.

In 1966, during a sabbatical in France, Franklin states he met some Vietnamese Communists and became a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist. He commenced his career as a revolutionary on March 21, 1966, when he and 70 other demonstrators disrupted a Redwood, Calif., City Port Commission meeting at which the commissioners were considering leasing two acres to the United Technology Center for a napalm plant. After his initia-



tion into revolutionary politics, Franklin, a specialist on the works of Herman Melville and on early science fiction, switched to teaching such courses as "Literature and Revolution," and "Marxism-Leninism."

Bruce Franklin and his wife, Jane, led an escalating series of violent disruptions and confrontations on the Stanford campus. The university fired Franklin and obtained an injunction barring him from campus.

In the mid-1960's Franklin was a founding member of the Red Guard, formed in emulation of the Communist Chinese youth organization during the Cultural Revolution. The Red Guard, later renamed and reorganized with elements of Students for a Democratic Society as the Bay Area Revolutionary Union, advocated preparation for immediate armed struggle.

In 1971, Franklin led his ultra-militant faction out of the Revolutionary Union to form the Venceremos Organization, VO. Franklin and the VO called for whites to unite with minority revolutionaries to fight a "people's war" against capitalism which was to be sparked by the outbreak of urban guerrilla warfare. The VO collected firearms and explosives.

Franklin and the VO in general exhibited a weapons fetish, filling the pages of the VO newspaper with drawings of guns, appearing at press conferences brandishing weapons, and reciting Chairman Mao's maxim—

Every Communist must grasp the truth, "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

No doubt Franklin's new expertise in "literature created by persons who became writers through prison experience"—mostly degenerates and revolutionaries like George Jackson, Jean Genet, and Eldridge Cleaver—was developed after his Venceremos cadres entered the prison movement in California in 1971. For the next 2 years, VO cadres actively recruited among the more alienated and violence-prone prisoners developing shock troops for the planned revolution.

In October 1972, members of the Venceremos central committee planned and carried out the escape of a prisoner, Ronald Wayne Beaty, himself a VO recruit. Using two cars to force the vehicle transporting Beaty to a halt, in approved Tupamaros style, the VO members murdered one guard and seriously wounded the second. Four VO revolutionaries were eventually convicted for their parts in this crime.

After the Beaty attack, the Venceremos Organization came under pressure from law enforcement investigators during the legal proceedings. By the spring of 1973, VO began to collapse. At the end of summer, Bruce Franklin announced that the Venceremos Organization was "defunct."

It is of interest to note that during this period of collapse, the East Bay Venceremos collectives broke away and in conjunction with some of the revolutionary prisoners they had recruited formed the Symbionese Federation. It was from the Symbionese Federation which numbered

perhaps some 50 persons that the Symbionese Liberation Army emerged on November 6, 1973, when it murdered Oakland school superintendent Marcus Foster.

In effect, tax-exemption is the equivalent of a Government subsidy and increases the tax burden on taxpayers. I am sure that the great majority of American taxpayers share my indignation at the granting of tax-exempt money to as notorious an enemy of America as Bruce Franklin. It is high time that the tax codes were overhauled to correct this and many other inequities.

#### FOOD DAY

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is National Food Day and many citizens have organized to make its effect felt throughout the world. Public concern about the world food situation is continually growing and solutions are being pursued in many ways.

Citizen efforts are of a wide scope and have been long in the planning. Hunger task forces have been started and are aimed at providing maximum food to all who need it. They are working to determine the degree of hunger and poverty in their communities, investigating the implementation of Government food programs and trying to improve these programs. Also, to attack the world hunger problem, walkathons, fasting, and hunger banquets have been organized to raise relief money for hunger problem areas.

Youth garden programs have been successful and effective. For example, 21,000 young gardeners in Cleveland public schools last year harvested a vegetable crop worth over \$600,000 for their families. This well-supervised voluntary program gets young people directly involved and serves to educate them as to the importance of food and our present-day food problems.

It is also important that the message of good nutrition be advanced. Public service broadcast announcements are being prepared and will be aired to counter paid advertising, especially that aimed at children, which promotes junk food and poor eating habits.

Farmers' markets have grown across the Nation and are another answer to our continuous search for nutritional, inexpensive food. It is at the farmers' market where you can get fresh, tasty produce and save money on the grocery bill. Since the foods we eat affect our health, a proper diet is an excellent way to prevent disease and protect health.

Attempts also are underway to cut down food imports and to make this country more regionally self-sufficient. Wasteful packaging and nonreturnable cans and bottles are also a target of food day activists. Food co-ops are being encouraged. Consumer education about the products and problems of the foods we buy is being significantly advanced. Gardens are springing up everywhere. Newspapers are carrying more and more

nutritional food articles in their food sections. Vending machine innovation is progressing to provide more nutritional food in place of junk foods. Food stamp outreach is being broadened to inform people of the eligibility requirements for food stamps. Teach-ins, one of the most effective methods of consumer education, are scheduled all over the Nation.

The purpose of Food Day is to mobilize public concern and motivate increasing citizen and industry support for a national food policy which will promote better quality, lower priced food supplies, insure the livelihood of the family farmer and allow increased U.S. assistance to needy nations. Food Day is a day for everyone to get involved, especially when decisions on a subject such as food so directly involve and affect everyone.

#### REMARKS ON THE DEDICATION OF A PORTRAIT OF GEORGE WASHINGTON AFTER JOHN TRUMBULL

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 7, I attended the unveiling of a portrait of George Washington at George Washington High School in my district in Northeast Philadelphia. During the ceremonies the chairman of the school's social studies department, William Ruderman, made an excellent speech about Washington and the artist, John Trumbull. At this time I enter Mr. Ruderman's remarks into the RECORD.

#### REMARKS ON THE DEDICATION OF A PORTRAIT OF GEORGE WASHINGTON AFTER JOHN TRUMBULL

I would like to address myself this morning to two topics regarding this painting. One, to the subject itself, George Washington, and secondly to the artist after whom it is painted, John Trumbull.

A casual glance at this painting indicates that Washington was a big man—a very big man. Immediately after he died, at age 67, his measurements were taken for posterity. His shoulders measured one foot, nine inches across which is average for a man of his unusual height. He measured six feet, three and one-half inches tall (6'-3½"). If Washington was that tall at death, he must have been at least one inch taller at the prime of life. He weighed well over two hundred pounds.

He and Lincoln had many characteristics in common. Washington, in his youth was a champion wrestler and rail splitter. It is a curious phenomenon that the two greatest presidents of the United States were also physical giants. Even by present standards Washington and Lincoln would be considered as unusually tall men. They were more outstanding for their size in their own time when the average man was considerably smaller.

If size may be regarded as the standard of excellence, then it is altogether fitting that this school, one of the biggest in Pennsylvania is named after George Washington.

Washington was probably painted more than any man of his time by the leading artists, John Trumbull, Gilbert Stuart and Charles Wilson Peale.

If you study a variety of portraits of Washington, one fact emerges above all else. He always looks different. Gilbert Stuart's painting which graces the one dollar bill is certainly different than this one. Aside from

the fact that Washington was interpreted differently by different artists and at different ages in his life, a great deal of the difference lies in the fact that in addition to totally different styles, artists take liberties. Their liberties usually covered up physical defects in Washington's appearance or simply tried to make him look better than he actually was although in this particular portrait, that may be debatable.

Emanuel Leutze for instance, took great liberty in his classic of Washington Crossing the Delaware. Every one of us knows that you just don't stand up in a row boat. But how effective would Washington appear, cold and miserable, huddled in the bottom of a long boat, one of many faces hiding from winter winds on the Delaware. He stands out because the artist wanted him to.

Washington's hair and the amount of it varies in his portraits. It was probably red in his youth, turning as he said "an early grey in the service of my country." He is often painted wearing a wig, but it is apparent that Trumbull painted in an exaggerated hair line.

His complexion, as described by his contemporaries, was "sallow" and in spite of a tan from wind and sun burn, his poor complexion was always visible.

Up till the 19th century, dentistry in the modern sense was unknown. When something went wrong with a tooth, it was extracted. So, at the age of twenty-two, George Washington had his first tooth pulled. By fifty-seven, he was the possessor of two sets of awkward, noisy, ill fitting dentures which plagued him for the rest of his life. One set, incidentally was made by Paul Revere. His sunken cheeks were often filled in by the artist, and Gilbert Stuart is even supposed to have filled out his cheeks with cotton when Washington posed for him.

You will never see a portrait of Washington wearing glasses. Yet like most adults after reaching middle age, he wore reading glasses and considered them a "humiliating disfigurement." He used them only in the privacy of his family and among intimate friends.

The artists all carefully retouched the pock marks that deeply pitted his face. He acquired them from a bout with small pox when he was only nineteen and he carried the scars for life.

In most portraits, the Father of his Country is shown as having a chest bulging with well deserved pride. The chest must have been tailor-made for under the well padded coat, Washington's chest was flat and somewhat hollow in the center, probably from a case of rickets at an early age.

What is remarkable is that in spite of great physical strength and endurance, Washington was subjected to a host of diseases in his lifetime and almost barbaric medical practices and yet survived to the age of sixty-seven. His death was due to what doctors today would call a strep throat and it could have been cured easily with anti-biotics and a simple tracheotomy. His doctors used a variety of treatments and remedies, among which bleeding was the most prominent. Undoubtedly they contributed more to his death than the infection. He died on December 14, 1799.

The original of the picture you are looking at was painted by John Trumbull, one of the outstanding chroniclers of the men and events at the birth of this Nation.

Whether Trumbull was a great or mediocre painter is of little importance. When the flag was raised at Iwo Jima, a camera clicked. When Mr. Ford was inaugurated, the Associated Press took pictures.

John Trumbull came at a time of scant visual recording. It is through the eyes of this "Connecticut Yankee" that we still envision many of the great events of our heroic age.

Few artists in the long history of western painting have been privileged to become the creators of visual symbols of an epoch.

Our image, for instance of Martin Luther comes from the paintings and prints of his friend Lucas Cranach. Henry VIII and his court live through the meticulous recordings of Hans Holbein the Younger. In like manner, our visual conception of the events surrounding the birth of this nation are due to the documentation of John Trumbull.

Trumbull lived a very long time. He was born in 1756 and died eighty-seven years later, in 1843, when the country was on the verge of the Mexican War and a new fangled contraption, the clumsy box camera, began seriously to compete with the gentle art of miniature painting.

He saw the first ten presidents take office and was friendly with six of the Presidents. In fact, he knew most of the great men of the age. It was a wonderful, exciting and most creative period, but Trumbull never really took advantage of it.

His greatest tragedy was that most of his good work was produced before he was forty and he lived to be eighty-seven. Much of his work was done in England, from memory, for there was little esthetic tradition in America and art was regarded by many as the invention of the devil.

Trumbull's father, a colonial governor of Connecticut tried to discourage his son from painting and young John probably agreed with him in principle but was visionary enough to see the need for painters, or chroniclers of the age. He wrote shortly after being graduated from Harvard:

"I am fully sensible that the profession of painting as it is generally practiced is frivolous and little useful to society, and unworthy of a man who has talents for more serious pursuits. But to preserve and diffuse the memory of the noblest series of actions which have ever presented themselves in the history of man, is sufficient warrant for it."

Thus, with an eye on history and the future, Trumbull turned to painting and in his lifetime produced nearly three hundred paintings. His greatest works are of the Revolutionary War and we are all familiar with his Battle of Bunker Hill, the Capture of the Hessians at Trenton, the Surrender of Burgoyne at Saratoga and the Surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown. His most famous painting, I think, is the Signing of the Declaration of Independence, which is reproduced in almost every U.S. history book.

Most of his works, including the original of this full length portrait, are housed in the Trumbull Gallery at Yale, a museum which he founded and designed.

An interesting fact is that John Trumbull suffered from monocular vision. He was nearly blind in one eye as a result of an accident when he was five years old. Because of this handicap, his best work was done in miniature. In his large works, like this one, his subjects often appeared distorted and grotesque.

His favorite subject and his personal idol was George Washington. He did thirty-four likenesses of him. Washington's admiration of Trumbull was apparent for in 1790 he wrote to Lafayette: "His pieces as far as they are executed, meet the applause of all who have seen them."

Trumbull rarely signed or dated his work. The original of this painting was probably done in 1790 and represents Washington after the Battle of Trenton or Princeton.

Many of Trumbull's miniatures have been used on our postage stamps and coins, and the picture of Hamilton on the ten dollar bill was done by him.

It is commonly believed that Philadelphia's First Presbyterian Church was designed by him.

John Trumbull's bicentennial occurred nineteen years ago on June 6, 1956. He was never a modest man and I think he would be flattered to know that one of his Washington portraits was to hang in a school like this.

He is buried at Yale in the famous Trumbull Gallery beneath the original of his full-

length portrait of Washington. The inscription on his tomb reads: "Colonel John Trumbull, Patriot, and Artist, Friend and aid of Washington. To his country, he gave his sword and his pencil."

His greatness lies not in the quality of his art, but in the fact that he gave the new republic a portrait of itself in all the agony and drama of its birth and because of this great legacy, posterity has not failed him.

Let us hope that the dedication of this painting will be our symbol of the bicentennial which officially begins this month, and that posterity will not fail us!

#### THE BIRTHDAY OF PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY

### HON. GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mrs. SPELLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 23, 1975, my county of Prince Georges will be 279 years old. In anticipation of our grand county's approaching birthday, I would like to quote the history of its early days and to describe its geographic relation to the Nation's Capital:

#### HISTORY OF PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY

When the Maryland Colonial Assembly decreed in 1695 that the new County to be named after Prince George be established on St. George's Day, 1696, almost 90 years of exploration and early colonization had already taken place.

This gentle, rolling countryside, nestled between the beautiful Potomac and Patauxent Rivers, was first seen by white men in the ships of Captain John Smith in the summer of 1608, and his maps, remarkably accurate for the times, indicate the presence of numerous and prosperous Indian villages throughout the area.

Captain Smith described the 'Papawomeke' (Potomac) as navigable for 140 miles and "fed with many sweet rivers and springs . . . from the bordering hills. These hills . . . yield no lesse plentie and varietie of fruit, then the river exceedeth with abundance of fish."

Of the "Pawtuxent" River, he wrote "here are infinit skulls of divers kinds of fish more than elsewhere" and noted that the Indian tribes included the "Acquintanaskuah, Pawtuxent and Mattapanient" which he found living together more or less in harmony and "these of all we found the most civil to give entertainment."

It was to the powerful emperor of the Piscataways, in his village near where Ft. Washington now stands, that Leonard Calvert and his men sailed in 1634, after their original landing from the Ark and the Dove at St. Clement's (Blackstone) Island in the lower Potomac River.

It appears that pressure from their Iroquois enemies to the north inclined the Piscataways towards peaceful relations with the colonists and a log fort was built at the present site of Ft. Washington for mutual security.

Father Andrew White, S.J., who wrote much about the early colony, found the area pleasant indeed and suitable for colonization, describing the Potomac as "the sweetest and greatest river I have ever seene, so that the Thames is but a little finger to it. There are no marshes or swamps about it, but solid firme ground, with great variety of woode . . ."

This pleasant country drew settlers rapidly, who gradually worked their way inland, spurred by the large land grants which the charter permitted Lord Baltimore to dispense. These, in turn, led to a baronial society, later to develop naturally into the plantation way of life.

Large settlements were slow to form, although Upper Marlboro and Bladensburg soon began to shape up as centers of politics, commerce and culture, ranking with Annapolis and with Oxford on the Eastern Shore.

With most of the land along the Potomac still occupied by the friendly Piscataways, settlements had been established up the Patuxent nearly to Laurel, at the mouth of Rock Creek within the present limits of Georgetown, and along the Anacostia River in the vicinity of what is now Hyattsville and Bladensburg by 1695, with about 1,000 colonists.

On May 8, 1695, the General Assembly adopted the act creating Prince George's County, so honoring Prince George of Denmark, who was to be consort later to Queen Anne of England. At this time the Prince was an advisor to the ruling monarchs, William and Mary.

At the time of its founding, Prince George's County included the area which now comprises Montgomery, Frederick, Washington and Garrett Counties—its boundaries reaching up to what was later to become the Mason-Dixon line and westward to a vague, unexplored Blue Ridge mountain area.

The first County seat was Charles Town, located along the west bank of the Patuxent, where the Mt. Calvert estate had been established in 1657. Later, in 1706, the town of Marlborough was founded, named for John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough. This became the County seat in 1721, retaining its original spelling until modified to Upper Marlboro about 1893.

The governing body of the County originally was the Governor and two other members, justices of the peace whom he appointed. This was both a judicial and administrative body, holding quarterly sessions. The high Sheriff acted as the clerk of the court, while each subdivision, or "hundred," had a constable. The County was at that time entitled to two delegates in the lower house of the Assembly.

In 1748, the area had become too large for efficient administration and Frederick County was established at the approximate line which now divides Prince George's from Montgomery County.

George Washington, Patrick Herry and others, were frequent visitors to Marlborough and Bladensburg, joining in social and political life of the times, which were gay enough from all indications. American horse-racing began in colonial Prince George's County and, according to his diary, Washington was among the first to wager, and lose, money at the Marlborough Race Track, which still holds annual meets.

Prince George's County, which had contributed both troops and supplies to General Braddock during the French and Indian Wars, again supplied its men and materials to Washington during the revolution, specifically to the Maryland regulars, whose steadfast attitudes earned the title "Old Line." This later evolved into the nickname "Old Line State" for Maryland.

John Carroll, born in 1735 where the present Courthouse now stands, became the first Bishop in America and founded Georgetown University. At Washington's request, he accompanied Benjamin Franklin, Judge Samuel Chase and Charles Carroll on a mission to Canada seeking aid for the colonies during the Revolutionary War.

John Hanson, first president of the United States under the Articles of Confederation, was a native of neighboring Charles County, his plantation located almost across the Potomac from Washington's Mt. Vernon. Closely associated with men of similar attitudes from Prince George's County during the Revolution and early days of this Nation, he is believed buried at Oxon Hill Manor, in the County.

When the new National Capital was established, it was from Prince George's County

that the Maryland portion was donated, leaving the present area of 486 square miles in the County.

Development of towns and plantations increased rapidly then and thousands of citizens had settled in Prince George's County before the disastrous interruption of the War of 1812.

British troops sailed up both the Potomac and Patuxent and the small American naval force of barges and sloops of war were routed and scuttled in the Patuxent near Marlborough. The British forces landed in Southern Maryland and encamped at Marlborough before marching on Washington, D.C. in two columns. In panic the garrison at Ft. Washington blew its magazines and abandoned the defense of the Potomac.

Raw recruits of the District militia fled after only a skirmish when the opposing forces met at Bladensburg, while Commodore Barney and his sailors and marines, transported from their abandoned fleet, were soon outnumbered and defeated, despite their gallant defense.

The following wild retreat has since been known as the "Bladensburg Races" and though the casualties were small—26 Americans killed and 53 wounded—the defeat cleared the way for the British advance on Washington and destruction of the Capitol Building and White House.

It was during that tragic period that Francis Scott Key found himself aboard a British warship in Baltimore harbor. He was seeking the release of Dr. William Beanes, of Marlborough, who had been taken by the British after he resisted looting of his home by British troops encamped near the town. The Marylanders witnessed the night-long bombardment of Ft. McHenry by the enemy fleet and Key was inspired by the defiant flag in "dawn's early light" to compose the Star Spangled Banner.

The next half-century found continued development enlivened by two historic events in Prince George's County. In 1832, railroad tracks of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad stretched into Bladensburg, and three years later extended into the Capital City. A short time later, Charles B. Calvert, of Riverdale, descendant of the Lords Baltimore, obtained financial and political assistance for Samuel W. Morse and his telegraph.

The National Intelligencer of April 10, 1844, some weeks before the historic message "What hath God wrought" was sent on May 24th, reports that messages were sent by the telegraph from the Calvert Mansion in Riverdale to Washington, and back, reporting on passage of cars along the B&O railway.

Prince Georgians, as all Americans, found themselves swiftly swept along by the surge of emotion and circumstances which led to the heart-rending days of the Civil War. Though border-line Maryland residents were divided in their sympathies, records indicate most Prince George's loyalties were with the Confederacy, and several County units fought with the South.

Strategically located, the County became a thoroughfare for Southern agents and the general attitude might be indicated by the forced suspension of the County seat newspaper, The Gazette, which was denied use of the U.S. mails because of its Southern leanings.

Only once did Confederate forces actually enter Prince George's County—on a raid in 1864 by troops of General Jubal Early, who sought to capture Washington or at least release the thousands of Confederate prisoners at Point Lookout, along the lower Potomac River. Both attempts failed.

During the war, the tavern of Mary Surratt, in what is now Clinton, housed Southern sympathizers, including John Wilkes Booth, who obtained ammunition there shortly before the assassination of Lincoln. Booth escaped along a route running through the County, and Mary Surratt was hanged with other conspirators, though later his-

torians believe her guiltless, a victim of the hysteria which swept the Nation at that time.

Passing through reconstruction, industrial revolution and expansion with the Nation, Prince George's County counted nearly 30,000 citizens at the turn of the 20th Century.

Small town commerce, keyed to agriculture—tobacco and truck vegetables for the Nation's Capital—marked the development of the County through the World War II period. Then came the first great surge of the city to the metropolitan area, a pattern yet to climax in this still rapidly-expanding jurisdiction.

By 1940 the population of 1900 had tripled, and the tally doubled again in only ten years, with 194,000 residents here in 1950. Prince George's counted 640,000 citizens as of January 1, 1969 and new residents now move in at a rate of about 600 each week of the year.

Prince George's now has more citizens than live in five States of the Union.

From this fantastic growth, most rapid in the Nation, comes both the Pride and the Problem today. As the landscape changes and develops, so must the way of life—personal, economic, civic and governmental. New subdivisions and apartment complexes and industry develop the need for more schools, roads, police and fire protection and all government services.

Prince George's residents today include influential and talented experts in all phases of government and industry, and her officials are playing an important part in the sophistication of government on both the state and federal, as well as the local, level.

The heritage is a proud one, the present stimulating, and the way ahead fantastic, troublesome perhaps, but certainly challenging.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that there are many, many people employed by the House of Representatives who are Prince Georgians. In recognition of this legion and in honor of St. George's Day, I extend to each Prince Georgian a cordial invitation to be my guest at St. George's Day on Capitol Hill, on April 23, from 5 until 7 p.m. in the Banking, Currency and Housing Committee room, room 2129, Rayburn Building.

Let us celebrate our special day together.

#### EMERGENCY HOMEOWNERS' RELIEF ACT

**HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 14, I was delayed unavoidably by court proceedings in which I was a witness in my home community of Winchester, Va., and did not reach the Capitol until too late to vote on the bill (H.R. 5398) the Emergency Homeowners' Relief Act.

Because of the obvious need of temporary assistance to such homeowners as have suffered loss of income through recession-induced unemployment and have become delinquent in their mortgage payments, I would have voted for this bill, but with substantial reservations along the lines of those set forth in debate by my distinguished Virginia colleague, Mr. DAN DANIEL.

I hope that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, who would have

the responsibility to develop regulations under the bill, if enacted into law, would take pains to insure that the program truly was used as a last resort, as is my understanding of its intent, and that the interests of the general taxpayer be protected against abuse of the program, either by mortgage lenders or by temporarily distressed homeowners having other sources of relief than this program.

Temporary Federal programs tend to become permanent. The bill would project this one into 1978.

I hope the distinguished committee which brought it to the floor will take a new look at the program—assuming it becomes law—to determine whether or not it might be terminated at an earlier date, after the program has been in operation for a year.

#### SURVEY RESULTS RELEASED

### HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, today I am releasing for the record the results of my recent winter questionnaire. This survey was mailed to approximately 170,000 postal patrons in my congressional district in late January, and to date, I have received some 20,000 responses.

Included in these results I found strong support for U.S. food aid to foreign countries, for Federal intervention in prolonged labor strikes, and for negotiations between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Although recent political scandals have damaged the Government's image in the minds of many people, I found that 55 percent of my constituents do not feel it is necessary to maintain a permanent Office of the Special Prosecutor to handle campaign financing violations and other irregularities.

My constituents also favor a temporary relaxation of environmental standards to reduce production costs for ailing industries.

The economy continues to concern residents in my district. Many made further comments on the need for definite economic leadership, but 57 percent are of the opinion that wage and price controls should not be reinstated. Along these same lines, they indicated a desire for cuts in many areas of Federal spending. Leading the way were cuts in general revenue sharing, followed by defense contracts, environmental protection, housing, job training, food stamps and other programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased by the large response to this questionnaire. To me it indicates an upturn in interest in the functions of Government. The general perception of these vital issues shows a renewed concern that our Nation's problems be solved before they become crises.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting a complete breakdown of the results of this questionnaire in the RECORD at this time:

#### WINTER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you believe we should continue to provide food assistance to the peoples of other countries? Yes, 58.8 percent; no, 34 percent.

2. What are your views on the arms limitation agreement reached by President Ford and Soviet Leader Brezhnev?

a. It is a major breakthrough? Yes, 24 percent; no, 25 percent.

b. the limits of 2400 weapons, which may include 1320 MIRVS, are too high. Yes, 33.6 percent; no, 12.9 percent.

c. the talks should be reopened and we should seek a new agreement. Yes, 39.5 percent; no, 11.9 percent.

d. the talks were plainly unproductive. Yes, 20.5 percent; no, 28.1 percent.

3. If the Palestine Liberation Organization formally acknowledges the legitimacy of the Israeli state, should our government encourage Israel to negotiate with the PLO? Yes, 56.8 percent; no, 32 percent.

4. In our efforts to cut foreign oil imports and conserve energy, if it becomes necessary to choose between gasoline rationing and a sizeable increase in gasoline taxes, which would you prefer?

a. gasoline rationing. Yes, 35.9 percent; no, 25 percent.

b. gasoline tax increase. Yes, 39.6 percent; no, 21.5 percent.

c. a combination tax-rationing system. Yes, 23.5 percent; no, 27.6 percent.

5. Are you in favor of temporarily relaxing environmental standards to reduce production costs for ailing industries? Yes, 56.3 percent; no, 39.4 percent.

6. Do you favor Federal intervention when any prolonged labor strike threatens the public interest? Yes, 82.4 percent; no, 14.6 percent.

7. If cuts must be made in the budget to allow the government to hold the line on spending, which of the following programs do you feel should be cut?

a. job training. Yes, 33.8 percent; no, 33.8 percent.

b. environmental protection. Yes, 42.6 percent; no, 29.6 percent.

c. defense contracts. Yes, 57 percent; no, 22.5 percent.

d. unemployment compensation. Yes, 21.6 percent; no, 39 percent.

e. food stamps. Yes, 31 percent; no, 33.3 percent.

f. housing. Yes, 34.8 percent; no, 28.6 percent.

g. public transportation. Yes, 29.8 percent; no, 36.8 percent.

h. aid to the elderly. Yes, 5.5 percent; no, 51 percent.

i. general revenue sharing. Yes, 60.3 percent; no, 16.8 percent.

8. What is your view on the Justice Department's attitude on enforcing antitrust laws?

a. acceptable. Yes, 31.5 percent; no, 18 percent.

b. too vigorous. Yes, 12.3 percent; no, 23.8 percent.

c. not vigorous enough. Yes, 43.1 percent; no, 10.5 percent.

9. Do you believe it is necessary to maintain a permanent Office of the Special Prosecutor to handle campaign financing violations and other irregularities? Yes, 38.4 percent; no, 54.6 percent.

10. Do you believe wage and price controls should be reinstated? Yes, 38.1 percent; no, 57 percent.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 14, I was absent when H.R.

5398, the Emergency Homeowners' Relief Act, was voted upon. At the time, I had joined Victor Polsky—a prominent Soviet Jewish dissident, recently arrived here from the Soviet Union—in a press conference.

Had I been there to vote on the bill, I would certainly have voted for it.

#### AUCCOIN ON U.S. FISHERIES ZONE

### HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have taken the floor to point out to my colleagues the very real and serious problems facing the U.S. fishing industry. If this industry is to survive it will be up to the Congress to enact meaningful reform and begin a sound program of conservation of the valuable marine resources off our shores. But the problems facing our fishermen and the Congress are very complex. My distinguished colleague on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Mr. AUCCOIN, of Oregon, has written an article on these problems and what our country must consider in our efforts to resolve them. I would like to enter at this point in the RECORD the full text of Mr. AUCCOIN's article as it appeared in the March issue of Portland magazine and I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

#### 200-MILE LIMIT QUESTION

(By LES AUCCOIN, Member of Congress)

The question of whether the United States should extend its offshore fishing zone to 200 miles involves an array of complex and competing arguments. But in a larger sense, it is only a part of a continuing development in the relations between nations. Hundreds of millions of people now look to the sea as a supplementary source of food supply, and more sophisticated technology allows nations to consider realistically the possibility of mining the seas for minerals and extracting increased amounts of oil and natural gas.

As worldwide interest in the resources of the sea increases, the need for international agreement with regard to the extent and means of development, and jurisdiction over such development, becomes critical. No longer are the oceans of the world thought to be the limitless source of food and other valuables we once believed them to be. No longer can we say that they will provide us with everything we will ever need—they will help, but only if used wisely.

The most immediate problem, and the one that receives the most attention, is the depletion of fisheries due to the competing demands of nations. There is clear evidence that Soviet fishing practices have caused serious depletion of Oregon's fish resources, with both short- and long-term implications. If these resources are not managed in an intelligent manner, paying attention to sustained yield principles, not only will a major Oregon industry suffer severe economic dislocations—unemployment and loss of earnings—but an Oregon tradition and way of life may come to an end.

For many years fishermen in different parts of the country have asked Congress to extend the contiguous fishing zone of the United States to 200 miles in order to protect fisheries from the harmful practices of other nations. But this action cuts both ways. The U.S.-based "far sea" fishing indus-

tries, such as the southern California tuna fleet and the Gulf Coast shrimp fleet, fish within 200 miles of the shorelines of other nations, and the consequences for them are profound. The federal government has gone so far in its opposition to the unilateral extension of a 200-mile fishing zone as to pay fines for American vessels seized within 200 miles of other nations rather than prohibit the U.S. boats from fishing within such zones would imply recognition of jurisdiction.

To resolve the problems arising from the conflicting wants of the nations of the world with regard to the seas, a Law of the Sea Conference, sponsored by the United Nations, was held in Caracas last year. While this Conference enabled the 143 participating nations to present their views, it folded up with little substantive progress. The best the conferees could do was to agree that some solution was needed, and that another round of talks should be held this year in Geneva.

And this brings us to the present. The Geneva Law of the Sea Conference is preparing to convene, but there is no guarantee that an international agreement acceptable to enough members can be worked out. Indeed, the likelihood is yet another impasse. Congress, responding to the urgent need to safeguard the nation's resources, is considering legislation which would extend unilaterally the fishing zone to 200 miles. A number of slightly differing bills have been introduced for this purpose, but a good example is the Interim Fisheries Zone Extension and Management Act of 1975. This bill would extend the fisheries zone and certain authority over anadromous fish in order to provide proper conservation management to protect the domestic fishing industry until general agreement is reached at the Law of the Sea Conference.

The U.S. State Department has condemned precisely such action in the past in the belief that such issues must be resolved through mutual agreement among the nations of the world. But there is good reason for consideration of this bill by Congress. While I agree that any lasting comprehensive solution must be worked out through international agreement, such agreements will not be found until the world knows the United States means business. The 200-mile limit legislation would in my judgment do this. It could provide the impetus for serious diplomacy so conspicuously absent today.

In 1973, as a member of the Oregon Legislature, I helped to pass a state law which extended to 50 miles Oregon's jurisdiction over its coastal seas. At the time this was done the Legislature knew that Oregon did not have a navy to enforce the law—and few foreign fishing ships were going to feel threatened by an Oregon Fish Commission employee chasing them around in a motorboat trying to hand them a summons. But just as Oregon passed its law as a way of telling the federal government that it wanted action, so should Congress begin work on this legislation to demonstrate to the world community the rightful concern of the United States. Congress wants the Law of the Sea Conference to show results—not just to agree to talk about it again next year.

There are a host of problems—legal, economic, political, and diplomatic—which must be worked out. But further delay on this issue will only mean further depletion of our vital fishing resources and greater economic hardship on those who make their living from the sea.

I hope that any international agreement which is reached will deal not only with our fish resources, but with the entire economic development of the sea. When such an agreement is reached, there will be a firm basis for expanding harvest of the sea—for fish and other forms of marine life, for oil and natural gas, and for minerals—to the maximum extent possible, while still practicing sound conservation principles.

## A TRIBUTE TO MR. JOHN M. KNAPICK OF CAMPBELL, OHIO

### HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 18, 1975, Mr. John M. Knapick of Campbell, Ohio, will be honored at a testimonial dinner which will be held at the Archangel Michael Greek Community Center in Campbell. A highly successful former head football coach at Campbell Memorial High School, John Knapick is retiring this year as athletic director and teacher after 43 years of dedicated service in the Campbell City School System.

Mr. Knapick was born in Fairport Harbor, Ohio, and moved to Youngstown with his family before he was a year old. He began his athletic career while attending St. Procopius Academy, a high school prep school in Lisle, Ill., which is just outside Chicago. Starring in football, baseball, and basketball, Knapick spent 5 brilliant athletic years at the academy.

While attending St. Procopius, Knapick was coached by Father Benedict Bauer, a personal friend of Knute Rockne, head football coach at Notre Dame University. In Knapick's own words—

Father Bauer taught me everything—all the fundamentals of football. Father Bauer would visit Knute Rockne every spring and pass along the information to us at the Academy.

Knute Rockne had made it a point to see Knapick in action on several occasions and, being very much impressed, Rockne eagerly waited for Knapick to join the squad at Notre Dame in the fall of 1927. Unfortunately, however, financial difficulties forced Knapick to remain closer to home.

While a student in Chicago, Knapick read in the Chicago Tribune that a young coach, "Bo" McMillin, was beginning his career at Geneva College in Beaver Falls, Pa. Compelled by his love for football, Knapick arrived at Geneva College aboard a motorcycle driven by his brother.

In his freshman year at Geneva College, Knapick played in all the games in which freshmen were eligible. As a sophomore, he had the distinction of playing in the first night football game in the United States. The game was played at Forbes Field against Duquesne, and Knapick thrilled the crowd by returning the opening kickoff 93 yards for a touchdown. In 1930, he was named to the Little All-America team.

Following graduation from Geneva College in 1931, John Knapick was named head football coach at Cleveland Benedictine. While coaching at Benedictine, he joined the Cleveland Pennzoil semipro team and was a triple-threat halfback, playing every minute of every game in a league that featured many former collegiate stars.

The following year, misfortune struck the personable John Knapick. During the first game of the season for Cleveland Pennzoil, Knapick suffered a broken

shoulder that ended his playing career. The injury also ended his hopes of playing baseball with the Cleveland Indians after an impressive tryout with the "Tribe." Knapick then returned to Youngstown where he coached the Hyvis Oil football team to 20 straight victories.

In 1933, Knapick joined Dick Barrett's coaching staff at Campbell Memorial and was named head coach in 1935. He launched his career by piloting his "poor little boys" through a 24-game winning streak. In the Steel Valley League, Knapick had undefeated seasons in 1936, 1939, 1945, and 1956, and was named Steel Valley Coach of the Year in 1958. Knapick brought State and national fame to Campbell by producing more than 150 outstanding college football players, including four all-Americans:

Andrew Cverko, Northwestern University; Jack Cverko, Northwestern University; Walter Chwalik, Miami University, Fla.; and Bob Babich, Miami University, Ohio.

In addition, six of Coach Knapick's boys went on to play professional football:

Ralph Goldston with Philadelphia of the NFL and the Canadian Football League; Andrew Cverko with Dallas; Jack Cverko with San Diego; Bob Babich with San Diego and Cleveland; James Carwell with Houston and Boston; and Gil Sloko with Detroit.

John Knapick retired as head football coach at Campbell Memorial in 1963, with a lifetime coaching record of 174 wins, 84 losses, and 29 ties. In 1972, he was named to the Ohio High School Coaches Hall of Fame.

Mr. Knapick resides in Campbell, Ohio, and is married to the former Sarah Crino. He has one daughter, Sally Knapick Winsen, a teacher in the Youngstown school system, and one son, John Philip, with the Campbell City Fire Department.

Mr. Speaker, John Knapick has had an outstanding career as a coach, teacher, and athletic director. In these capacities, he has helped countless young people to grow into mature, responsible adults. Because of his service to the youth and his community, the city of Campbell, which is also my hometown, is a better place in which to live. When John Knapick's many friends join together to honor him, I hope to be among them.

## THE 1975 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM FLORIDA'S THIRD DISTRICT

### HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I mailed a questionnaire to my constituents in the Third Congressional District of Florida, seeking their views on important national issues. I received more than 12,000 responses and I have just completed compiling the results of the questionnaire. I am placing the results of the questionnaire in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I believe my col-

leagues in the House will benefit from seeing the opinions of a cross section of my constituents on the major issues of the day.

Here are the results of my questionnaire expressed in percentages:

[In percentage]

Do you favor:

- (1) Immediate tax cuts to fight recession?
- Yes ----- 84.2  
No ----- 15.8
- (2) Reduced government spending to fight inflation?
- Yes ----- 92.1  
No ----- 7.9
- (3) Compulsory national health insurance?
- Yes ----- 42.7  
No ----- 57.3
- (4) Increased military supplies to Southeast Asia?
- Yes ----- 22.4  
No ----- 77.6
- (5) In order to conserve energy, do you favor:
- (a) Higher fuel taxes? (Yes) ----- 53.1  
(b) Rationing? (Yes) ----- 41.2  
(5.7 percent wrote in other preferences.)

#### FREEDOM WORTH DEFENDING— VIET FIGHT NOT IN VAIN

**HON. BOB WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress will soon be making momentous decisions about our future action in Vietnam. The whole world including our enemies and our friends will be watching to see if we weaken our resolve to fight for freedom.

A forceful and timely editorial on this subject appeared recently in the San Diego Union.

I include it as a portion of my remarks in the Appendix:

#### FREEDOM WORTH DEFENDING—VIET FIGHT NOT IN VAIN

The questions and recriminations are beginning. Did the 56,000 Americans who gave their lives in Vietnam die in vain? Did the millions of U.S. airmen, soldiers, sailors and Marines who fought in Vietnam accomplish nothing? Was our \$150 billion investment in Vietnam wasted? The suffering of our prisoners of war, of the wounded and disabled, of the families of the killed and missing in action—has it all become meaningless now that the enemy is sweeping through the cities and countryside that the Americans once helped defend?

Events of the last two weeks in Indochina are tragic enough for the people suffering there now, but they also are destined to haunt the American conscience for a long time to come. Ten years after the first U.S. combat units went ashore at Danang, we are still debating whether they should have been sent there in the first place. Two years after we struck an agreement with the Communists to remove our forces, we are still not sure whether we did the right thing in leaving our allies to the doubtful future promised by a jerry-built "cease-fire."

History will one day answer all of the political and military questions raised during

the long agony of the Vietnam war, but one question can be answered now. History cannot undo the meaning of sacrifices made for a cause which is right. Does anyone believe that the 53,500 Americans who died in World War I died in vain because their sacrifice did not prevent another World War a generation later? One of the cruelties of warfare is the frailty of the hopes for enduring peace that wars engender.

Americans are fortunate. Our homeland has never felt the scourge of a foreign invader. The reason is that we have an historical commitment to the principle that people have a right to live securely within their borders under a government of their own choosing. We know that when a powerful force defies that principle anywhere in the world it threatens our own security.

The United States of America made its commitment to the survival of South Vietnam in response to that principle. Our support of the South Vietnamese prevented a victory by invaders from the north. Under terms of the 1973 cease-fire agreement we continued our support by replacing South Vietnamese material combat losses on a one for one basis. When the Congress, over a period of two years, progressively cut back on this commitment, we increased greatly the risk of what is happening in South Vietnam today.

Every day we read of Communist tanks rolling over territory once defended with American blood, but territory is not really the issue. What should concern us more is that those tanks are rolling over a principle that is worth fighting for, one that means life or death for free nations, one that Americans must stand ready to defend. This is surely not the last time that our country will face a challenge to its commitment to that principle.

The American sacrifice in Vietnam still has meaning, and it will continue to have meaning as long as freedom is cherished anywhere in the world. Our men will not have died in vain unless the American people decide that the cause of freedom is not worth defending. We have given the rest of the world—both our friends and our enemies—reason to question whether we remain committed to that cause or not. That is the overriding question that should be on the conscience of the American people today.

#### 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF NASSAU POLICE FORCE

**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today, the County Board of Supervisors of Nassau County, N.Y. met in the Old County Court House in Mineola and unanimously voted to create a county police force.

The original force, numbering 55, was entrusted with protecting the rights of the 200,000 residents of Nassau who were spread over an area of 175 square miles. Today, under the leadership of Commissioner Louis J. Frank, the force numbers 3,900 policemen and 1,000 civilian employees and must protect a much larger population living in an area of 220 square miles.

The first cars used by the Nassau Police Department were Ford runabouts, which were not supposed to be driven in excess of 20 m.p.h. except in an extreme emer-

gency. Today, the force is equipped with modern vehicles containing sophisticated police equipment. The duties of the force have expanded from the land alone to include the sea and the air. There is a fleet of 15 boats patrolling the shoreline and four helicopters and one plane for use in the skies above the county.

Credit should also be given to the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association and its present president, Daniel Greenwald. The Nassau County PBA has been most effective in furthering the welfare of both the men and women of the police force and the citizenry of the area.

I would like to congratulate the Nassau County Police Department for its exemplary performance over the past 50 years and I wish its members all the best for the future.

#### SCHEUER INTRODUCES BILL DE- SIGNING TO LOWER PRICE OF IM- PORTED OIL

**HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of introducing a bill which was also offered in the Senate Monday by the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PHILIP A. HART). The purpose of this legislation is to insure the free flow of imported oil at the lowest possible price by designating the Federal Energy Administration as the sole purchasing agent and authorizing its purchases through sealed bids.

In the past 2 years the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries has quadrupled the price of crude oil. The ability of the OPEC nations to control the price implies the ability to control the supply as well. As a result of the behavior of this oil monopoly, we have suffered serious economic problems; elsewhere in the world there is the potential for economic chaos and slow strangulation.

While the Arab-Israeli dispute may originally have been impetus to the formation of the OPEC cartel, its settlement is unlikely to bring the price down. Surely the Venezuelan or Indonesian appetite for a high oil price will not be reduced by the course of Middle-East politics. Indeed, it is entirely possible that the price of oil may go still higher.

While the administration has tried to deal with the problem of imported oil, it has assumed that we must take the high foreign crude prices as an established fact. While the administration has talked of promoting solidarity among consuming nations, it will effect no reduction in price so long as oil continues to be purchased through oil company agents who have no interest in achieving low prices.

What is needed is a single oil-buying organization to deal directly with oil producing nations. By soliciting direct, sealed bids from these nations, the prices could be driven downward closer to pro-

duction costs. By encouraging competition among the OPEC nations, we can finally drive down the price of oil.

This is perhaps the most appropriate moment for this legislation, Mr. Speaker. At this time there is a worldwide surplus of oil, yet little indication by the oil cartel of reducing the price. What we need is a policy that will place between the American consumer and the OPEC cartel an agent whose primary interest is the achievement of a reasonable price of foreign crude for the American consumer.

The bill follows:

H.R. 5978

A bill to amend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 is amended—*

(1) by inserting after the first section the following:

"TITLE I—MANDATORY ALLOCATION OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS";

and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE II—PETROLEUM IMPORTS

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

"SEC. 201. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

"(1) the United States needs adequate and available supplies of petroleum products at the lowest possible cost to meet the present and future needs of commerce and national security and the requirements for petroleum products of businessmen, communities, and consumers in activities in interstate commerce and affecting interstate commerce;

"(2) a major factor in the high rate of inflation, unemployment, and other economic dislocations is the quintupling of the cost of foreign petroleum;

"(3) the present and projected harmful effects to the economy, the businessman, and the consumer are caused in part by a lack of competition among suppliers of petroleum to the United States and among petroleum companies within the United States; and

"(4) the political and economic importance of imported petroleum from foreign nations is of such significance to the United States that it should be purchased by the Government rather than private companies.

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 202. It is the purpose of this title to insure the free flow of oil in foreign and interstate commerce at the lowest possible price.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 203. For purposes of this title, the term—

"(1) 'Administration' means the Federal Energy Administration, and 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration;

"(2) 'Crude oil' includes crude oil, natural gas, liquefied natural gas.

"(3) 'Qualified buyer' means a citizen of the United States, a domestic corporation, a domestic agricultural cooperative, or any department, agency, or other instrumentality of the United States or of any State.

"(4) 'Person' includes any individual, corporation, governmental agency, department, or instrumentality, or other entity.

"(5) 'Responsible offeror' means any company, sovereign state or person acting on its own or on behalf of others who has been found by the Administration, in accordance with such regulations as he may promul-

gate, to be capable of performing in accordance with the terms of its offer.

"PROHIBITION ON IMPORTATION

"SEC. 204 (a) On and after October 15, 1975, no person shall import into the United States any crude oil or refined petroleum product unless it has been purchased from the Administration, or manufactured from crude oil purchased from the Administration.

"(b) Any person who imports petroleum into the United States except in accordance with this title shall be punished for each offense by a fine not exceeding \$1,000,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both.

"FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 205 (a) The Administration shall act as the exclusive agent of the United States in—

"(1) purchasing crude oil produced outside the United States for importation into the United States,

"(2) purchasing crude oil produced outside the United States for sale to refiners outside the United States pursuant to subsection (h) of this section, and

"(3) purchasing refined petroleum products outside the United States for importation into the United States.

"(b) All crude oil and refined petroleum products purchased by the Administration pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be sold to qualified buyers free on board the point of purchase. The Administration shall not engage in the business of producing, transporting, or refining crude oil or refined petroleum products on its own account or on the account of others.

"(c) The Administration shall endeavor to buy and sell without profit or loss. In the furtherance of this policy the Administration—

"(1) may, in the case of any individual transaction, sell crude oil or refined petroleum products at a price above or below the cost of same if, in the judgment of the Administrator, such sales may result in progress toward a lower price for oil sold in international commerce; and

"(2) shall periodically establish posted prices that will apply to all sales and outstanding contracts for sale of crude oil and refined petroleum products according to their particular gravities, qualities, grades, varieties, and locations.

"(d) Persons qualifying as responsible offerors wishing to sell crude oil or refined petroleum products to the United States shall submit sealed offers of sale to the Administrator in accordance with such regulations as the Administration shall promulgate.

"(e) All such sealed offers submitted to the Administrator shall be in United States dollar amounts and shall show price, specifications, volume, terms of delivery and schedule of delivery. The Administrator shall accept those offers whose terms are most favorable to the United States, and shall have the power to negotiate with the offerors of most favorable terms for terms more favorable to the United States, except that no contract accepted will be for a duration of more than two years.

"(f) The terms of any offer, or of any contract or agreement entered into by the Administration to purchase crude oil or refined petroleum products shall be kept secret by the Administration, its officers, and employees. The Administrator shall insure that such terms are known to no more than six persons within the Administration. Such terms may, however, be made public no sooner than five years after the termination of the transaction to which they apply, provided that the identities of particular offerors and contracting parties are not thereby disclosed.

"(g) (1) The Administrator shall, by the issuance of regulations, determine the sys-

tem by which sales of crude oil and refined petroleum products purchased by the Administration pursuant to this section shall be made to qualified buyers.

"(2) Any regulation promulgated under authority of this subsection shall be promulgated pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

"(3) Any regulation promulgated under authority of this subsection shall (A) encourage competition within the domestic petroleum industry, (B) allocate supplies of crude oil and refined petroleum products equitably on a geographical basis, and (C) insure the maximum utilization of petroleum refining facilities located within the United States.

"(1) The refinery in which the crude oil in question is to be run is owned by a qualified buyer.

"(2) The qualified buyer has contracted with the Administration to import into the United States all refined petroleum products manufactured by it from crude oil sold to it by the Administration.

"(3) The Administration has taken care, pursuant to subsection (g) (3) of this section, to insure the maximum utilization of petroleum refining facilities located within the United States.

"(i) In the performance of its functions under this title the Administration shall not set or establish tariffs or quotas on the importation of crude oil or refined petroleum products.

"AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 206. (a) In the performance of its functions the Administration is authorized—

"(1) to make, promulgate, issue, rescind and amend rules and regulations governing the manner of its operation and the exercise of powers vested in it by this act;

"(2) to appoint and fix compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out such functions; and

"(3) to contract for the purchase of crude oil and refined petroleum products from any private individual, foreign state, or foreign or domestic corporation.

"(b) All contracts and other obligations entered into by the Administration shall be guaranteed by the full faith and credit of the United States.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 207. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 208. (a) The Administrator shall submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress in January of each year a report which shall include a financial accounting of purchases and sales by the Administration under this title during the prior calendar year. Such report shall not, however, disclose any information required to be kept secret under the provisions of section 205(f) of this Act.

"(b) Any report made under this section shall contain such recommendations for additional legislation as the Administrator or the President may consider necessary or desirable to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

"GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT

"SEC. 209. The General Accounting Office shall audit the functions of the Administration under this Act semiannually and report to the President and the Congress. Such report shall not, however, disclose any information required to be kept secret under the provisions of section 205(f) of this Act.

"DEFENSE AVAILABLE IN BREACH OF CONTRACT ACTIONS

"SEC. 210. In any action in any Federal or State court for breach of contract, there shall be available as a defense that the al-

leged breach of contract was caused solely by compliance with the provisions of this title, or any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant to this title."

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 1924. Disclosure of information concerning crude oil or refined petroleum products and speculation thereon.

"Whoever, being an officer, employee or person acting for or on behalf of the United States or any department or agency thereof, and having by virtue of his office, employment, or position, become possessed of information required to be kept secret by title II of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 or by regulations promulgated pursuant to that title, willfully imparts directly or indirectly, such information, or any part thereof, to any person not entitled under such Act or regulations to receive the same; or, before such information is made public through regular official channels, directly or indirectly, speculates in any such product by buying or selling the same in any quantity; shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

"No person shall be deemed guilty of a violation of any regulations promulgated pursuant to title II of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973, unless prior to such alleged violation he shall have had actual knowledge thereof."

(b) The table of sections of chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1924. Disclosure of information concerning crude oil or refined petroleum products and speculation thereon."

#### THE RUSSIANS ARE COMING— WITH CAMERAS

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Soviets are continuing their attempts to invade the American market with various products. In addition to the Russian tractors and watches that I have previously discussed, the Soviets are now planning to export cameras to this country.

Concern has been expressed from numerous quarters with Soviet imports and U.S. Government proposals to grant the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status. The reasons are numerous.

One major reason is the Soviet's ability to set a price for their goods which has no regard for market costs. Economists have pointed out how this is possible due to the state-controlled economy of the Soviet Union. Production costs are unknown. The result is the possibility of unfair competition by Soviet goods and the export of more American jobs.

We seem to be developing a situation where the United States first builds various Soviet plants which allow that country to expand its industrial base and military machine and then we are expected to buy Soviet products. Both result in the export of American jobs.

At this point I include in the CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD the text of an article from the Washington Star-News of April 11, 1975.

#### RUSSIAN CAMERA

NEW YORK.—Berkey Photo, Inc., says its import subsidiary has reached agreement to market a Russian-made camera in the United States. The agreement with Mashpriborintorg, the U.S.S.R. export agency for cameras and other optical equipment, covers the Cosmorex Se Camera, Berkey said.

The camera is expected to retail for under \$140 and will be sold nationally beginning April 14, Berkey said.

#### SOME OF THE SECURITY OF THE FREE WORLD IS CRUMBLING THESE DAYS

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members are genuinely concerned over the international reaction to the tragedy in South Vietnam, and will note with interest the following article by Ernst Cramer, senior editor of Axel Springer's publications in Germany. The article which appeared in the Sunday, April 6, edition of Die Welt in Hamburg, Germany's most prestigious newspaper, is a sober reminder of the problems we face in Europe in the wake of the Indochina tragedy.

I insert the translation of this article into the RECORD at this time:

SOME OF THE SECURITY OF THE FREE WORLD IS  
CRUMBLING THESE DAYS

(Translation of an Article by Ernst Cramer)

The catastrophe of Vietnam is the gravest defeat the United States of America has suffered since the Republic was founded 199 years ago. And unless the West, whose foremost power the USA remains, learns the proper lessons, the collapse in Indo-China will be not merely the final of the tragedy of Vietnam. It will be the prelude to a far greater debacle.

It would be unjust to blame America alone for the breakdown of the South Vietnamese defense machine. President Nguyen Van Thieu and his generals have simply failed. But American officers with long experience in Vietnam had prophesied this: "If we withdraw and abandon the South Vietnamese to their own resources, total collapse will be at best a matter of a few years."

The coup de grace was the decision by Congress to reduce aid for South Vietnam so drastically that it was tantamount to a total cut. When the news reached Vietnam, demoralisation hit the army on a unprecedented scale.

But the disaster we are now witnessing had long been programmed: the seed was sown over ten years ago when President Lyndon Johnson began escalating the American engagement, at the same time, however, ordering restrictions on his generals in the conduct of the war which made a military victory impossible. The soil was fertilized when the Communist side's skillful polemics about the morality of the fight for Vietnam's freedom even undermined the thinking of America's leaders.

And the seed of defeat began to sprout when Henry Kissinger, then President Nixon's security adviser, negotiated the agreement on withdrawal of US troops and American disengagement began.

It is idle at this date to resume the dis-

cussion about whether it would ever have been possible to achieve a military decision in favor of South Vietnam. But if such a chance had never had credence it would have been a crime to sacrifice even one single life in this struggle. All real experts on the situation, who do not wear political or ideological blinkers, agree two facts, however: first, that a military victory could have been won, given the courage in the highest places; and second, that many South Vietnamese hoped for such a development for many years because it promised a better future.

All this is now of the past. Communism has won a great victory whose effects reach far beyond Indochina. For the defeat the United States has suffered in this faraway, sorely tried country in Southeast Asia has profoundly shaken the confidence of the free world in the reliability of the leading power in the West. More: this development has given new courage to the adversaries of America and her allies.

"Today the Vietnamese, tomorrow it will be the Israelis," Arab circles are gloating, and already the chances for progress towards peace in the Middle East have faded into the distant future.

In Moscow too, and in the other control stations of Communist power in eastern Europe, there can be no doubt that the pro's and con's of possible demarches westwards are being weighed up anew. With the collapse in Vietnam some of the security of West Berlin, of Germany and of western Europe has crumbled away.

Mr. Kissinger well knows this. These days he repeatedly harks back to 1914 and fears now as then misunderstandings could lead to misjudgments, indeed to a collision between the world powers. But in Congress a mood largely reigns that in the end the embarrassing defeat in Vietnam is a cause for relief. And those publicists who for years have willfully or involuntarily worked to weaken the forces of the free world, applaud enthusiastically.

Since Aristotle tragedy has been followed by catharsis, the process of purification. Will the Americans, will the other free peoples now awaken to the knowledge that the way so far taken will lead to the abyss? Will they come together and compel their leaders to set new priorities? Only an incurable optimist would answer these questions with an unreserved affirmative.

#### NORTHERN IRELAND TROUBLES CONTINUE

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, despite the facade of peace in Northern Ireland there remains many serious problems for the people of this war-ravaged nation. The most serious of these is the continued disregard of the basic civil rights and liberties of the people by the British Government.

The Irish National Caucus has prepared a comprehensive fact sheet which outlines perhaps the most tragic symbol of oppression in Northern Ireland, the Long Kesh Concentration Camp where many citizens of Northern Ireland have been incarcerated many with little if any respect of their rights of due process.

The Irish National Caucus is a new organization made up of prominent leaders of the Irish American community.



Some of its members are good friends of mine and represent some of the most eloquent spokesmen of the Irish community. These include Dr. Fred O'Brien who serves as information director; Mr. Sean Walsh; Mr. Teddy Gleason, the distinguished leader of the International Brotherhood of Longshoremen; Mr. John Henning, former Ambassador to New Zealand; Mr. Brendan McCusker; and Rev. Sean McManus. The caucus has already received the endorsement of 30 of the nation's largest Irish organizations as well as the executive council of the AFL-CIO which gave their endorsement in February.

I welcome the caucus and wish them the best of success. They are committed to finding solutions of the problems in Northern Ireland and boast some 1 million supporters already.

We must continue our efforts toward establishing a lasting peace in Northern Ireland. Next week I will be reintroducing a resolution which calls for the people of Northern Ireland to have the right of self-determination. I anticipate that this will be considered during hearings later in the year in the International Relations Committee of the House.

At this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert the article written by Dr. O'Brien entitled "The Facts Behind Long Kesh Concentration Camp." I urge my colleagues to read this article so they too can see the problems which still exist in Northern Ireland and hopefully they will join with me in finding the solutions:

#### IRISH NATIONAL CAUCUS—THE FACTS BEHIND LONG KESH CONCENTRATION CAMP

(By Dr. Fred Burns O'Brien)

British Justice in Occupied Ireland has been persistently deteriorating during the present five year conflict still ranging against the inherent injustice of the British Government, its Army and its Judiciary that sustains its presence in Ireland against the will of the people of Ireland for varying degrees of concern and a diversity of political philosophical reasoning. The institution of detention without trial is the despicable handiwork of a desperate British Government. This process deprives the detainee of the basic legal rights to be charged, confront witnesses and seek litigation before a jury of peers that is the stated foundation of due process under the English Common Law System.

To incarcerate an individual without informing him or her of the charges is to cast aside the necessity of a system of justice and obliterate the pretense of a legal system. The process of internment without trial cannot be excused or justified under a democratic system, only one that has at its base a totalitarian instrument of shame. The island of Britain houses a legal system that is just on its face, but that legal system has not been transposed in Occupied Ireland as pertinent parts to protect citizens were deleted and a selective process was promulgated upon selected victims of not justice but administrative process overriding the judicial Process.

#### ABUSIVE LEGISLATION

The Special Powers Act, now superseded by The Emergency Provisions Bill, are two pieces of legislation enacted by the British Parliament at Westminster, London, for imposition on the Irish People of the Six Northeast Counties of Ireland and not applicable to the other claimed jurisdiction in which the British Government exercises authority. Both Acts are extraordinary measures and are in derogation of the basic human rights of those coming within their imposed admin-

istration. On paper, they are intended to sound necessary although a bit unreasonable, but in practice they are absolutely brutal and inhumane setting the stage for the construction of Concentration Camps in Ireland.

The intent of both cited Acts is identical and the purpose of the latter act is to continue the questionable practices of the prior Act by setting out in law vague guidelines, so that any dastardly acts by The Crown's Forces might be legislatively justified. Through the two pieces of legislation, the violation of human rights is perpetuated and British policy in Occupied Ireland was in fact to destroy equality and equity for its inhabitants.

The legislation on its face is prima facie in derogation of democracy and its application is selective and arbitrary, abridging full guarantee of rights under domestic and international law. The Special Powers Act and now The Emergency Provisions Bill are designed to relegate dissent and effective political opposition, contrary to British designates, to oblivion. Internment without trial is a crime against humanity from which other abuses derive their being.

#### INHUMANE TREATMENT

Subsequent to the utilization of internment without trial causes detention and torture of detainees in institutions similar to the Long Kesh Concentration Camp now known as Her Majesty's Prison, The Maze. So blatant, so rampant was the extent of torture that the Irish Free State government in Dublin filed charges and a case against the United Kingdom government at the European Court in Strasbourg.

Among the charges against Britain, the Free State government alleges that in fact the British government violates the European Convention of Human Rights guaranteeing the right of life, the right to liberty and security of person and discrimination in the administration of justice based solely on political consideration. Also alleged is that treatment of detainees and internees constituted torture and inhuman treatment.

#### VERIFICATION OF TORTURE

Various sources have verified that in fact there has been torture practiced upon those incarcerated. Amnesty International, an international organization based in London confirmed abuse upon detainees. Congressman Lester Wolff heavily disguised went in to Long Kesh and observed the brutal conditions and talked to the men inside and testified to the observations of his visit before a specially convened Committee on Foreign Affairs. Bishop Thomas J. Drury, a member of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy stated after visiting the Concentration Camp "I was a chaplain with the United States Army-Air Corps during World War II, but even in Japan I never saw such abominable conditions. Long Kesh is clearly designed to disorientate its victims. In plain language, it is designed to torture, degrade, and drive the men out of their minds and its succeeded in the case of P.O.W. Patrick Crawford."

Verifying the Bishop's allegations is a report by Dr. Robert Daly, Professor of Psychiatry at University College, Cork, Ireland. Dr. Daly interviewed twenty men who had been subjected to extreme coercive pressure. He concluded "Whether it was called interrogation in depth or brainwashing was an academic point. The aim of the treatment was to cause temporary psychosis (in layman's terms to send a man temporarily insane), which was a severe psychological injury able to have very lasting (permanent) consequences. Some of those people have been permanently damaged." Dr. Daly was fully supported by Dr. Anthony Storr, the Harley Street (British) psychiatrist, who studied the cases of those studied by Dr. Daly. Dr. Storr concluded, "It is exactly what I would expect."

The British in the face of international

embarrassment empowered a Commission under Lord Compton bearing his name. The Compton Commission set out with the task to investigate charges of torture. The process used was called "Interrogation in Depth" and the then Prime Minister, Edward Heath, was queried on its probability of continued use responded, "I must make it plain that interrogation in depth will continue."

#### MENTAL AND PHYSICAL TORTURE

The general process of torture is as follows: (Words of Dr. Daly) "The men were made to stand for many hours with arms raised against a wall, with a hood over the head and with a machine creating a background of monotonous noise. The men were also deprived of sleep and kept on bread and water." During this process they were beaten and physically abused, mostly concentrated on one area and upon the testicles. The intent of the depravity was to induce terror and humiliation. The process decreased intake of calories, temperatures were kept high to increase sweating, leading to dehydration resulting in physiological as well as psychological changes.

The Compton Report admitted ill-treatment of detainees, but excused it as necessary, although it was in clear violation of all covenants referring to human right guarantees. All allegations of abuse under the interrogation in depth was admitted by the Compton Commission that substituted selective rhetoric of ill treatment rather than torture, but the substance of hooding, etc., remained unchanged.

#### CONCENTRATION CAMP BURNED

The men of Long Kesh Concentration Camp are the victims of British torture and ill-treatment for their political offences. Minds and bodies can only tolerate so much suffering until the breaking point drive the rational beings into revolt. Such was the case in Long Kesh when victims of all processes previously referenced in this report had sustained all the abuse they could take. On the night of October 15, 1974, the men and boys of Long Kesh, Republican and Loyalist, Catholic and Protestant, burnt the concentration camp to the ground.

For two weeks they had appealed to their British captors for an improvement of depraved conditions to absolutely no avail. In Cage 13, British Forces beat an internee after an argument and this literally ignited those in the camp. The result was conflagration. The internees under internment under a system fraught with indiscretions, further subjected to beatings and torture, could take no more and destroyed the camp.

The reaction from the British Forces was an immediate attack upon the unarmed men and boys who were riddled with American manufactured rubber bullets and CS gas. The treatment of Irish People by the British Army involves maiming and killing; men and women are arrested and tortured; incarcerated and further abused. The entire way of life in Occupied Ireland is daily punishment of the people by the British. Degradation of the Irish is a British pastime both in and out of the Concentration camps.

Naturally and rationally the men and boys in the camp revolted at the inhumane treatment by the British and were joined by the women in Armagh prison. No people should be expected to suffer in their own country at the hands of a foreign power. It all leads to the inevitable conclusion that Ireland's problem is British presence with its complement of British terrorism promulgated by its Army. If any rational human being realizes the extent of abuse suffered by the Irish at British hands they would welcome the burning of the Long Kesh Concentration Camp as further symbols of the Irish will to resist British terror. The burning of Long Kesh was an act of unity of all political prisoners, Republican and Loyalist, Catholic and Protestant.

**KEMP CALLS FOR INCREASED CONGRESSIONAL SCRUTINY OF FOREIGN DEBTS OWED U.S. TAXPAYERS**

**HON. JACK F. KEMP**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation to provide that no debt owed the United States by any country may be settled in an amount less than the full value of that debt, unless Congress approves of such a settlement.

This issue of foreign indebtedness to the United States is one which we must take with utmost seriousness. Foreign debts very much affect our budget, our balance of payments, and our relations with other countries. Most important of all, foreign debts affect the American people who have exemplified a generosity unmatched in history in extending financial assistance of all kinds to nations throughout the world, and who have extended these particular loans with the assumption that they would be honored, and would be repaid according to a mutually agreed upon schedule between the United States and the debtor.

It concerns me very much that in recent years the State Department has taken upon itself certain loan negotiations which have had the effect of writing off substantial debts owed the American taxpayer by foreign governments. The Congress collects money from U.S. taxpayers, the Congress appropriates money from U.S. taxpayers, and I think the Congress, and not some executive department, should have final say over whether or not money owed to the U.S. taxpayer is to be collected, or is to be written off.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign debt owed the United States as of June 30, 1974 was \$32 billion, exclusive of World War I debts. When World War I debts are added on, payments due the American taxpayers from foreign debtors total over \$55 billion. Of the World War II debts owed the U.S. as of June 30, 1974, \$6 billion was delinquent. Of the World War I debts owed as of June 30, 1974, over \$19 billion was delinquent.

During the past several years, the State Department has entered into agreements with three nations which have netted up 3 cents on the dollar, and effectively canceled over \$5 billion in outstanding foreign debts; \$2.6 billion in claims from the Russian lend-lease debt were canceled; \$2.2 billion in Indian Government rupees were canceled, and, most recently, a \$370 million claim against the French Government was settled for \$100 million.

At these times of inflation and recession at home, I question whether the American taxpayer who extended these loans in the first place shares the generosity of the State Department in writing off the loans.

The legislation I'm introducing today would not prevent the State Department from renegotiating foreign debts. It would, however, prevent the State Department from engineering these mas-

sive giveaways without the consent of Congress.

The Senate has already expressed agreement with the principle that foreign debts should not be rewritten at less than face value without the concurrence of Congress. Largely due to the efforts of Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Jr., the Senate voted in 1973 to prevent any settlement of India's debt to the United States at less than face value unless Congress approved of such a settlement.

The legislation I introduced yesterday has already been introduced in the Senate by Mr. BYRD, and is the result of his long, and often lonely battle to focus congressional attention upon delinquent payments due the American taxpayer.

I hope my colleagues in the House will join me in helping to maintain control of money loaned out by the American taxpayer with the reasonable and valid expectation it would be repaid according to schedule, and at the levels agreed upon.

**"THAT THEY MAY LIVE"**

**HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Curtis T. Corson, a resident of the Second Congressional District of New Jersey, has written a poem dedicated to the Bi-Centennial of the United States.

Mr. Corson's ancestors were among the original settlers of southern New Jersey, arriving in the area in 1690. Mr. Corson was born in Cape May County, N.J., and has lived there all his life. He was a farmer in the area and for the past 6 years has been a campground manager.

Mr. Corson has never written poetry before and I commend him on his magnificent effort. I would like to read his poem, "That They May Live," to the House of Representatives:

THAT THEY MAY LIVE

(By Curtis T. Corson)

Listen all people, and you shall hear  
How the United States, came to be here.  
Tune your minds, and listen well  
So that your children, will live to tell.

Your ancestors crossed the ocean, and braved  
the sea

To reach this land, of liberty.  
Cherish your freedom, and guard it well  
So that your children, will live to tell.

They fled oppression, and tyranny  
To find a home, for you and me.  
Cherish your freedom, and guard it well  
So that your children, will live to tell.

They came here to worship, as they would  
And develop religion, for the common good.  
Cherish your faith, and guard it well  
So that your children, will live to tell.

They left behind hunger, want and poverty  
They found, a fruitful land of opportunity.  
Conserve our resources and use them well  
So that your children, will live to tell.

Some came here, against their will  
Enslaved by us, in farm and mill.  
Make room for them, and treat them well  
So that your children, will live to tell.

The Indian was here, before we came  
Living well, on land and game.  
We must learn, to do as well  
So that our children will live to tell.

This land, the Indian did not soil  
Was received by us, to soon despoil.  
Change your ways, and do it well  
So that your children will live to tell.

They conquered the wilderness, with ax and plow  
With blood and sweat, upon their brow.  
Do your share, and do it well  
So that your children will live to tell.

They rejected a King, upon his throne  
And established a Government, of their own.  
Respect its Laws, and obey them well  
So that your children will live to tell.

They pushed the Frontier, from east to west  
Across mountain and ocean, from crest to crest.

Keep moving forward, all obstacles repel  
So that your children will live to tell.

Frontiers are here, for those who seek  
And are found by the bold, not the meek.  
Keep moving forward, all obstacles repel  
So that your children will live to tell.

Shade your eyes, and look ahead  
Be a leader, and not the led.  
Teach your children, and guide them well  
So that their children will live to tell.

United for strength, a mixture of all  
Divided in contention, we are apt to fall.  
Make bonds of unity, and weld them well  
So that your children will live to tell.

We stand free, a light to all  
Stand up straight, and do not fall.  
Those who govern, do it well  
So that your children will not rebel.

**U.S. ARMS SALES A GROWING THREAT TO PEACE**

**HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, after a record \$8.3 billion in orders for foreign military sales in fiscal 1974, the export of American weapons is increasing still further in the current year. The United States contributes more to foreign arsenals through arms sales than the rest of the world combined. In 1974, American arms were sold to 70 foreign governments including a large number of repressive military dictatorships in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. In these countries, our arms help to perpetuate the subjugation of the people of the existing government.

The most dangerous facet of our foreign military sales program is our role in the Middle East, which has purchased the preponderance of American arms exports during the past few years. While the administration purports to be working for a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict and to reduce the risk of renewed hostilities, it has supplied vast quantities of arms to Iran, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and other nations in this volatile part of the world. By expanding the arsenals of virtually all parties in the Middle East and Persian Gulf regions, the United States has made it easier for war to be waged and helped to insure that any future war will be more tragic and

destructive than the last. The enormous expansion of arms sales to Middle Eastern nations has been carried out by the administration without the prior knowledge or consent of Congress. I have introduced H.R. 4133 in the House, similar to legislation filed in the Senate by Senator KENNEDY, which would suspend the sale of arms to Persian Gulf nations for 6 months unless Congress approves a comprehensive policy statement on such sales submitted by the President.

It is imperative that Congress participate in all decisions to sell weapons to various countries throughout the world. Until this year, Congresses only involvement in this key aspect of our foreign policy was in receiving periodic reports after the fact on sales completed in the recent past. At that point, it was, of course, too late for Congress to act against any sale it did not approve of. An amendment to the Foreign Military Sales Act, contained within the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, constituted the first significant step toward meaningful congressional oversight of proposed arms sales. That amendment provides for prior congressional notification of all proposed sales valued above \$25 million carried out under the Foreign Military Sales Act. Congress then has 20 days in which to disapprove a proposed sale by concurrent resolution.

These recently enacted oversight requirements have a number of major loopholes which must be closed through appropriate legislation. First, the amendment adopted in 1974 applies only to sales conducted under the Foreign Military Sales Act. The export of weapons by private corporations and nongovernmental agencies is regulated under the provisions of the Mutual Security Act, which grants sole regulatory power to the President. On February 19, 1975, I introduced H.R. 3213 which would subject all proposed arms exports under the Mutual Security Act to the provisions of prior congressional notification and congressional disapproval contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974. I am pleased to report that 45 of my colleagues have joined me in sponsoring this bill to date. The cosponsors are listed below:

Abzug, Badillo, Baucus, Bedell, Brademas, Brown of California, Carr, Collins of Illinois, Conyers, Corman, Cornell, Dellums, Diggs, Downey, Edgar, Edwards of California, Ellberg, Ford of Tennessee, Ford of Michigan, Gibbons, Gude, Hannaford, Harrington, Hawkins, Hechler, Helstoski, Holtzman, Koch, Leggett, Long of Maryland, Maguire, Metcalfe, Meyner, Mikva, Mitchell of Maryland, Moakley, Mottl, Ottinger, Riegle, Roe, Rosenthal, Simon, Solarz, Stark, and Stokes.

A second deficiency of existing provisions for congressional oversight in the field of foreign arms sales is the exemption of all sales valued at less than \$25 million. From the standpoint of American foreign policy, it is the destination of the arms, rather than their cash value, which is of greatest significance. A relatively small sale of arms to South Africa or Hungary, for example, would have enormous implications for the conduct of our foreign policy. It is therefore neces-

sary that Congress have prior notice and veto power over all proposed foreign weapons sales, regardless of the size of the transaction.

On April 7, 1975, I introduced H.R. 5659 which eliminates the exemption from oversight of all proposed arms sales valued at less than \$25 million. The bill also establishes special procedures for the consideration of resolutions disapproving particular proposed arms sales to insure that Congress has an opportunity to complete action on such resolutions within the 20-day oversight period specified by law. I plan to circulate a Dear Colleague letter later this week to ask for the support of my colleagues on this piece of legislation.

No amount of congressional oversight conducted on a piecemeal basis, however, can effectively replace a set of consistent policies governing the sale of arms to foreign countries which will best serve the foreign policy objectives of the United States and the overall interests of world peace. This type of leadership has been sadly lacking as the administration has greatly expanded authorized arms sales during the past few years. An intensive evaluation of the possible consequences of massive arms sales by the United States to nations throughout the world is long overdue. Congress should seriously consider placing strict limits on additional arms sales until such an evaluation has been completed and fully considered by Congress.

The New York Times of April 14, 1975, contains an excellent article on the scope of our foreign military sales, particularly to nations in the Middle East. The article points out that the munitions industry has profited enormously from the recent increase in military sales. It is not the welfare of the munitions industry, however, which should be of paramount importance to the Ford administration in setting policy in this vital area. I reprint this informative article below for the consideration of my colleagues:

**U.S. ARMS EXPORTS BOOM, PARTICULARLY TO THE MIDEAST; ORDERS, AT RECORD, TOP \$8 BILLION A YEAR—MANUFACTURERS, WHILE DELIGHTED, ARE TROUBLED BY CONGRESSIONAL CRITICISM**

(By Michael C. Jensen)

The worldwide arms buildup, particularly in the Middle East, has brought boom times for United States exporters of arms.

Foreign orders for American-made arms have reached a high of more than \$8-billion a year, and deliveries of weapons to foreign customers are growing at the fastest rate in the nation's history.

Spurred by the feverish arms build-up in the Middle East, the arms boom is being financed in part by huge surpluses of petrodollars.

For some American arms manufacturers, the sale of weapons systems abroad has become one of their most profitable lines of business. For others, it has compensated for the decline in domestic military sales that followed America's disengagement from Vietnam.

Although the surge in business has delighted American manufacturers, it has also caused them some problems:

It has stirred Congressional criticism that exports are getting out of hand and that the United States is stimulating an arms race in the Middle East.

It has renewed charges of a conflict of interest on the part of former military officers who now work for arms contractors.

It has revived the label of war profiteer, which weapons manufacturers wish to avoid. "It's that old 'merchant of death' stigma," said one Defense Department official.

#### GRUMBLING HEARD

Also, some manufacturers are grumbling that they are not getting the cooperation they feel they deserve from the State Department and Defense Department.

Defense experts say that the boom in military sales will continue at least several more years and that a surge in multi-year contracts for future arms sales insures a continuing increase in weapon production in the years ahead.

United States manufacturers of weapons have recently sold antitank missiles to Oman, air defense missiles to Kuwait, jet fighters to Iran and Saudi Arabia and missiles to Israel that are capable of carrying nuclear warheads.

In the fiscal year ended last June 30, overseas customers ordered a record total of \$8.3-billion worth of American-made fighter planes, tanks, missiles and other military equipment and technical assistance. The Pentagon served as a middleman, adding 2 per cent to the price as an administrative charge. Direct sales by manufacturers plus aid provided by the United States Government brought the total of arms orders from foreigners to about \$10-billion.

Of the \$8.3-billion in "foreign military sales" orders, more than \$6.5-billion were placed by Mideast countries—with \$3.8-billion of that from Iran and \$2.1-billion from Israel.

#### MAIN BENEFICIARIES

The increase in foreign orders for American arms has been rapid. Orders in fiscal 1974 totaled more than twice the year-earlier level and about eight times the average level of the late nineteen sixties.

Manufacturers that were the leading beneficiaries of foreign military contracts were such traditional suppliers as the Bell Helicopter Company (a subsidiary of Textron, Inc.), the Northrop Corporation, the McDonnell Douglas Corporation, the General Electric Company, the FMC Corporation and the Raytheon Company.

These six companies, according to the Pentagon, received prime contract awards totaling more than \$2-billion from foreign military customers over the last two fiscal years.

Although scores of United States companies manufacture weapons, a mere handful of them do the bulk of the business. The Defense Department announced in February that 132 technical assistance and training teams were operating in or for 34 foreign countries under "foreign military sales" contracts. An analysis of these contracts indicated that 90 per cent of the dollar volume (about \$650-million of the \$727-million involved) was accounted for by five companies. They were:

Bell Helicopter, with a \$225-million contract for training helicopter pilots and mechanics in Iran and for developing a logistic system.

Raytheon, with a \$32.5-million contract for the use and maintenance of the Hawk missile in Iran.

The Bendix Corporation, with a \$139-million contract to establish a logistic system for the Saudi Arabian army.

Northrop, with a \$146-million contract to train F-5 fighter pilots and mechanics in Saudi Arabia.

The Vinnell Corporation, with a \$76.9-million contract to train Saudi Arabia's national guard.

#### CANDID DISCUSSIONS

Many arms manufacturers are reluctant to discuss their sales to foreigners, fearful

of arousing controversy. However, some of the aerospace companies that are traditionally military-oriented were willing to talk candidly in recent weeks about current trends in their business.

McDonnell Douglas, for example, was clearly pleased by the prospect for foreign sales of its Phantom fighter, one of the mainstays in its line of military and commercial aircraft.

Last year the big aerospace company delivered 24 Phantoms to the United States armed forces. During the same period it delivered more than 100 Phantoms to Iran and Greece.

Over the next two and a half years, McDonnell Douglas expects the growth of sales abroad to accelerate, with an additional 349 Phantoms to be delivered to foreign governments but none to the United States military.

"Those F-4's [sold to foreigners] will be a very large part of our total production," an official of the company said in Washington.

McDonnell Douglas disclosed that, even though its over-all business was down in 1974, exports rose \$292-million to \$1.4-billion. One-third of its exports, it said, were sales to foreign governments.

Bell Helicopter, another major exporter, said that despite a decline in United States military sales, its dollar volume in 1974 increased 25 per cent and its exports rose \$160-million. Especially helpful, Bell said, was a five-year \$700-million contract to supply Iran with helicopters and training and logistic services.

Foreign military sales are engineered through a complex set of procedures and relationships that link the Pentagon, the State Department, the Washington offices of arms manufacturers and a number of associations that serve as a common meeting ground for government and industry representatives.

Indeed, there are so many of these associations that a "Council of Defense and Space Industry Associations" coordinates their activities. Among the most influential of its members are the Aerospace Industries Association of American and the Electronic Industries Association.

Another important organization is the American Defense Preparedness Association, administered by H. A. Miley, Jr., a four-star general who retired two months ago as head of the Army Materiel Command.

"What we do is develop a rapport between the services and industry," General Miley said in an interview.

#### AN IMAGE CAMPAIGN

Although former officers such as General Miley tend to talk without embarrassment about sales of military hardware, many manufacturers' spokesmen are not so forthcoming. The FMC Corporation, for example, objects to being listed as an important arms supplier.

"We don't exactly like being labeled international warmongers," said an FMC spokesman.

Part of the company's current image-making program is a four-color advertisement that shows a worker planting seeds in a rice paddy. The headline of the ad (for an FMC insecticide) says: "Every seed has one precious chance at life."

Documents filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission, however, portray another side of FMC. They disclose what every buyer knows—that in addition to insecticides and food machinery, FMC produces tracked personnel carriers, automatic naval gun mounts and guided missile launching systems.

The documents also show how profitable the sale of such products can be. In 1974 FMC's defense business of \$170.5-million accounted for only 8.5 per cent of the company's sales but contributed 20 per cent of its pretax earnings.

#### VAST EXPORT TRADE

How do foreign arms sales of American companies compare with domestic military sales? In fiscal 1974, the Defense Department spent \$15.2-billion for weapons and other items such as food and uniforms. During the same period, foreign orders for American-made weapons totaled more than \$8-billion.

The United States is by far the world's largest exporter of weapons. According to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the United States was responsible in 1973 (the last full year for which such statistics are available) for 54.4 per cent of the world's arms exports. The Soviet Union was second with 27.5 per cent.

Other countries, such as France and Britain, also sell large quantities of military equipment. Britain, for example, is reported to be negotiating a major arms deal with Libya that could include hundreds of millions of dollars worth of fighters, warships and other military hardware.

In the past, weapons produced by American manufacturers often were given away to allies by the United States Government or were financed with loans guaranteed by the Defense Department or the Export-Import Bank.

Most arms sales today, however, are for cash. In fiscal 1974 the Defense Department made loans of only \$1.4-billion, mostly to Israel. The Export-Import Bank extended credits of \$200-million, all for Iran. Outright gifts of arms amounted to \$789-million, nearly half for Cambodia.

One increasingly controversial aspect of foreign arms sales involves their influence on domestic sales and product development.

Paul Kinsinger, a researcher at the Brookings Institution in Washington, recently chronicled Iran's increasing involvement in American weapon procurement.

A decade ago, he pointed out, Iran purchased the F-5A interceptor, a relatively unsophisticated plane designed by Northrop exclusively for export to less-developed countries.

By 1970 Iran had progressed by buying the up-to-date F-4E, manufactured by McDonnell Douglas.

In 1973 Iran, was allowed to buy the Grumman F-14 fighter, regarded by the Pentagon as the most advanced equipment available.

Last February the Secretary of Defense reported that the United States Navy had agreed to stretch its delivery schedule to give Iran equal priority during the F-14 production run. In effect, this would give Iran delivery of its F-14's before the Navy was fully supplied.

In addition, Mr. Kinsinger said, both Iran and Israel have reportedly expressed interest in buying the Rockwell International Corporation's Condor missiles for their fighters, even though the Defense Department has not yet decided to use the Condor because of its high cost.

#### CRITICS IN CONGRESS

One of the most voluble watchdogs in Congress has been Senator Gaylord Nelson, a Wisconsin Democrat. He recently warned, "The level of United States weapons and training being provided into Iran and Saudi Arabia lead some people to believe that the United States is actually stimulating an arms race in the Persian Gulf."

One concession Congress has wrung out of the Pentagon is the right to veto any pending foreign military sale of more than \$25-million. However, a number of these notifications have been classified, effectively preventing any public debate.

Some of the classified transactions (such as an order for surface-to-surface Lance missiles, sold to Israel by LTV) were later made public.

Others, however, remain classified. It is openly discussed in Capitol Hill that classified deals are now pending on jet fight-

ers for Switzerland and rockets for Iran. The Swiss currently fly fighters made by the French and British.

In one analysis of arms sales abroad, the General Accounting Office, which represents Congressional interests, reported early this year that nearly 500 military technical assistance personnel in Iran had skills that were in "critically short" supply in United States military units.

#### COSTS ARE NOTED

The G.A.O. also said that the Government had failed to recover at least \$10.5-million in administrative costs and \$24.2-million in interest costs on Export-Import Bank loans for foreign arms sales. The bank, it said, made the loans at lower interest rates than it paid for its borrowings, some of which were from the United States Treasury.

Arms manufacturers and their associations are quick to respond that they are maligned and misunderstood.

"Sometimes you get the feeling that the whole world is against you," said Jean A. Caffiaux, a vice president of the Electronic Industries Association.

"The assistance that foreign companies get from their governments is much greater than we get," he said. "Why, the ministers of defense in France and Britain are salesmen for their country's products."

Marshall J. Garret, an official of the Aerospace Industries Association of America, agreed.

"Our buddies up on Capitol Hill have no concept of the hell we have to go through to make a sale," he said. "Probably the least-known fact in the United States is the Government's absolute and utter control of the export of munitions. We have to get a license from Munitions Control of the State Department before we talk to even a friendly country."

Notwithstanding the red tape, the aerospace industry clearly has profited from its military exports. The Defense Department was its biggest customer last year spending more than \$13-billion with aerospace companies. And military exports were up 27 per cent from the year-earlier level.

The aerospace industry's profit margin has improved dramatically from a low in 1971, when earnings after taxes were 1.8 per cent of sales, to 2.4 per cent in 1972, then 2.9 per cent in 1973 and 3.4 per cent in 1974. While the aerospace margin is still well below the average of 6 per cent for all manufacturers, its improvement has been steady.

One subject that arises when foreign military contracts are discussed is kickbacks, which often must be paid by American suppliers to middlemen in the buying country.

Richard R. Violette, director of sales negotiations for the Defense Security Assistance Agency in the Pentagon, testified last summer that "commissions" of up to 10 per cent were required in some commercial foreign arms sales but that larger sales often required payments of only 2 per cent.

"In many countries, corruption is a serious problem," said a Senate aide. "In Lebanon, the size of the kickback is the determining factor in what weapons system is selected."

Company and association officials take a more benign view of such "commissions" or "agents' fees." They dislike them, they say, but find them a necessary part of doing business in many parts of the world.

Although some countries remain more difficult to deal with than others, there has been some attempt to reduce the kickback problem. Shah Mohammed Riza Pahlavi of Iran, for example, has barred all commissions in his country.

Although arms manufacturers are not happy with kickbacks abroad, they are more likely to complain in private about too much United States Government "massaging" of their deals with foreigners.

Leonard A. Alne, who spent five years as

director of the Defense Department's office of military sales and is now a consultant to Northrop, Raytheon and the Westinghouse Electric Corporation, sketched a picture of resentful arms manufacturers entangled in red tape and engulfed by a rising tide of criticism from Congress.

"As far as I'm concerned," he said, "the less 'policy' we have the better. There's a knee-jerk reaction about this business—that it's inherently villainous. But every transaction and every country are different."

**U.S. FOREIGN MILITARY SALES—TOP 10 COUNTRIES IN FISCAL 1974**

[In millions of dollars]

Deliveries	
Israel	\$985
Iran	510
West Germany	417
Saudi Arabia	200
Australia	173
Greece	104
Taiwan	99
Britain	65
Canada	53
Venezuela	26

  

Orders*	
Iran	\$3,800
Israel	2,100
Saudi Arabia	588
Greece	435
West Germany	219
Spain	148
Canada	94
Taiwan	88
Korea	81
Chile	68

\*Some orders cover more than one year.

Source: Department of Defense.

**LEADING U.S. MANUFACTURERS OF ARMS FOR EXPORT<sup>1</sup>**

[Companies are ranked by combined 1973-74 sales]

[Millions of dollars]

Company	Fiscal 1974	Fiscal 1973	Typical product
Textron (mainly Bell Helicopter)	\$60	\$509	Helicopters.
Northrop	221	171	Fighter-bombers.
McDonnell Douglas	120	224	Fighters.
General Electric	169	165	Fighter engines.
FMC	272	27	Armored personnel carriers.
Raytheon	34	191	Missiles and electronics.
Chrysler	220		Battle tanks.
United Aircraft (Sikorsky Helicopter)	126	68	Helicopters.
American Motors	157	13	Jeeps.
Hughes Aircraft	122	12	Missiles.

<sup>1</sup> Defense Department list of companies receiving prime contract awards of \$10,000 or more for "foreign military sales." (Some are multi-year contracts and may be supplied from current Government stocks.)

**NATIONALIZING OF RAILROADS**

**HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have seen the advocates of the "nationalization" of our railroads fire up their engines. To date, I have seen little in the way of convincing arguments for such a course of action. Just the opposite has occurred. The more I hear of nationalization of the entire railroad system in the United States the more it scares me. An excellent article against nationalization appeared recently in

Traffic World. This article was written by the Transportation Association of America and I would like to share it with my colleagues:

**NATIONALIZATION OF RAILROADS: A MISTAKE AMERICA CANNOT AFFORD TO MAKE**

**A \$100 BILLION "PROSPECTUS"**

As an American citizen you are invited to invest about \$500 in a new enterprise.

There will be no dividends; the enterprise is not intended to earn a profit.

But there may well be financial losses; if so, you will be irrevocably committed to help pay them.

Sorry, but once you have invested you may neither sell nor trade—nor even give away—your interest.

You won't have any voice at all in management or operating decisions; they will be made for you, and in your name, by politicians and government bureaucrats.

Great public benefits are forecast for the enterprise. Unfortunately, it's not now possible to predict what they will be, how they will be achieved, or when they will be realized.

If railroad nationalization were a commercial investment proposition, this would, in essence, be the "prospectus" that would have to be presented to the American people.

Unfortunately, however, the laws that require full factual disclosure in investment prospectuses don't apply to political issues. As a result, the hard facts of railroad nationalization proposals are largely ignored in the emotionalistic and often irrational public debate on this critical question.

Nationalizing the U.S. railroad industry would require an initial investment of an estimated \$100 billion or more—or just under \$500 for every man, woman and child in the country. It would place the greatest peacetime strain in history on the nation's financial resources. Without huge tax increases or unprecedented levels of deficit spending—or, very likely, both—it is hard to see how the federal budget could possibly absorb such an enormous outlay.

Furthermore, even its strongest advocates admit that a nationalized railroad system might well be expected to sustain substantial operating losses. Virtually every government-owned and operated enterprise in the country, from public transit systems to the U.S. Postal Service, loses money year after year. The same is true, without exception, of nationalized rail systems in other countries; subsidies in some countries run over \$1.5 billion annually. Such losses could only heighten the already heavy financial pressure on the taxpayer.

Nor would it be possible, as a practical matter, for the nation to de-nationalize its railroads if it later wanted to change its mind. Nationalization is, for all intents and purposes, a one-way street; once the fateful step was taken, neither the managerial strength nor the financial wherewithal to reverse the process would be available in the private sector. For better or worse, America would have only the choice of a nationalized railroad system or no railroad system at all.

Proponents of railroad nationalization admit that the cost would be high. But, they contend, it is a necessary cost. Their arguments generally break down into three parts:

- (1) Our railroad transportation system is "sick," and unable to adequately meet social and economic needs of the nation.
- (2) The "sickness" is the fault of private-enterprise management of the U.S. railroads, and
- (3) Nationalization would cure the existing ills, and thereby bring substantial social and economic benefits to the nation.

This is a very emotionally appealing argument. In a simplistic "good guys/bad guys" fashion it sets forth problem and solution very plainly, one-two-three.

The trouble is that all three points are, at the very least, open to serious question.

So much has been said and written about the "sickness" of the U.S. railroad industry that it is easy to over-estimate the severity of the problems confronting it. There is no question that a number of carriers are experiencing serious financial difficulties; as an industry, the railroads earn appreciably less return on investment than virtually every other type of U.S. business; some important roads in the northeast quadrant—notably the Penn Central—are now bankrupt, while a few others teeter precariously on the verge of insolvency. But this is far from the whole story.

On the positive side, the U.S. railroads comprise the only national rail system in the world to earn any profit at all.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, their industry-wide financial picture—which includes the heavy losses incurred by the Penn Central and other bankrupt roads—is far from representative of the many more prosperous lines, which stack up well financially by any standard. And, despite recent economic downturns, the industry experienced one of its most profitable years of the past decade in 1974.

In sum, while some railroads are certainly facing serious problems, the picture is by no means as unremittingly bleak for the industry as it is sometimes painted.

In the freight transport field, the American rail system is universally acknowledged as the best in the world. Not only is the U.S. railroad service faster and more reliable than the same service in other nations, but American users pay considerably less for it.<sup>2</sup> And the carriers of this nation continue to exert worldwide leadership in railroading; as a rule, railroad innovation—from new operating equipment to advanced management systems—originates in America and is exported abroad to less progressive foreign (and nationalized) systems.

The only area in which superiority is claimed for foreign rail systems is passenger transportation. To a great extent this reflects cultural differences not related to railroading. For example, U.S. travellers prefer air and highway (especially private automobile) transportation for personal reasons, whereas economic and/or geographic conditions elsewhere make these alternatives less appealing to the citizens of other nations. Moreover, although passenger service is the most publicly exposed part of railroading, it is in the United States—as in most other countries—a secondary function of an industry whose main job is movement of the food, fuel and industrial goods needed for the public and economic welfare.

Nor has government takeover done much to enhance rail passenger service in the United States. Not only has the number of passenger trains been cut by about half since the creation of the National Railroad Passenger Corp. (AMTRAK), but even the small amount of remaining service is already requiring \$200 million in annual subsidies.

Thus, while American railroading is far from an unmitigated success, on balance the

[In cents]

U.S. railroads	1.31
Canadian National Railways	1.32
Japanese National Railways	1.66
Netherlands Railways	2.07
Italian State Railways	2.40
French National Railways	2.83
German Federal Railway	2.88
British Railways	3.34

<sup>1</sup> Outside the U.S., only a single one of the world's many railroads has returned a profit in any recent years the Canadian Pacific, the private-enterprise portion of Canada's mixed public/private system and the only non-U.S. privately operated railroad.

<sup>2</sup> Average freight charges per ton-mile were recently found as follows:

industry is far healthier and more productive than its critics seem willing to acknowledge. In the face of this, the blanket condemnation of private-enterprise railroad management in the U.S. as "inept" or worse appears hopelessly out of touch with reality.

A great many diverse factors have played roles in causing the problems that are currently besetting the U.S. railroad industry. Certainly one of these has been an element of managerial misjudgment; railroad management makes no claim to perfection, as could scarcely be expected in an industry where many different individuals, of many different levels of competence, are employed. But the simplistic scapegoatism of placing all the blame for every problem on management's shoulders serves more to camouflage the true causes than to point toward a solution.

The bankruptcy of the mammoth Penn Central affords a fine example of the fallacy of this approach. There is little question that managerial failures had a good deal to do with this disaster. But so, too, did government-imposed conditions on the Pennsylvania-New York Central merger that created the Penn Central. So did industry-wide labor work rules. So did restrictive regulatory policies of federal and state governments. So did changed economic conditions such as competitive inroads by motor carriers, major shifts in manufacturing activity away from the regions served by the Penn Central and a similar shift in coal production. It may be emotionally satisfying to single out just one of these factors for blame, but it is no substitute for serious, reasoned analysis.

In addition, it must be acknowledged that U.S. railroad management, whatever may be its failings, has overseen development of the best railroad system in the world. If management is to be held responsible for the industry's problems, it can hardly be denied credit for its successes, as well. On this basis, simple logic indicates that railroad management in the United States is at least equal to, if not better than, railroad management elsewhere in the world.

Seen in this light, the proposed 'answer' of railroad nationalization appears much less attractive. Not only is it based on a greatly exaggerated view of the industry's problems and an oversimplified and misleading identification of the cause of those problems, but there is also strong evidence that, instead of helping solve U.S. railroad problems, nationalization might very well make them worse.

Nationalization of industry has been tried many times in many different places throughout history. Mostly, the results have been extremely poor. Even governments dedicated to communist or socialist philosophies have often been forced, for practical reasons, to denationalize large sectors of their economies; they found the goals nationalization was intended to achieve just weren't being adequately realized.

Railroad nationalization, say its advocates, would improve railroad service in the United States. It would encourage improved productivity in the industry. It would help bring about reduced rates.

The experience of England—which nationalized its railroad system in 1949—indicates just the opposite, however. In 1964 a British national opinion poll, based on comments of more than 2,500 randomly selected Englishmen and women, found over half of those questioned believed nationalization of their railroad system had achieved none of these goals.

Instead, they found (by a two-thirds majority or better) that nationalization produces "too much bureaucracy and red tape"; that workers in a nationalized enterprise "don't work so hard"; that nationalization "wastes public money," and—perhaps most significant of all—that instead of reducing

rates, nationalization actually had increased them.<sup>2</sup>

The British poll, reflecting more than 15 years of that nation's actual experience with nationalization in several industries, including railroading, also produced these findings:

Some two-thirds of those questioned, asked to compare free enterprise with nationalization, found free enterprise "most efficient." Only 18.9 percent said nationalization was most efficient.

62 percent said free-enterprise economy was most conducive to lower operating costs and lower rates and charges; only 18.4 percent found nationalization better in this respect.

The fairest type of economy for the worker, said 56.4 percent, is a free-enterprise economy; nationalization was found fairest by only 28.8 percent.

Overall, the best type of economy for the country is free enterprise, according to 64.1 percent of those polled. Just 20 percent found nationalization to be best for the country.

Such heavy majorities, from a nation which has had some years of experience with substantial economic nationalization, cannot be dismissed lightly. If those who have tried this course of action so strongly believe it has worked out badly, it would be foolhardy for America to rush headlong down the same path without the most careful exploration of every alternative.

The American railroad system undeniably has some very serious problem before it. But those problems require specific and direct solutions, not the shotgun approach of nationalization—especially when that approach has been demonstrated ineffective in comparable situations abroad.

If the goal is to improve, and not further damage, the U.S. railroad industry, nationalization is a mistake America can't afford to make.

#### A RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH BOSTON LITHUANIAN CITIZENS CLUB

### HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues, a resolution which was formulated at a convention of South Boston Lithuanian citizens upon the 57th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the Lithuanian state. I want the Lithuanian people and all Americans of Lithuanian descent to know that I stand behind their efforts to regain the status of an independent state. In fact, I am a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 165 which expresses the sense of the Congress "that the U.S. delegation to the European Security Conference should not agree to the recognition by the Soviet Union's annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and it should remain the policy of the United States not to recognize in any way the annexation of the Baltic nations by the Soviet Union."

The resolution of the South Boston Lithuanian Citizens Club is as follows:

#### RESOLUTION

We, the Lithuanian Americans of Greater Boston, assembled this 16th day of Feb-

<sup>2</sup> "Aims of Industry" poll commissioned by the British National Opinion Polls, Ltd.

ruary, 1975, at the South Boston Lithuanian Citizens Club to commemorate the restoration of Lithuania's independence, do hereby state as follows:

That February 16, 1975, marks the 57th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the more than 700 year old Lithuanian State, which was won and protected by the blood sacrifice of the Lithuanian people during the wars of independence of 1919-1920, and recognized by the international community of States;

That the Republic of Lithuania was forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940, in violation of all the existing treaties and the principles of international law;

That subjection of peoples to alien domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of the right to self-determination and the other fundamental human rights; is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation;

That so many countries under foreign colonial domination have been given the opportunity to establish their own independent states; while Lithuania having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries is now subjugated to the most brutal Russian oppression and is nothing but a colony of the Soviet empire;

That though the Soviet Union, through programs of resettlement of peoples, intensified russification, suppression of religious freedom and political persecutions, continues in its efforts to change the ethnic character of the population of Lithuania, the Soviet invaders are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and the exercise of their human rights.

Now, therefore, be it resolved:

That we demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military forces, administrative apparatus and the imported Russian colonists from Lithuania and allow the Lithuanian people to govern themselves freely;

That we demand immediate release of all Lithuanians who are imprisoned for political and religious reasons and who for years are lingering in various Soviet jails and concentration camps;

That in expressing our gratitude to the United States Government for its firm position of non-recognition of the Soviet occupation and annexation of Lithuania, we request an activation of the non-recognition principle by stressing at every opportunity the denial of freedom and national independence to Lithuania and the other Baltic countries;

That the Soviet Union, in seeking a policy of detente with the United States, shall be requested to demonstrate its good faith and good will by restoring freedom and national independence to Lithuania and the other Baltic States;

That we are asking Senators and Members of Congress of the United States for their support of our requests;

That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the United States Senators and Congressmen from our State, and the news media.

#### INFLATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT: THE COMMUNIST PARTY'S NEW DRIVE—PART I

### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, with its customary opportunism, the Communist Party, U.S.A.—

CPUSA—has seized upon the present eco-organize for revolutionary Socialist changes in our Government and economic system.

The Communist Party's drive is twofold: First, a mass organizing campaign implemented through CPUSA's apparatus for penetration of trade unions, the National Coordinating Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy—NCCTUAD or TUAD; and second, a legislative campaign in Congress to implement bills furthering Marxist goals.

First, let us consider the mass organizing campaign.

The mass organizing effort became public with the convening of a September 14, 1974, "Emergency Trade Union Conference To Fight Inflation" by TUAD in Chicago. The keynote speaker who outlined the CPUSA economic policy at the conference was Fred Gaboury, TUAD field organizer and CPUSA's Midwest trade union secretary.

The TUAD "Emergency Trade Union Conference to Fight Inflation" proposed a program for congressional economic action including slashing the military budget; price control of "food, rents and utilities"—a line to attract consumers; "public works to provide full employment with jobs at union rates of pay"; and "free, comprehensive health care for all."

The TUAD conference promulgated a call for mass demonstrations on November 16, 1974, as a "first step" in implementing this program. Of the 17 persons who signed the call for the November 16 demonstrations, 9 are either identified members of the Communist Party or editors of its official publications, while most of the additional 8 have extensive records of activity with multiple CPUSA fronts and causes.

The first group includes:

Ernest DeMaio, CPUSA, then vice-president of the United Electrical Workers and now U.N. representative of the Soviet controlled World Federation of Trade Unions.

Peter Orris, CPUSA, member of the executive committee of the Medical Committee for Human Rights.

Jack Spiegel, CPUSA, Midwest Organizer, Shoe Workers Union.

Angela Davis, CPUSA, and "co-chairperson," National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression—NAARPR.

Bert Corona, CPUSA, general secretary of CASA Hermandad.

Dr. Carlton Goodlett, CPUSA, publisher, Sun Reporter.

George Murphy [George B. Murphy, Jr.], CPUSA, Baltimore Afro-American.

Jim Williams, coeditor of Labor Today, the CPUSA's trade union publication, described by CPUSA's Gus Hall as "the TUAD organ."

John Kailin, coeditor, Labor Today.

Other sponsors included Jane Benedict, director of the Metropolitan Council on Housing, a CPUSA-dominated tenant organizing group. Mrs. Benedict has served in executive roles in CPUSA-dominated unions, fronts, and causes for some 35 years. She was the principal active organizer of the New York branch of the CPUSA's anti-inflation movement which eventually took the name New York Coalition to Fight Inflation and Unemploy-

ment, and was a leader in organizing the National Coalition to Fight Inflation and Unemployment—NCFIU.

Other signers included Carl Farris, labor secretary of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference—SCLC—and TUAD activist; Clyde Bellancourt, director of the American Indian Movement—AIM—and functionary of the CPUSA's NAARPR; Fr. William E. Hogan, of Chicago's Alliance to End Repression, a part of NAARPR; Illinois State Representative Peggy Martin, a founding sponsor of NAARPR; Alan Weaver, executive board, Local 1693, American Federation of Teachers; Rosella Bailey, president, King City unit, Elder Citizens of Washington State; and Elmer A. Benson, former governor of Minnesota.

The TUAD meeting also approved a call for an "anti-inflation demonstration in Washington, D.C. in March, 1975." As those who read the various trade union and CPUSA publications are aware, the mass march on Washington has been rescheduled for April 26, 1975.

The CPUSA newspaper, Daily World, then took up the call for mass demonstrations, stating:

The idea of mass action has won wide acceptance . . . People's lobbies, rallies and marches in Washington have been suggested. Representative John Conyers (D-Mich.) in a speech in Detroit some time ago suggested the launching in Washington of a People's Lobby on Inflation. A proposal for a major march in Washington after the election is being widely discussed [within Communist Party circles]. This can become a focus for all other efforts \* \* \*.

Additional evidence for CPUSA origin and control of the various "Coalitions to Fight Inflation and Unemployment," as the movement is generally known, may be seen in the report to the Central Committee by Daniel Rubin, formerly CPUSA's organizational secretary who is now assigned as secretary of the CPUSA Anti-Inflation Commission, responsible for developing the strategy of the national campaign.

In his report to the December 7-9, 1974 CPUSA Central Committee meeting, Rubin stated that the party's aim had first been to focus the "rising tide of struggle" on "the organization of the simultaneous protest actions held in 39 cities on November 16."

Rubin further praised the CPUSA's organizing effort to develop a new united front by involving "progressive", that is, pro Socialist forces. He boasted that—

The coalitions are of a very broad character, involving a significant sector of labor and the Black community as well as nearly all other sections of the anti-monopoly forces.

Rubin claimed for CPUSA the lead role in "stimulating this movement," but left it to other CPUSA leaders like Gus Hall to detail that the "significant sector of labor" was derived mainly through CPUSA's own TUAD organization, and that the representatives of the "black community" came from groups already sympathetic to the Communist Party's brand of socialism.

Following the successes of the November 16 demonstrations, a follow-up

conference of the TUAD-derived coalitions was held in Chicago on December 16 at which the National Coalition to Fight Inflation and Unemployment—NCFIU—was set up.

The Communist Party has marshaled virtually all its existing fronts into the economic campaign. These range from the NAARPR through the Chicago Peace Council and surviving chapters of the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice to the Emma Lazarus Jewish Women's Clubs and the Young Workers Liberation League—YWLL—which for its part, according to its new chairman, James Steele, is "helping to build youth support for the Hawkins full employment bill and formulating proposals to strengthen it."

Steele also pointed out to a March meeting of the YWLL central committee that the group was attempting to organize unemployed youth saying:

Their unity with workers on the job, however insecure, is the foundation of mass youth unity.

He also said:

YWLL's Youth Rights program is the vehicle to unite and carry the entire young generation to a higher ground [toward communism]. Steele reported that as part of the youth rights campaign and as an adjunct to the NCFIU program, "Youth United for Jobs and similar organizations have been built in several cities. Youth employment bills have been submitted in three states.

The chairman of the Communist Party's youth group also outlined YWLL activities "in unity with broader forces to militantly honor Dr. Martin Luther King on April 4, the first international day of solidarity with U.S. youth fighting racism." The international day of solidarity on Dr. King's birthday was declared by the Soviet-controlled youth organization, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, of which YWLL is the U.S. affiliate.

The YWLL sponsored marches and demonstrations duly took place in New York, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia and other cities, supported by such organizations as Operation PUSH, local NCFIU branches, NAARPR, National Welfare Rights Organization, the Coalition of Labor Union Women—CLUW—the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists—CBTU—and the National Student Committee Against Racism—NSCAR.

In the New York City demonstration, YWLL supported the action both directly under its own name, and via its new fronts, West Side Youth United for Jobs and Park Slope Youth United for Jobs, which are merely offshoots of the West Side YWLL branch and the Park Slope YWLL.

In fact, in many cases, the local affiliates of the National Coalition to Fight Inflation and Unemployment are attached to local branches and clubs of the CPUSA.

The National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression has proved invaluable to the CPUSA in bringing elements of the civil rights movement and prison movement into the NCFIU campaign.

In particular, Operation PUSH—People United to Save Humanity—has assisted in linking alleged racial discrimi-

nation with job layoffs. Operation PUSH has also assisted in the effort to attract more Negroes into the new united front by associating the name of the late Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. with the various local NCFIU/PUSH rallies in mid-January and the first week of April marking the anniversaries of the birth and death of Rev. Dr. King.

The founder and leader of Operation PUSH, Rev. Jesse L. Jackson, a former associate of Reverend King in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference—SCLC, has previously supported organizations dominated by the Communist Party including the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice, the New Mobilization Committee and the Chicago Peace Council.

In the context of the unemployment campaign, it is of interest to note that some three years ago, Political Affairs, the theoretical journal of the CPUSA, delightedly quoted Rev. Jackson as saying:

We are going to talk not just about jobs, but we are going to talk about capitalism itself. For a long time people did not talk about capitalism because of McCarthyism. People have been afraid of using the word because the alternative is supposed to be communism. Whether or not that is the alternative, capitalism is a bad system.

Since December, the new Communist Party front, NCFIU, has been the motivating force in various building actions, rallies and demonstrations in preparation for its long planned April 26 march on Washington.

In addition to the January and April Martin Luther King events, these included a January 29 march in Washington by the CPUSA-controlled Distributive Workers of America, supporting a February 5 rally in Washington sponsored by the United Auto Workers—UAW, and holding a March 1 legislative conference also in Washington directly sponsored by NCFIU.

The president of district 65, Distributive Workers of America, is David Livingston, an identified CPUSA member. Livingston led the January 29 demonstration on the west steps of the Capitol. The Daily World reported,

His voice rising in anger, Livingston denounced President Ford's request for aid to Southeast Asia.

Livingston's preference for socialism was apparent at an Emergency Conference on Economic Alternatives held in the caucus room of the Cannon House Office Building in November, just before the November 16 demonstrations. He said:

I do not believe, and the membership of my union does not believe, that there is any solution to the problems of energy that does not begin with nationalization of the oil companies in the U.S.

To loud applause, Livingston said:

Let the American people eat, let them be warm, and let them work.

A statement more suitable for enumerating the rights of draft horses than for the liberty-loving American people.

While NCFIU and its affiliates began organizing for a mass march on April 26 early in the year, on February 21, rep-

resentatives from the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees—AFSCME; the International Union of Electrical Workers; Communications Workers of America; the CPUSA-controlled District 65, DWA, and District 1199, Hospital and Health Care Employees; and other unions met in New York to plan an "independent" march on Washington "to demand Government action on mounting unemployment."

The date originally chosen for this independent action was April 29, and was announced by Victor Gotbaum, executive director of District 37, AFSCME. A member of the Marxist Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee—DSOC—which works within the left-wing of the Democratic Party, Mr. Gotbaum claims he is not a socialist.

In response to the date variation, the Daily World interviewed an NCFIU representative who "said the organization expects the two groups to get together and work out a common date." To no one's surprise, the date decided was NCFIU's original April 26.

During this period, Trade Unionists for Action and Democracy and NCFIU kept up a pressure campaign via rank and file groups on the leadership of many unions and the AFL-CIO to participate in the "March for Jobs or Income Now."

On March 20, the Industrial Union Department—IUD—of the AFL-CIO announced it had changed the date of its march in Washington from April 19 to 26.

AFL-CIO's IUD comprises some of the largest and most powerful unions within the AFL-CIO including AFSCME; the United Steelworkers which absorbed the CPUSA-dominated Mine-Mill and Smelter Workers in 1967 and in which the CPUSA reports it is playing an active part in organizing rank and file movements; the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and the International Association of Machinists.

At this point, plans for the rally are snowballing. With so many responsible union leaders supporting the action on the 26th, large numbers of rank and file members are expected to participate. AFSCME and NCFIU report they have reserved some 460 buses and four trains. By the first week of April over 20,000 tickets had been sold. The organizers predict as many as 100,000 participants.

NCFIU and its allies will hold a separate march from the Capitol to Kennedy Stadium starting at 11 a.m. A united rally is scheduled for 1 p.m.

Recent literature from NCFIU indicates a new ploy to avoid identification of the march as CPUSA inspired. Although NCFIU was the first to call for the April 26 action, its leaflets now read "Industrial Union Department—AFL-CIO—Calls March on Washington, April 26th, 1975, For Jobs or Income Now!" NCFIU's program now calls for:

#### NCFIU PROGRAM

##### EMERGENCY SESSION OF CONGRESS

Set Aside All Other Business.

Provide Food Free from Federal Stocks for those in Need.

Stop Evictions, Repossessions, Utility Shut-Offs and Health Care Plan Cut-Offs.

Extend Unemployment Benefits for Duration of Joblessness to All, including 1st Job Seekers at 75% of Wages.

Immediate Public Works and Service Jobs for Millions of Unemployed and Crash Summer Jobs Program for 3 Million Youth, at Union Wages.

#### JOBS OR INCOME

30 Hour Week With No Reduction in Pay. Pass A Strengthened Hawkins Full Employment Bill (H.R. 50).

Keep Scheduled Cost-of-Living Increases In Social Security Benefits and Raise.

Supplementary Security Income. Expand Trade To Create Jobs and End Cold War Trade Restrictions.

#### ROLL BACK AND FREEZE PRICES OF NECESSITIES

Sharply Reduce and Eliminate Taxes for Lower And Middle-Income People.

#### CHANGE PRIORITIES NOW

Slash The Military Budget! No More Military Funds For Cambodia, South Vietnam Or Other Corrupt Dictatorships! Use The Money For Social Needs!

Close Tax Loopholes of the Super-Rich and Corporations.

Pass A Strong Health Security Bill To Assure All Adequate Health Care.

Massive Aid to Cities and Other Areas for Housing, Schools, Hospitals, Mass Transit, Day Care, etc.

Mr. Speaker, NCFIU's current list of sponsors follows:

#### LIST OF SPONSORS

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only.)

#### PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, Member of Congress.

Mayor Richard Hatcher, Gary, Indiana.

Percy Sutton, Manhattan Borough President.

James Ferlo, Pittsburgh Model Cities Commissioner.

Frank Barbaro, New York State Assemblyman.

George A. Cincotta, New York State Assemblyman.

Miriam Friedlander, Member of New York City Council.

Howard L. Lasker, New York State Assemblyman.

Edward L. Sadowsky, Member of New York City Council.

Jean Bellefeuille, Exec. Dir. Mobile Home Owners & Tenants Assn, Epping NE.

Jane Benedict, Chrsn, NY Metropolitan Council on Housing.

Thais Blatnik, W. Liberty College Campus Ministry, Triadelphia, W. Va.

Anne Braden, So. Institute for Propaganda & Organizing, Louisville.

Thomas J. Brown, Pres. Serv. Empl. Int'l Union, Local 557, Louisville.

Rev. Frank Buismato, OFM, Ctr. for Peace & Social Justice, S.F., Cal.

Harvey Brenner, Pres. United Auto Wkrs, Local 808, Los Angeles.

Bill Chandler, Tx. Dir., United Farm Wkrs. of America, AFL-CIO.

Noam Chomsky, Professor, Mass. Institute of Technology.

Minona J. Clinton, Human Resources Dev. Inst., AFL-CIO, Pittsburgh.

John Dauer, United Farm Workers, San Antonio, Texas.

Gertrude Decker, Pres. BKlyn. Council Emma Lazarus Jewish Women's Clubs.

Katherine DeShaw, Coordinator, Duluth Community Health Center.

Jim Douglas, Staff Att'y, Organizaciones Unidas/Tx. Valley Legal Proj.

Henry Fellsone, War Tax Resistance, NYC.

William Ferguson, Steward, AFSCME Local 171, Madison Wisconsin.

Lucy Fried, Coordinator, Coalition for Economic Survival, Los Angeles.



Rev. Franklin D. Graham, Prog. Dir., NYC Council of Churches.

Edward Greer, Assoc. Prof. of Political Science, Hampshire Coll., Amherst.

Wib Gulley, Dir., N.C. Public Interest Res. Group, Durham, N.C.

Craig Hart, Dir, Westside Action Center, Denver, Colorado.

Donald L. Harvey, Cayuga Co. Action Program, Auburn, NY.

Marii Hasegawa, Pres. Womens Int'l League for Peace & Freedom.

Wayne Holley, Comm. for Economic Survival, Utah.

Bob Hollowwa, Past Pres. Molders & Allied Wrks. Union, Lcl. 374, L.A.

Daniel J. Kane, ACA-IBT, Local 111, NYC.

Earl W. Keihl, Sr. Int'l Rep., United Furniture Workers, York, Pa.

Fanny Klein, Council of Senior Citizens, Bronx, NY.

Dr. Ralph Knopf, People's Mandate, Bronx, NY.

Sylvia Kushner, Exec. Secy., Chicago Peace Council.

Dan Leahy, Dir., Human Affairs Program, Ithaca, NY.

Regis Arthur Lemaire, Grosvenor Neighborhood House, NYC.

Carolyn F. Lobban, Dept. of Anthropology, R.I. College, Providence.

Rodger McAfee, Comm. for Economic Survival, Raisin City, Cal.

Russell McKnight, Pres. Humanist Assn. of Los Angeles.

Larry Myers, Boilermakers Local 104, Seattle.

David L. Yorgar, 1st V.P., Iowa Federation of Teachers.

Shirley Nelson, Fellowship for Social Justice, San Gabriel, Cal.

Howard L. Parsons, Prof. Dept. of Philosophy, Univ. of Bridgeport, Conn.

Sam Pevzner, Exec. Dir. Jewish Cultural Clubs.

Arline Prigoff, Radical Alliance of Social Service Workers, NY.

Sarah Richio, Neighborhood Council to Combat Poverty, NYC.

Ramona Ripston, Exec. Dir., ACLU of So. Calif.

Daniel Rubin, Chrsn., Comm. on Unemployment & Inflation, Communist Party.

Gedalia Sandler, Gen. Secy. Jewish Cultural Clubs.

David Selden, Education Policy Consultant, Alexandria, Va.

Sr. Gretchen Shaffer, Catholic Community Services, Wheeling, W. Va.

Norman Silberman, Rockaway Democratic Coalition, NYC.

Helen Smart, Treasurer, Humanist Assn. of Los Angeles.

Nathan Solomon, People's Party, NY.

Charlotte B. Spangler, Exec. Dir., YWCA of Brooklyn, NY.

Dirk J. Struik, Professor, Belmont, Mass.

Harrison Tabor, Pres. Serv. Empl. Int'l Union, Local 110, Fresno.

Theodore Taylor, Exec. Dir. Day Care & Child Dev. Council of America.

Randy Tufts, Tucson Public Power.

Dr. Willard Uphaus, Exec. Dir. Emeritus, World Fellowship, Inc.

Connie Redbird Uri, MD, Indian Women United for Social Justice, Cal.

Sidney A. von Luther, Pres. Nat'l Coalition to Fight Inflation & Unemployment.

Fr. Ronald Voss, Center for Peace & Life Studies, Indiana.

Fr. F. B. Williams, Chapel of the Intercession, NYC.

Georgetta Williams, Neighborhood Board No. 1, NYC.

Jim Williams, Co-Editor, *Labor Today*.

Sunny Wise, Vice Pres., National Student Association.

E. Victor & Judith F. Wolfenstein, Professors, UCLA.

FRESNO, CALIF., RESOLUTION ON ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, passage last week of House Joint Resolution 148 marked the first official step toward designating April 24, 1975, as a "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man." As many of my colleagues know, this designation is prompted by the recollection of the 1915 genocide which the Armenian people endured at the hands of the Turkish nation. If an observance of this nature is to be a truly meaningful testament to the occurrence of this past atrocity and an instructive lesson in hopefully preventing future ones, the words must be accompanied by action.

I am proud to report that the city of Fresno in my congressional district is doing just that. In calling this fact to the attention of other Members, I am pleased to include at this point in the Record the text of a proclamation issued by Mayor Ted C. Wills of Fresno, Calif., officially designating the week of April 20, 1975, as "Armenian Heritage Week."

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, a significant segment of the population of the San Joaquin Valley is composed of the Armenian people who have contributed to the progress and betterment of life through agriculture, commerce, teaching, the professions, churches, and community organizations; and

Whereas, the Armenians among us are a remnant people of a nation against whom the first genocide of the 20th century was made, beginning on April 24, 1915, when a million and a half of them, comprising half the total of Armenians living during the Ottoman Empire, were annihilated by the Turkish government through a series of well-planned and secretly instituted atrocities, including the murder of the menfolk and the forced marches into the deserts of the women and children, where their ranks were decimated by hunger, lack of water and shelter; and

Whereas, by their own resolute Christian faith and will to survive and live again, and the generosity of many in the United States of America resulting in relief operations, a fraction of them were rescued and subsequently immigrated to this country and now comprise several hundred thousand in number; and

Whereas, their contribution to the building of America is evident by their leadership in the fields of education, science, medicine, the arts and government; and

Whereas, the Armenian community is an integral and important member of this multi-ethnic city and desires to help create and promote a greater appreciation for each culture; and

Whereas, we join the Armenians on this, the 60th Anniversary of this genocide, to affirm our conviction that genocide in whatever form and against whomever it is perpetrated, is rejected and condemned by us and all peace-loving and justice-seeking people of the world;

Now, therefore, I, Ted C. Wills, Mayor of the City of Fresno, do hereby proclaim the week of April 20-26, 1975, as Armenian Heritage Week and Thursday, April 24th as "Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man," and urge all the citizens of Fresno to render proper recognition to this solemn oc-

casion and commemoration of the 60th Anniversary of the martyrdom of the Armenian people, and to participate in the activities of Armenian Heritage week.

THE MAKERS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to your attention the accomplishments of a talented young constituent of mine, Miss Margaret S. Blakey of York, Pa.

In a recent essay contest sponsored annually by the American Legion for high school students, Miss Blakey submitted the winning essay. Since we will soon be celebrating the 200th anniversary of our country, her remarks in her essay entitled "The Makers of American Democracy" are indeed timely. I would now like to share Miss Blakey's thoughts on this subject, for I believe that her views are original and expressive.

The essay follows:

THE MAKERS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

In 1776 when Great Britain's thirteen American colonies banded together and proclaimed that from that day forward they would exist as an independent nation, free of all ties with Great Britain, the rest of the world laughed. They thought that the United States of America was a lofty name for a group of pompous colonists, and "democracy," the proposed form of government, a preposterous, slightly ridiculous idea that could never possibly succeed.

Time have proved them wrong, for in the 200 years that have passed since the colonies declared their independence, the United States has not only survived but has risen to become the wealthiest, most industrialized, most powerful nation in the world. As the country nears its Bicentennial Anniversary, it seems only natural that many Americans will pause to reflect on our history to determine just what has enabled us to become the nation we are today and who has played a role in forming and shaping our government in making American democracy.

The Founding Fathers of America are generally considered to be those men who were primarily responsible for drafting the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and other important documents of the day. They were the backbone of the American Revolution, and through them came the philosophies that guided the colonists in their struggle to throw off the yoke of Great Britain's rule. While their contributions to the shaping of the United States' democratic government are invaluable, it is necessary to realize that democracy did not start with the Founding Fathers. Many of the basic tenets of this philosophy began hundreds of years before, and the Founding Fathers were the receptacle for a wealth of ideas that had arisen before; they gathered the many scattered principles of democracy and molded them together with unique ideas of their own into a workable philosophy that became the foundation of American government.

Democracy actually began in Greece more than 2000 years ago. In 600 B.C. the Greeks stated their concept that every citizen should take an active part in government. All the male citizens met in a general assembly and voted on issues concerning the community. They elected officials to make laws and determine policy, and they had a judicial system

to see that the law was administered properly.<sup>2</sup>

Several other cultures also influenced democracy in the United States. Cicero, the ancient Roman philosopher, believed that every person has some basic rights and that political power comes from the consent of the people.<sup>3</sup> Both of these principles are an integral part of our current political philosophy. The Declaration of Independence mirrors a basic Christian belief that all men are equal before God. In the years following the Revolutionary War several French writers influenced American thinking. Montesquieu believed in the separation of executive, legislative, and judicial powers; Voltaire professed that no government had the right to invade on the rights and freedoms of the individual; and Rousseau said that the only rightful rulers are those chosen freely by the people.<sup>4</sup>

English principles have always been important, being perhaps the greatest of all foreign influences on American democracy. In 1215 when King John approved the Magna Carta, he established provisions to protect the citizens against unlawful arrest, taxation without representation, and unfair trials by guaranteeing the right of a trial by jury. Other English writers of the Revolutionary period—Coke, Sidney, Harrington, Hobbes, and Locke—were important in the shaping of the American Constitution. From these writers came the basic outline of our judicial system and the two-party political system. Locke was probably the most influential of the English writers; he believed that the purpose of government was to protect the lives, liberties, and rights of the people. With Locke originated the Social Contract Theory, which embodies the idea that the state arose as a voluntary act of free men, that it exists to serve the will of the people who are the only source of political power, and that they may distribute that power as they see fit.<sup>5</sup>

The American colonists were aware of these principles, and they used them extensively. Thomas Jefferson, the principal writer of the Declaration of Independence, used Locke's Social Contract Theory as the justification for the American Revolution, arguing that the King and his ministers had violated the Contract. Samuel Adams was quoting Locke when he said that all men had a natural right to change a bad constitution for a better one whenever they have it in their power to do so.<sup>6</sup>

The Founding Fathers leaned heavily on the experiences of the colonists in the New World when writing the Constitution that was to frame the government of the United States. The idea of constitutional government, that is having a constitution that expressly states the powers of the government and the rights of the individual, was one that had been established in America many years before the Revolution. John Adams wrote the Massachusetts constitution in 1780, and John Jay wrote the New York constitution in 1777; these constitutions served as models in the planning of the new national government. Adams, like Montesquieu, argued strongly for a limited government with a balance of power between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government.

The Founding Fathers were pragmatic; they learned from their past mistakes. Benjamin Franklin remembered the failure of his Albany Plan of Union in 1754, and George Washington knew from his experiences during the Revolution the problem of trying to deal with a weak legislature. They both took steps to prevent these problems from occurring in the new government of the United States.<sup>7</sup>

James Madison is a name that is synonymous with democracy. For his tireless efforts of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, he

earned himself the title "Father of the Constitution." Madison kept records of this historical assembly, later publishing them; but Americans mostly remember him for his ability to work out a compromise between differing factions when a middle ground seemed impossible.

Most state constitutions adopted during the Revolution contained a clear declaration of the rights of all persons. The man responsible for the first American bill of rights was George Mason. He wrote the Virginia Declaration of Rights of 1776. James Madison followed Mason's example when he proposed the first ten amendments to the Constitution, which became known as the Bill of Rights.<sup>8</sup>

The myriad of foreign influences coupled with native ideas has produced a doctrine of democracy that is distinctly American. Although some of the principles are directly traceable to a specific origin, most have intermingled; and it has become difficult to distinguish which thought came from exactly which origin. We have taken the most useful sections from several different political doctrines and combined them in the way most suitable to our needs. The result has been a philosophy that bears similarities to many others and at the same time remains uniquely different.

"Democracy like all other words, ideas, or institutions of men has a history and that history is not static but dynamic."<sup>9</sup> Just as democracy did not start with the Founding Fathers, it did not end with them either. There is continuous change as we strive to attain the democratic ideals of equality for all men in the sense of equal opportunity for all and the right of each man to pursue with absolute freedom his own interests so long as he does not infringe upon the rights of others. These are the goals we are working for and, if realized, would signify that we had reached a perfect democracy. Every American should be concerned with moving closer to these ideals, for the quality of democracy depends on the quality of participation; democracy needs people to make it work. As the Founding Fathers and all those who went before them are responsible for making the democracy we have now, so do we, in turn, have the opportunity as citizens of the United States today to be the "Makers of American Democracy" for tomorrow. This is the challenge presented to our generation, and the way in which we meet that challenge will determine our future.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>2</sup> Donald Kagan, "Ancient Greece," *The World Book Encyclopedia* (1972), VIII, pp. 364-5.

<sup>3</sup> Leland P. Baldwin, *Best Hope of Earth: A Grammar of Democracy* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1948), p. 63.

<sup>4</sup> Raymond G. Gettell, *History of American Political Thought*. (New York: The Century Co., 1928), p. 22.

<sup>5</sup> Gettell, p. 21.

<sup>6</sup> Baldwin, p. 63.

<sup>7</sup> Clinton Rossiter, "United States Constitution," *The World Book Encyclopedia* (1972), XX, pp. 126-30.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Stuart Brown, ed., *We Hold These Truths* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941), p. 1.

#### LEE HAMILTON'S WASHINGTON REPORT, "THE NATIONAL DEBT"

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include my Washington Report, "The National Debt":

#### THE NATIONAL DEBT

In my discussion of the economy it will usually not be long before someone brings up the size of the national debt. People are concerned about its enormity, and they want to know how long we can continue to add to it, when we are going to pay it off, and what its effects are on the economy.

Although most of us place the problem of our \$540 billion national debt near the top of our list of problems, economic experts, strangely enough, just don't seem to get as worried about the size of the national debt as they do about achieving economic growth, high levels of production and employment, or reasonable price stability.

There is little doubt that the federal debt is huge. The question is has it gotten too big? Federal debt has been shrinking as a portion of total output and total debt, and, to the surprise of most of us, the federal government has borrowed more conservatively than the rest of the economy. The 1954 total debt of \$271 billion amounted to 75% of the gross national product (GNP), while today's \$540 billion debt represents only about 38% of our current one-and-one-half trillion dollar GNP. While federal debt has grown by 45% since 1950, private debt has increased by 800%, and the federal debt, as compared with total wealth, is much smaller than it was 20 years ago. The critical test for determining if the federal debt is too large is confidence on the part of the lender that the government will be able to repay the debt. The federal government pays the lowest rate of interest of any borrower in the economy. This is certain evidence that hard-headed lenders, such as banks and insurance companies, consider the federal government to be the best of all credit risks. So the upper limit of federal debt is established by the willingness and ability of the American people to support their government.

Nevertheless, we are still uncomfortable knowing that our government seems to make no effort to pay back what it has borrowed. We look at the national debt as a heavy burden we are selfishly passing on to our children. But the chief way we can burden them is to use up the nation's stock of capital goods so that the nation will be less productive in the future. If we pass on an internal debt (that is, a debt owed by a government to its own citizens) there are some distributional effects among people (for example, interest payments go from all the people to a few people who hold the government securities). If, however, the debt is external (owed, that is, to foreigners) there is a net reduction in the goods and services available to Americans.

The toughest question about the effects of federal deficits is whether they cause inflation. Traditional economic thought holds that federal budget deficits do cause inflation, but modern economics finds it is not an easy question to answer. For one thing, there is no systematic relationship between a budget deficit and inflation—a deficit of a given size may be inflationary in one year and not in another. In the past we have had inflation along with a budget surplus and falling prices along with a budget deficit. If the economy is sagging badly, as it is today, a deficit, and the economic stimulation it implies, can be healthy for the economy. The alternative is to permit the economy to continue indefinitely in recession with growing stagnation and unemployment. On the other hand, if the economy is running at full steam and overheats, even a small deficit may be excessive.

The debt also has significant psychological effects. A businessman may be dissuaded from an investment by reckless public spending or encouraged to make an investment be-

cause of an economy stimulated by government spending. Obviously, wasteful government spending and a careless attitude toward government deficits erode public self discipline and can lead to disastrous inflation.

Budget deficits and surpluses may not be quite as dominant in the economy as we have sometimes thought. Much of the inflation of recent years, for example, involves food and fuel prices and occurred independently of changes in the national debt. International conditions, collective bargaining agreements, and technology, to name a few factors, may have a greater influence on the economy than a deficit or a surplus. Nonetheless, federal deficits are still very important. Lower federal spending eventually means less demand in the economy and lower prices. The real cause of inflation is, of course, an imbalance between supply and demand, when demand is greater than supply, prices rise; when supply is greater than demand, prices level off or fall.

Oddly, contemporary economists tell us that we may never pay off the debt and that there are some disadvantages if we did. They point out that we would gain little by paying it off. Of course, our children would no longer be taxed to pay the interest on a debt. But, if there were no debt, we would lose an important mechanism for stabilizing the economy. In a faltering economy, government spending creates demand and jobs and returns us to prosperity. If the debt were paid off, we would also lose government bonds as a safe form of investment and deprive individuals and businesses of safe and easily convertible securities. In addition, over \$500 billion in taxes—the equivalent of \$2,200 for every man, woman, and child in the nation—would have to be raised to pay off the debt.

The point of all of this is that the federal debt is a serious matter and that new debt should be computed carefully, always with an eye to balanced inflationary tendencies with needed economic stimulation.

**THIRTEENTH DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS**

**HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the RECORD the results of my newsletter poll, taken in February and March of this year:

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF FLORIDA QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS, FEBRUARY-MARCH 1975—TOTAL RESPONSES: 14,975

[In percentage]

1. Which do you feel is the single most important economic issue?

- (a) Unemployment ..... 39
- (b) Inflation ..... 55
- (c) No answer ..... 6

2. Are you in favor of a tax cut, even if it means a greater budget deficit?

- (a) Yes ..... 52
- (b) No ..... 44
- (c) No answer ..... 4

3. During a period of high unemployment, do you favor the government providing jobs for those temporarily unemployed?

- (a) Yes ..... 78
- (b) No ..... 19
- (c) No answer ..... 3

4. Do you favor wage and price controls as an answer to our economic problems?

- (a) Yes ..... 61
- (b) No ..... 35
- (c) No answer ..... 4

5. President Ford proposes to limit cost-of-living increases for social security recipients to 5 percent. Do you agree?

- (a) Yes ..... 30
- (b) No ..... 67
- (c) No answer ..... 3

6. Do you favor the temporary delay of environmental controls on automobiles and industry to help ease our energy problems?

- (a) Yes ..... 67
- (b) No ..... 30
- (c) No answer ..... 3

7. To deal with our energy problems, do you favor:

- (a) Gas rationing to individuals ..... 31
- (b) Gas rationing to service stations ..... 8
- (c) Tax on all oil imports ..... 17
- (d) Tax on gasoline ..... 17
- (e) Tax on cars by weight ..... 23
- (f) Tax on cars by horsepower ..... 27
- (g) None of the above ..... 21

8. Do you favor a program of national health insurance?

- (a) Yes ..... 83
- (b) No ..... 15
- (c) No answer ..... 2

9. If so, should the program be operated by:

- (a) The Federal Government as part of social security ..... 62
- (b) The private insurance companies ..... 23
- (c) No answer ..... 15

10. Should a national health insurance program cover:

- (a) All medical bills ..... 64
- (b) Only catastrophic medical problems ..... 25
- (c) No answer ..... 11

11. U.S. troops in Europe:

- (a) Increase ..... 3
- (b) Maintain at present level ..... 34
- (c) Decrease ..... 30
- (d) Bring them all home ..... 28
- (e) No answer ..... 5

12. Is it in the best interests of the United States to continue providing arms and military equipment to Israel?

- (a) Yes ..... 61
- (b) No ..... 33
- (c) No answer ..... 6

**THE METRIC SYSTEM**

**HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. Speaker, as the following article from the March 3, 1975, issue of U.S. News & World Report makes clear, the world is moving rapidly toward universal use of the metric system. In order for the United States to remain competitive in the world marketplace, it is vital that we make the transition to the metric system without undue delay. Following the lead of a number of my distinguished colleagues, including Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. HECHLER, and Mr.

McCLORY, I am today introducing legislation that would help facilitate such a change.

This bill would establish a National Metric Conversion Assistance Board to study the best ways of converting to the metric system, taking into account the interests, needs, and views of all segments of our economy and other interested groups. The Board, after completing its study, would then recommend appropriate legislation for effecting the transition.

Since the change to the metric system is inevitable, it is incumbent upon us, I think, to make that change as painless as possible for everyone, and that can only be done by means of careful and thorough planning and the provision of whatever assistance may be necessary.

The article follows:

**THE METRIC SYSTEM IS CREEPING IN ON UNITED STATES**

Steadily, without much fanfare, the U.S. is adopting the metric system—the standard of weights and measures used by most of the world.

Leading the shift are businesses—especially those competing abroad—educators, some federal agencies.

Also, a new push is getting under way in Congress to make metrics the official system for the nation within a decade. It's a legislative issue, debated now and again for almost 150 years, that may finally be resolved.

Swing by GM. In the meantime—

General Motors, the nation's largest manufacturer, is swinging to a policy of designing all new parts in metrics. The giant firm wants to harmonize production for all GM plants around the world. In the U.S., it will affect about 40,000 of GM's suppliers.

Pintos and Mustangs equipped with 2.3-liter engines are being powered by motors designed entirely in metrics. An estimated 30 to 40 per cent of Ford's production is in foreign markets where metrics are the standard. A shift in the U.S. will make parts interchangeable.

Big international firms such as Caterpillar Tractor, John Deere, International Harvester and IBM have been using metrics for years in foreign trade. They are now working on plans to use more of the same specifications in the U.S.

Before long, shoppers may be buying clothing and textiles with sizes in centimeters and meters, rather than in inches and yards. Sears Roebuck, J. C. Penney and Levi Strauss, among others, are now studying the impact of such changes.

Some canned and packaged foods will soon be carrying metric equivalents to ounces and pounds on their labels.

Later this year, Seven-Up soda will come in ½-liter and liter bottles, as a substitute for pints and quarts.

By 1979, all wine sold in the U.S. will be in metric bottles.

Paper, too. An international panel has agreed on a new standard size for widely used office paper—210 by 280 millimeters. It may eventually replace the 8½ by 11-inch paper found in most U.S. offices today.

Many adults will be in for some trying times computing the new figures. But youngsters in many parts of the country are already getting their first taste of the new standards in school.

At least 14 States are in the early stages of preparing classwork in metrics. Six have enacted laws calling for the metric system to be taught. In California, all elementary-school texts must include metrics by 1976.

Maryland has a six-year program of instruction to shift to the new system.

Many federal agencies are getting on the metric bandwagon, as well.

The U.S. Patent Office is encouraging inventors to include both types of measurements in their patent applications.

*Even ships.* The Maritime Administration has ordered all ships to be built to metric measures by 1980. All maritime cargo now traveling to and from Europe is marked with dual dimensions.

Federal environmental pollution standards, Agriculture Department crop reports and federal radio-signal measurements all carry the new figures.

Kilometers, as well as miles, are cropping up on highway signs as several States try out the new system.

Some television and radio stations are reporting temperatures in both Fahrenheit and centigrade degrees.

The American National Metric Council has been set up by private industry to aid business and government in the conversion process.

However, most experts agree that, if the entire nation is to go metric, it must have full federal backing—an idea that has been kicking around since Thomas Jefferson urged adoption of a decimal system 150 years ago.

In 1866, the National Academy of Sciences recommended shifting to the decimal system, but little came of the proposal. Finally, in 1968, Congress ordered the Department of Commerce to look into the problem. It concluded that the transition to metrics was inevitable and the sooner it was carried out the better.

The Senate adopted conversion legislation in 1972 and seemed just as ready to pass a similar bill last year. But the measure bogged down in the House, in large part because of the insistence of labor, along with some business groups, that the Government should pay for new metric-measure tools and equipment made to the metric standard.

*Issue of subsidies.* One sponsor of metric legislation, Representative Olin Teague (Dem.), of Texas, chairman of the House Sciences and Astronautics Committee which will hold hearings on the bill, says it will be "one of the first bills to come out of committee." However, aides say Mr. Teague is against federal subsidies for such things as replacement of tools. "You'd need a Government inspector in every tool box," says the aide.

Nevertheless, an official of the AFL-CIO says labor will insist on federal subsidies because "metric conversion would put a great burden on workers." As an example, the official argues that a typical machinist who buys his own tools might spend as much as \$4,000 for a new set of metric-measure tools. Many small businesses say much the same thing—replacing existing equipment could prove prohibitive.

A bill in the Senate, sponsored by Claiborne Pell (Dem.), of Rhode Island, would provide grants of up to \$2,000 to offset retooling costs.

Says one industry official: "There's bound to be a lot of hauling and tugging over the final version of the bill, but if everybody gives a little I think we can finally get the switch to metrication under way."

Supporters of the legislation estimate that the switch could add from 500 to 700 million dollars in exports a year—and foreign firms could increase sales 300 to 500 million in the U.S.

Failure to make the switch would leave the U.S. out of step with the entire industrialized world. About the only nations that have not adopted the metric system are Brunei, Burma, Liberia, the Yemen Arab Republic and the Yemen People's Democratic Republic.

## DEFENSE DEPARTMENT AND CONSULTANT CONTRACT

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, Washington correspondent Seth Kantor of the Detroit News in a story published April 10 has described the following example of Pentagon watchkeeping on the ramparts of the world:

[From the Detroit News, April 10, 1975]

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT AND CONSULTANT CONTRACT

(By Seth Kantor)

WASHINGTON.—The Pentagon says it can't figure out the likely political impact of any possible U.S. military force in the Middle East, so it has hired an outside consultant to find the answer, for \$107,569.

Both the Defense Department and the consulting firm, American Institutes for Research (AIR), say they don't have a specific movement of military force in mind.

What is certain is that AIR came up with the idea for the contract and the Defense Department sought no other bidders for the job, according to Pentagon records.

A Pentagon spokesman told the Detroit News that on March 11 AIR got a contract to study "the political impact of U.S. military force in the Mid-East" because the Pentagon "cannot come up with precisely the same information on its own."

The study is to be conducted in Washington—much of it concerned with reading newspapers from Arab nations—said officials both in the Pentagon and at AIR.

A contract officer in the Defense Supply Service, the agency which handled the non-competitive, unsolicited contract proposal from AIR, said the contract does not exclude any country in the Middle East from the study.

But the man in charge of the study does not say that. He is Paul A. Jureidini, born and raised in Lebanon and now a U.S. citizen. He said Israel is not to be included in his research.

"No. Not Israel," he said. "Somehow, we forget that Israel is in the Middle East."

So far the Defense Supply Service has obligated \$35,015 for the first year of the study which is scheduled to continue through June, 1977. The Pentagon calls it "a one-shot deal."

Asked if the \$35,015 might be equal to Jureidini's annual pay at AIR, the officer said the outlay of federal funds "has a relationship to the man's salary and skills."

Jureidini says that "basically this is a feasibility study of the perceptions of editorial writers and poly-makers in the Middle East. First we have to develop a reliable method of measuring those perceptions."

As an example, Jureidini said he would look at how one or more Mid-East countries perceive "a U.S. military force in the Mediterranean: Positively, negatively or not at all."

Jureidini supervises Mid-East studies at AIR, a private "think tank" with major offices at Palo Alto, Calif., and in the nation's capital. Its chief clients are a number of federal agencies that provide much of AIR's search into the behavioral sciences.

I submit that matters have reached a sorry pass when the Defense Department, with the entire U.S. intelligence and diplomatic information apparatus in the Middle East at its disposal, must pay someone right downtown here \$107,569 to read Arab newspapers to assess the

political impact of a U.S. military presence in the area.

But in addition, the contract in question is a perfect specimen of a type which should be avoided wherever and whenever possible. The proposal to the Defense Department was unsolicited and the contract let without competitive bidding. Such practices extend from contracts with individual "consultants" to those for the procurement of billions in weapons systems. These practices are a plague in a time of extreme stress on Federal resources. The foregoing example, in a money figure anyone can comprehend, is a wasteful affront to the American taxpayer.

I have concluded that the contract should be canceled forthwith.

Accordingly, I have written the Secretary of Defense the following letter requesting an explanation of the contract:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please explain to me your department's justification for Defense Supply Service contract No. MDA 903-75-C0210 to the American Institutes for Research, 3301 New Mexico Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., published in the Commerce Business Daily, March 27, 1975.

On the face of the facts set forth in the attached story by Seth Kantor of the Detroit News Washington bureau, I hope that you will give serious consideration to the immediate cancellation of this contract.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,  
Member of Congress.

## A TRIBUTE TO ADELE GALIBER

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my public congratulations to Mrs. Adele Galiber of Charlotte Amalie who was recently feted at a testimonial dinner held in her honor by the St. Thomas Lions Club. Mrs. Galiber, a pioneer St. Thomas music teacher, musician, and devoted mother, is the second person so honored at the Lion Club's annual dinner in recognition of outstanding Virgin Islanders.

Hundreds of persons in the Virgin Islands over the years have had their lives magically touched by this remarkably gifted and dedicated teacher. Mrs. Galiber has been able to transcend both good times and bad by teaching the love and appreciation of music to our young people for over 40 years. For her work and her achievements in the field of music education, she was honored in 1968 by the first civilian Governor of the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have personally known Mrs. Galiber and the members of her outstanding family. I would like to share with my colleagues a little bit of this remarkable woman by including the following article from the Virgin Islands Daily News to be printed forthwith:

LIONS CLUB TO HONOR A. GALIBER

Lions Club of St. Thomas will hold a gala testimonial dinner and dance Friday night honoring Mrs. Adele Galiber, pioneer St.

Thomas music teacher, musician, and mother of a talented family of prominent Virgin Islanders.

Lion president Al Davis announced yesterday that tickets for the event scheduled for 7 p.m. Friday at Frenchman's Reef hotel, may be purchased from any Lion, or at Haynes Drug Center in Barbel Plaza.

Mrs. Galiber retired from active teaching in the public schools in 1968, after 40 years of service, and she was honored by the Virgin Islands' first civilian governor, Paul M. Pearson, for her innovation work in music education during the depression when limited funds were available for the schools.

Still spry and hearty in her retirement, Mr. Galiber devotes daily sessions to her beloved piano, and to her 'second love,' her island garden, bursting with fruit and floral tributes to her loving care.

A teacher and counsellor to generations of young Virgin Islands musicians, Mr. Galiber reared a large and talented family, whose own lives have contributed much to the Virgin Islands.

Son Flavio is a dentist, with offices in St. Thomas and Washington, D.C., and another, Andre is a physician, with offices in St. Croix. Another son Rudolph is an assistant commissioner of Public Works, and Leayle is a lieutenant colonel, serving as adjutant general of the new Virgin Islands National Guard. Daughter Doris is a mezzasoprano with the Oscar Hammerstein group, and daughter Norma is a supervisor of social services in Washington, D.C.

Friday's dinner dance honoring Mrs. Galiber will feature the music of Lion Arthur Jeppesen and His Society Band of Reknown. Cocktails are at 7 p.m. dinner at 8 p.m., and dancing from 10 p.m.

The testimonial to Mr. Galiber is the second in an annual series honoring outstanding Virgin Islanders, and was initiated last year with a testimonial honoring veteran teacher and sportswoman, "Miss Edith" Williams.

Proceeds from the dinner and from a souvenir program published for the occasion will be used by the Lions to purchase education equipment and materials for the blind of St. Thomas.

Lions Club of St. Thomas recently completed the purchase of a \$7,000 specially-equipped van to be used in transporting the blind and the aged.

ISRAEL'S 27TH ANNIVERSARY

**HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, 27 years ago today the State of Israel was founded. These past 27 years stand to the people of all nations as a symbol of achievement and dedication and as a reminder that determination and courage can overcome the most difficult and trying adversities.

Since 1948, with the support of many of the world's nations and a firm commitment on the part of world Jewry, Israel has developed a democratic government, an expanding economy, and a stable society, and has become a model of growth and achievement for many other emerging nations. In meeting the challenges of a harsh, underdeveloped land, the Israelis have demonstrated an initiative and determination often characterized as the epitome of the pioneering spirit of the 20th century.

Their economy has made tremendous gains since the birth of the State. From the desert has been built highly productive agricultural land. At the same time, the country has encouraged development of the arts and sciences and can boast a fine symphony orchestra, Nobel prize-winning authors, more than 1,000 libraries and 5,000 schools, seven major universities and 52 colleges, and many museums and scholarly institutes.

Israel's progress has been recorded by economic indicators, growth rates and production figures. But these numbers simply cannot describe the pride, the perseverance, the sacrifices that have contributed to the making of Israel.

And even as Israel has itself been developing, it has offered its assistance to other developing countries. Believing that the gap in living standards between prosperous and poor nations is a danger to international stability and peace, Israel has sent hundreds of instructors, advisers, survey missions, and builders to dozens of countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America under the auspices of U.N. agencies or at the invitation of the governments concerned. The Israel people, having found a measure of peace and prosperity after centuries of adversity, seek to share with other peoples in many lands the instruments and ways of peace.

But as the Israel people have made strides, their nation has been continually threatened both economically and physically. Only because of its strong and unyielding desire to remain free and maintain an atmosphere of dignity has it been able to overcome these tremendous odds. Despite the pressures imposed on the State of Israel—despite a future dimmed by uncertainty and danger—it has continued to reaffirm its determination to remain a free and independent state.

As Americans who cherish freedom, liberty, and equality, we take note of this special day—a day to reaffirm the ideals on which Israel was founded and a day to remark on the determination and accomplishments of the Israel people.

RESIGNATION OF FAA ADMINISTRATOR ALEXANDER BUTTERFIELD

**HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Mr. Alexander P. Butterfield as administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration will be greeted with mixed emotion by the Congress and the aviation community.

Unfortunately, his tenure as the FAA Administrator has been surrounded by a great deal of controversy, which is largely due to the aftermath of the Watergate situation. I personally feel that Alex Butterfield gave everything he had to this job, and I happen to think that under the circumstances, he performed quite admirably in a very difficult job.

Just recently, there was an article in the Wall Street Journal about Mr. Butterfield which pointed out that he has devoted considerable time and attention to the FAA, and especially the problem of air safety. In fact, one of the most knowledgeable men in the field of aviation safety, Mr. Oscar Bakke, declared that Mr. Butterfield gave great attention to aviation safety and tried to effect positive changes in this vital area of FAA responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of Mr. Butterfield's difficulties as Administrator, I am not sure that anyone could perform this job, until Congress decides to do something about the relationship of the Federal Aviation Administration to the Department of Transportation. Mr. Butterfield and his predecessors for the most part, have been frustrated in their attempts to bring about change, because of the bureaucratic interference of the DOT on practically every FAA suggestion on safety and internal organization. I happen to think that the Congress made a mistake in the 1966 legislation, which established the DOT, when it ended the FAA's independence, and made it little more than a bureau of the DOT.

I claim to have no insight on Mr. Butterfield's problems in this connection, but knowledgeable people in the field of aviation tell me that every time he and his subordinates tried to affect change, they were stymied by the DOT bureaucracy. For the next FAA Administrator, I hope this will change.

I wish Alexander Butterfield success in his future endeavors and I hope that history will judge his performance as administrator, not on the basis of Watergate, but on his sincere devotion to the job of Administrator and his efforts to make aviation a vital link in the Nation's transportation system.

WHO NEEDS IT?

**HON. SAM STEIGER**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, 1975, the Wall Street Journal carried an editorial which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. This editorial deals with the issue of Federal land-use legislation and asks the question, "Who Needs It?" I commend this well respected newspaper for raising this question. For the last few years I have attempted to answer this same question, and have concluded that it will benefit no one—with the exception of a handful of environmentalists, planners, and Government bureaucrats.

The American people certainly neither need nor want this kind of restrictive Federal Government involvement in local land-use decisions. The public protest against this legislation last year clearly supports this conclusion. I hope that my colleagues will once more heed the advice of the people and reject the concept of a Federal land-use bill.

I would ask the Members of this body to consider this thoughtful statement from the Wall Street Journal.

[From the Wall Street Journal, April 15, 1975]

WHO NEEDS IT?

Presidential Candidate Mo Udall, a principal backer of the "land use" bill that died under public protest in 1973, has reintroduced a less authorization sounding version in this Congress. But the question remains: Who Needs It?

Chastened by the 1973 accusations that he was trying to install a U.S. Gosplan, Mr. Udall is at some pains to explain essential differences between the new and old bills. The new one, for example, contains no federal sanctions against states that do not set up planning operations that meet federal standards. The old bill would have bludgeoned them into cooperating by threatening to cut off federal airport, highway and conservation aid. The new bill also reduces the scope of proposed planning activities, apparently out of deference to politically powerful groups—farmers, for example.

The result is that Mr. Udall can now promote his bill with the modest plea that the federal government just wants to be helpful to the states. It wants to give them \$500 million over six years to help them set up planning councils and no one is going to lay a finger on any state that prefers to go its own way. Of course, participating states would only get a bit of money initially; they wouldn't get the full federal grant until their plan got the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Now, as much as Mr. Udall would like to stress the innocence of the federal land use initiative, it has broad and profound implications. Those people who protested in 1973 obviously had some feel for those implications, even though Mr. Udall, Senator Jackson and others, of the land use movement apparently do not.

The ownership and use of land is both a tangible and intangible source of economic and political power. In the United States, unlike most nations of the world, land ownership is widely dispersed and real estate has long been a means for almost anyone with a few dollars to acquire some lasting substance. There are substantial political differences between countries where millions of people own their own land and countries where all land is owned by the state or much of it is owned by an aristocracy, the crown or large-scale private landlords. That difference is mainly in the political outlook of the electorate, its sense of independence and freedom. It is not easily defined but that makes it no less important.

Land ownership has never carried unrestricted rights. Land use restrictions have been applied mainly through local zoning laws, so that one man's ideas of how to use his land would not inflict some intolerable difficulty or annoyance on his neighbor.

Anyone who has had experience with zoning boards knows that questions over how a man can use his land are often sensitive and complex. It is the kind of question that demands, in a society such as ours, settlement at the local level.

It is safe enough to say that zoning as it now exists does not seriously impede the workings of market forces to put land to its highest and most efficient uses. That, in turn, provides an underlying base for an efficient economy—that is to say an economy capable of generating jobs and a high standard of living. It is not a neat looking system; there are lots of zoning fights and neighborly squabbles, but it adjusts to changing needs and fortunes in a rationing a finite resource.

Mr. Udall says he merely wants to provide "broad policy and financial incentives and also to put the federal government's house in order." That last is a tall order indeed. We find no popular groundswell. Until he comes

up with more convincing arguments, it seems only fair to keep asking, "who needs it?"

ST. ADALBERT SCHOOL CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to join me in offering congratulations to the teachers and pupils of Cleveland's St. Adalbert School, which will celebrate its 50th anniversary on April 27, 1975. This is indeed a joyous occasion for St. Adalbert after years of hard work to keep the community-oriented school alive. The school was founded as an alternative to public education for innercity youth and has often experienced financial difficulties through the years, while keeping tuition costs minimal for pupils from east central, one of the city's most depressed areas.

St. Adalbert opened its doors in 1924 in an old wood frame building. This was the culmination of efforts begun in 1922 by a group of black Roman Catholics living in the east central area, to make the church more responsive to the needs of the black community. In 1960 a new school was built, and thus St. Adalbert became the first alternative school in Cleveland's inner city.

The school was founded, not as a citadel for Catholic education, but rather as an alternative to public education. Throughout the years St. Adalbert has met the particular educational, cultural and spiritual needs of inner-city children. Unlike public schools, St. Adalbert has been able to provide individual attention to the personal, familial, and societal problems of its pupils. Presently 300 students are enrolled, comprising 45 percent Catholics and 55 percent members of other denominations. The school has never discriminated in tuition or enrollment, showing more concern about where a child comes from than what church he belongs to. Religious practice is, however, encouraged and Christian values are stressed.

St. Adalbert is a community-oriented school. Pupils coming from outside the east central area are expected to pay the largest part of the school's financial burden. Of the 200 families with children attending the school about 50 come from outside the community. The school is controlled by the community through the St. Adalbert Community School parent-teacher unit which is the policymaking board for the school. This group assures that the needs of black people are met by the school administration.

In addition to education, St. Adalbert also provides clothing and food distribution, a meeting place for nonpartisan political activities, recreation, and youth activities, meetings of Alcoholics Anonymous, Alateen, and the Fairfax Area Council.

I call on my colleagues to join with me in commending St. Adalbert School for the essential services it has provided to the east central area for the past 50 years.

COMPLAINT FILED AGAINST PORT AUTHORITY TOLL INCREASE

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I filed a complaint with the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, requesting that he disallow the 50-percent toll increase that the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey recently announced. The Administrator has the authority to do so pursuant to the Bridge Act of 1906.

I am enclosing a copy of the complaint for the benefit of my colleagues.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
April 16, 1975.

HON. NORBERT T. TIEMANN,  
Administrator, Federal Highway Administration,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TIEMANN: Last week the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey ordered a 50% increase in the toll rate for the bridges and tunnels under its jurisdiction. I believe that these increases are unjust and unreasonable.

Therefore, I am requesting you to exercise the authority vested in you, as Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, pursuant to the Bridge Act of 1906, as amended (33 U.S.C. 494), to determine that such tools are unreasonable and unjust, to prescribe what rates may be reasonable and just under the circumstances, and to order a compensatory repayment of any unjust rates which may be paid if the higher rates go into effect in the interim.

The full text of the complaint is attached.

Sincerely,

PETER A. PEYSER,  
Member of Congress.

COMPLAINT

This complaint is brought pursuant to Title 49, C.F.R., Part 310.

I. Complainant is Peter A. Peyser, U.S. Representative from the twenty-third Congressional District in New York State. His district encompasses much of Westchester County and part of New York City. Many of his constituents, in addition to himself and his family, regularly use the bridges and tunnels of New York City, which will be subject to the proposed rate increase, and they will suffer an unjust and unreasonable financial hardship if this toll scheduled is approved:

II. The bridges affected are the George Washington Bridge, the Bayonne Bridge, the Goethals Bridge, and the Outerbridge Crossing. The George Washington Bridge is located at West 178th Street, crossing the Hudson River to Fort Lee, New Jersey; the Bayonne Bridge extends from Bayonne, N.J., crossing Kill Van Kull to Port Richmond, Staten Island; the Goethals Bridge extends from Elizabeth, N.J., crossing Arthur Kill to Holland Hook, Staten Island, and the Outerbridge Crossing extends from Perth Amboy, N.J., to Tottenville, Staten Island, New York.

III. The agency responsible for establishing and collecting the tolls is the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, located at 1 World Trade Center, New York, New York 10048.

IV. The rates alleged to be unjust are as follows:

\$1.50 for passenger cars, which represents a 50% increase from the normal rate;

\$.75 for motorcycles, which also represents a 50% increase from the normal rate.

V. Complainant believes that the rates are unreasonable and unjust for the following reasons:

1. The rate increase ordered by the Port

Authority is in excess of that necessary to conduct its operations and to assure a fair and reasonable return on capital invested in the Port Authority operations. The 1974 annual report indicated that last year the operating revenues of the Port Authority rose to \$156,116,000, a \$19,000,000 increase over 1973, despite decreased use of the bridges and tunnels.

2. The rate increase will not result in a shift of mass transit.

(a) During the gasoline shortage last winter, it became acutely obvious that the great majority of those who do drive in passenger cars do so because there is no mass transit available to them, and those who do not car pool do not because car pooling is very impractical, and in many cases is impossible. While there is no question that car pooling should be encouraged, this rate increase will not have the desired impact.

(b) The municipal governments in the metropolitan area have taken no action which would indicate that the area is sufficiently capable of affording adequate mass transportation for those who, because of the proposed rate increase, would be forced to utilize mass transportation. Again, there is no question that mass transportation should be encouraged and emphasis should be placed upon developing an adequate mass transportation network in the area. However, the proposed increase would not be that emphasis, but instead would be a form of regressive taxation.

(c) The municipal governments in the metropolitan area have taken no action to facilitate car pooling arrangements, in order to make car pooling workable and feasible. In the absence of such actions, it is unreasonable and unjust to impose financial hardship upon those who have no alternative but the private automobile for commuter transportation.

(d) The rate change will have sufficient adverse impact upon Northern Westchester County, which does not have sufficient mass transportation facilities. If the rate increase of the Port Authority is approved, it is certain that the New York State Thruway Authority will raise the toll on the Tappan Zee Bridge between Westchester and Rockland Counties \$.50 to make it uniform with the toll on the George Washington Bridge. This will cause severe economic detriment to this area, and cannot result in a significant switch to mass transportation because there is no adequate system of mass transportation in the area.

(3) Commuters cannot afford a 50 percent increase in the cost of transportation.

The United States is currently in the midst of the deepest economic slump it has experienced since the Great Depression. Currently, the unemployment rate is 8.7 percent, meaning that 8,000,000 people are out of work. Inflation, although not as severe as last year, is currently running at an annual level of between 7 percent and 8 percent. Thus, the commuting worker is facing the worst economic picture that he has experienced in over 40 years.

The New York Metropolitan Area has been severely hit by this combination of recession and inflation. Workers in this area have seen their real incomes drop approximately 4 percent in the last year. A 50 percent increase in tolls for a daily commuter would be an added \$125 cost annually for the average commuter, which would virtually eliminate the impact that the recently approved tax rebate would have.

(4) The impact of this will be severest on those who can least afford it.

The gasoline shortage last winter made it very clear that those who could not car pool and who could not utilize mass transportation were low and middle income commuting workers. These workers do not have viable transportation alternatives, and do not have the economic leverage to sustain the 50% toll increase.

(5) The increase is inflationary.

The rate increase of \$.50 is a 50% increase in a major budgetary item for many New York and New Jersey workers. Clearly this can only serve to fuel inflation and thwart real economic recovery in the area.

(6) The increase will drive business away from the New York Metropolitan Area.

Businesses, already facing a depressed economy, will view this increase as a further incentive to move away from this area. Their workers will demand to be compensated for this cost of living increase. Those that cannot compensate their workers will face the loss of trained workers, or increased worker dissatisfaction over a situation beyond the control of management. Given the current economy, this can only be an incentive to move away from the area.

VI. Complaint has taken no prior action to obtain a change in the rates of toll alleged to be unreasonable and unjust, because no opportunities exist outside of the Federal Highway Administration for a hearing on this issue, and the probability that the Governor of either State will veto this rate hike is remote.

VII. The complaint prays that the Administrator determine that such tolls are unreasonable and unjust and disallow the increase; that the Administrator, if necessary, initiate formal adjudication to determine if any increase would be reasonable under the circumstances, and if a lesser increase would be reasonable, then to prescribe such a lesser increase; that in the event that the increase is determined unreasonable and unjust, the Administrator order a rollback of the increase, and that such rollback be compensatory; and the complainant prays for such other and further relief as the Administrator may deem just and proper.

#### THE ENERGY PROBLEM: THE SOLUTION IS A RETURN TO THE FREE MARKET

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. present energy difficulties are another example of how Government interference in the free market system is costing the American taxpayer more money. And the Government is attempting to solve the problem by employing more of the medicine that almost killed the patient the first time around.

At the present time there are calls for a variety of different Government regulations, controls, and initiatives to "solve" or "cure" our difficulties in the field of energy.

As in any other area of life, problems cannot be solved unless and until we clearly understand their cause. To view Government as a potential solution to energy difficulties rather than one of the primary causes of those problems, is to misunderstand reality.

Consider the manner in which a variety of Government rules, regulations, and controls have contributed to our current energy dilemma.

In recent years, for example, demand has been increasing for all sources of energy while the supply curve has been plunging downward. Government is responsible for a large part of the increased demand and is equally responsible for decline in supply.

One Government policy which has in-

creased demand, and which continues today, has been the favorably low rates given to mass users of energy such as utilities. As a result, utilities have doubled demand every 8 years since the end of World War II. In addition, the price of gasoline has been kept artificially low by Government, producing clogged highways with automobiles using a maximum amount of fuel. Environmental regulations have dramatically increased the use of such scarce resources, and Government's policy of controlling the price of natural gas has added to the already inflated demand for petroleum. At the same time that Government was increasing the demand for oil through these policies, it was keeping the supply down through an equally shortsighted policy—the imposition of artificial import quotas. All of this was happening, it must be remembered, long before the Arab oil embargo.

An excellent example of the Government doing more harm than good by interfering in the free market system can be found in an examination of the tightly regulated natural gas industry. This shows the paradox that the Government has been a major cause of the inflation and lack of production in the energy industry while attempting to help the consumer.

Today, the Nation faces a shortage of natural gas, yet it is generally agreed that there appear to be sufficient recoverable reserves of natural gas to accommodate the needs of Americans. That raises the question: If there are sufficient reserves of natural gas, then why cannot the United States get the natural gas that we both want and need? It is because free market principles have been violated. The interesting point that we have mentioned before is that the Government did this mischief, not by raising the price, but by artificially holding the price down. When Congress made the fateful decision to pass the Natural Gas Act in 1954, we guaranteed shortages and price increases. By limiting the price of gas sold in interstate commerce, we succeeded at one stroke in making it uneconomic for new sources of gas to be developed. While the regulation varied from area to area, it insured an average interstate price of gas of less than a realistic price.

Under artificial, Government-mandated price ceilings, the buyer and seller continued to exchange goods, but not at a price agreeable to both of them. The price has been a good deal for the consumer, but the return to the seller has been so low that he has not had enough profits to reinvest in further exploration and recovery of natural gas. Profits, after taxes, are industry's seed money. Those profits are the seed that industry plants so that it will have a crop to sell next year. If there is not enough seed, then there will not be enough crop. The natural gas industry is an example of there not being enough seed to produce enough crop for next year. The free market system allows for seed money—profits—by having both the buyer and the seller agree on the price of the item. But, in the case of natural gas, the Government has regulated seed money out of the exchange price.

With gas prices kept low, it is not sur-

prising that many users switched from other fuels to gas. The ultracheap gas caused utilities and other industries to convert to it, thus ruining our domestic coal industry by capturing its market. With everyone using gas at a price which did not allow for its replacement, no one should be surprised that our already developed reserves are running low. Only now is the Government beginning to learn the simple lesson that cheap gas does not help to fight inflation if there is none of it to be had!

The artificially low price has not only prevented more gas supplies from being developed; it has also prevented the development of alternative fuels. The coal liquefaction process, for example, is capable of supplying us with enormous quantities of cheap liquid and gaseous substitutes. But it certainly cannot compete with the unrealistic regulated gas price. The result is that we have shortages of fuel everywhere.

The U.S. Geological Survey says that we have 228 trillion cubic feet of gas no more than 100 miles offshore, and less than 600 feet under the surface of the ocean. Gas is being flared in Louisiana, and is bubbling up to waste in the Gulf of Mexico. And it is the Government's regulation alone, not our abused free market system, which prevents us from getting at it.

This is one clear case in which allowing a price increase would help us to conquer inflation far more effectively than maintaining the regulation. All the price limit succeeds in doing is restricting the supply and preventing the development of alternative fuels. The final irony of the absurd situation which regulation has brought about is that now that we need our domestic coal industry, we find it crippled as a result of our policy on natural gas.

Characteristically, Congress saw fit to ignore warnings about a fuel shortage when there was time to take affirmative action to meet the need—that action consisting of withdrawing Government from the business of controls and permitting the free market system to work.

An analysis prepared by the Senate Committee on Government Operations revealed that by September 1970, long before the Arab oil cartel was formed the shortage had begun to take effect. The National Petroleum Council warned that the country faced a deficit of 250,000 barrels per day of fuel oil during the winters of 1970 and 1971. A House subcommittee investigated the fuel crisis and heard from Government and industry witnesses a number of suggested reasons for short supply: Tougher environmental regulations were requiring utilities to burn larger quantities of cleaner fuels; atomic energy was far behind schedule; demand for energy was shooting up; international disruptions were decreasing crude oil imports.

What did Congress do? It imposed wage and price controls on the economy. Thus, fuel oil prices were frozen at offseason lows and gasoline prices at seasonal highs. The result was to discourage the refining of fuel oil.

As early as January 1970, the President's Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Controls had recommended abandoning

the import quotas, but President Nixon refused to take his own task force's advice. As a result, demand levels continued to rise and refiners used up their yearly quotas early in 1972, forcing some to start drawing oil from stocks at a rate that plunged storage to the lowest point in postwar years.

While Government price controls have kept the cost of oil artificially low, thereby increasing demand, the general inflation of the economy has made the cost of finding oil increasingly high. Between 1960 and 1970, the cost of drilling an average well in the United States rose from \$55,000 to almost \$95,000. Today, drilling the average offshore well costs more than \$500,000, and the average well in Alaska will run to more than \$2 million. In addition, the chances of hitting a productive well are only one in eight. If Government continues to interfere in the economy, businessmen will have little incentive to make the huge investments necessary. More important, perhaps, the necessary capital will simply not be available.

If the price of domestic crude had been allowed to rise in line with the world changes in price, then more supplies would have been developed, more substitutes investigated, and more demand inhibited.

These past Government actions have helped cause the energy crisis. Now, the Government intends to solve this problem by extending the present regulations and adding other forms of Government interference. This will be done because we are said to be in the middle of an emergency, the so-called energy crisis. This crisis will allegedly be solved by more Government regulation. All this legislation will do is make the situation worse. What needs to be done is to remove restrictive legislation, not add more.

Those who advocate a policy of gasoline rationing as a legitimate response to the current problem are doing what politicians often do: look to more Government coercion to remedy the ailments brought about and deprive us of a part of our freedom as well.

The fact is that gasoline rationing is the last thing we need. The same is true with regard to a high tax on gasoline, which is also being proposed. Both represent irrational approaches to a real problem—approaches which will make things worse, and not better.

The major argument being advanced for rationing is that it is the only way to be fair to the poor. The fact is, quite to the contrary, that absolute equity is impossible to achieve. Rationing, in the long run, is unfair to everyone—and to provide a system of rationing for the 100 million automobiles on American roads would require the institution of a huge and costly new bureaucracy.

The real way to increase production and decrease consumption—which are the stated goals of every coercive proposal now under consideration—is to permit the free market to work. Economist Milton Friedman notes that—

The most effective way to cut consumption and encourage production is simply to let the prices of oil products rise to whatever level it takes to clear the market. The higher prices would give each of the 210 million

residents of the U.S. a direct incentive to economize on oil, to find substitutes for oil, to increase the supply of oil.

The only alternative to the free market, Professor Friedman points out, is—artificially low prices accompanied by governmental rationing. This method induces each of us to oppose the general interest rather than further it. Our separate incentive is to wangle as much as we can from the rationing authorities. . . . 210 million persons each with a separate incentive to economize or 210 million persons dragooned by men with guns to cut down their use of oil—can there be any doubt which is the better system?

While not as dangerous as rationing, the surtax proposals would also push the Nation further away from self-sufficiency in energy. Shale oil, for example, might become economically feasible if the price of crude oil reached \$8.50 a barrel, but this would be the case only if industry can capture that \$8.50. If the equivalent price of crude is pushed to that level with a surtax, the Government receives the revenues and shale will remain unprofitable and thus undeveloped.

The real answer to our energy problems is not to stifle the free market which the various proposals now before us would do, but to permit it to work. Dr. W. Philip Gramm, professor of economics at Texas A. & M. University and a consultant to Canada's Ministry of Natural Resources, declares that—

The first step in solving the energy shortage is to allow the free market system to work. All price ceilings and government controls should be eliminated. Such action would greatly stimulate the supply of energy sources and eliminate shortages. Prices would rise but the expansion of output would hold prices to the minimum which current conditions dictate.

Discussing the merits of the free market as opposed to the various forms of Government regulation and intervention now under consideration, Professor Gramm states that—

The free market will insure that energy will be allocated to the highest priority users. Price increases are not pleasant, but they are better than low prices and no energy. If these higher prices work hardships on the less fortunate among us, special provisions which would be preferable to the distortions and waste of rationing could be provided for this small minority.

The fact is that all suggestions meant to lower demand—rationing, increased gasoline taxes, et cetera—ignore the fact that no matter how much demand is lowered, energy problems will remain. Ultimately, the fossil fuels we now use will be exhausted. By the year 2000, many experts predict we will run out of gas and oil and new sources of energy will be needed to replace them. Driving at 55 miles per hour may save some marginal amount of gasoline today, but if that is not all we do we are only preparing for a larger and less soluble energy problem at a later time.

In the short run, there is as much oil and gas as we need. Unfortunately, most of the available known world reserves are in countries which have formed a tightly organized cartel which has dramatically increased prices. The problem is not that the oil is not available. It is that we and our West European and Japanese allies cannot easily afford it.



The cost of imported oil has risen from less than \$2.50 a barrel in 1971 to \$11.70 a barrel today—oil that costs about 15 cents a barrel to produce. By the end of 1974, the United States will have spent an estimated \$29 billion for imported oil—as against \$7.8 billion in 1973. That is approximately \$20 billion that the American people will not have for goods and services produced in the United States.

What Americans seem not to understand is that the largest transfer of wealth in the history of the world—from the West to the oil producing states—is now taking place. The fourfold increase in the cost of imported oil has placed the balance of payments of almost all Western nations in the red. This cannot continue for very long without bankrupting many Western countries. Italy is on the verge of bankruptcy at the present time.

By the end of 1975, the assets of the oil producing countries will total from \$120 to \$130 billion. At this rate, by 1980, according to the World Bank, the OPEC countries will have more than \$600 billion. Countries such as Great Britain are becoming hostages in another way as well. If the Arabs suddenly withdrew their funds from England, the British economy might collapse. The Financial Times noted that, "Britain is at the moment mortgaging its future," borrowing against expectations in order to obtain oil now. Italy's oil deficit in 1974 was \$7.5 billion. This cannot continue.

What we must do at this time is not only discuss short-run ways in which to lower demand, but consider long-run ways in which to increase our domestic supplies and cease to be dependent upon the OPEC nations for oil—and, in the even longer run, plan for the time when nuclear, solar, geothermal, and other alternative sources of energy will have to replace the fast-disappearing fossil fuels.

One indication of the direction in which we should be moving was suggested by Anthony Harrigan, executive vice president of the U.S. Industrial Council. In an address before the Discussion Club of St. Louis, he declared that—

The U.S. has no alternative but to press ahead with the goal of energy self-sufficiency and meet our national needs from within our own territory. The evidence is overwhelming that we must accelerate the search for oil and gas on land and offshore, that we must utilize the vast coal reserves we possess, that we must develop new technology for shale oil and solar energy, and that we must speed up construction of nuclear power plants.

Yet, Government has taken every possible step to make energy self-sufficiency impossible. The 1970 Clean Air Act, which calls for the use of more and more expensive sources of energy, has neither been repealed nor revised. Restrictions on surface mining have been tightened. Licensing of nuclear plants proceeds at a snail's pace—more than 45 months from application to permit in one case. Decontrol of gas and oil prices is not authorized.

Mr. Harrigan notes that—

As a nation we could supply what the sheiks are monopolizing. In that way, we could strike at the oil cartel. But the domestic foes of free enterprise and energy develop-

ment refuse to utilize that freedom. Our people, as yet, have not awakened to the danger and the opportunity.

Unfortunately, many politicians have decided that the best way to deal with our energy problems is to make scapegoats of the oil companies, and keep the price of oil below the real market price. The attack upon oil company profits is simply a demagogic ploy to avoid laying the blame for our difficulties where they belong, namely with the intervention of Government in the economy through artificial price controls, import quotas, and unrealistic environmental standards.

The fact is that the very oil companies which are now coming under such sharp attack are the very companies which have historically provided Americans with the greatest supply of energy at the lowest prices in the world. The only thing which is being accomplished by the current attacks is the creation of uncertain conditions which are discouraging investment in the petroleum industry—when we need it most.

Economist Milton Friedman states that Members of Congress should be worrying that the oil companies are not making enough—not that they are making too much. The fact is that while Exxon, for example, announced 1973 profits of \$2.44 billion—up 59 percent over the figures of a year ago—the corporation projected capital expenditures of \$3.7 billion for 1974. It is, in effect, spending at least a billion more than it took in in profits to enhance the Nation's energy outlook. It is going to require massive expenditures by all oil companies if the present shortage is to be overcome and continued Government interference will make such expenditure much less likely.

It is Government, not the petroleum industry, which has produced the current energy gap. It is Government, not the industry, which for more than 5 years delayed plans to build the Alaska pipeline, delayed lease sales of Federal offshore tracts, refused, despite frequent industry assertions of the need, to establish sound energy policy, raised the industry's tax burden, imposed for more than 20 years artificially low prices on natural gas, and, through import quotas, limited the amount of crude oil which could be brought into the country.

Now, all of these Government policies are coming home to roost. The best thing for Government to do to end the energy crisis is to step aside and permit the free market to work.

Both the proposals of the Democrats in the Congress and of the Ford administration fail to appreciate this fact. Discussing these proposals, Prof. Murray Rothbard states that—

The Democrats want to make the oil shortage more severe by imposing gasoline rationing, import quotas on oil, and compulsory allocations by government. In short, combat the oil shortage by really creating an oil shortage. The Ford Administration, on the other hand, has opted for what it . . . calls the "market" solution for the alleged problem: a high tariff on imported oil, joined with a high tax on domestic production, thereby restricting the supply of oil and gas, and driving the price up. That's the market?

Professor Rothbard notes that the short-term oil shortage is a myth:

The gasoline "shortage" disappeared overnight last year when the U.S. and other Western governments finally allowed most gas and oil prices to rise to free market levels. The price of gasoline went up by ten cents a gallon or so, and that was that. Has there ever been another time in human history when influential forces have called for the rationing of a product that is in no sense in short supply.

To move in the direction of a real solution we must alter those laws which limit production and alter as well those laws which stimulate an increased artificial demand—such as the arbitrarily high standards set for auto emission causing the use of additional petroleum products. If the free market is permitted to work, the energy problems we face—while not disappearing, would hardly appear the crisis they now seem to be.

H.R. 5247

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, testimony of Leon H. Keyserling, former Chairman of Economic Advisers and president of the Conference on Economic Progress, before the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation on H.R. 5247, authorizing local public works, makes some very important points, including the facts that:

First, the budget is out of balance because we are so far short of full production and full employment, and

Second, the deficit will continue to increase so long as we fail to take those measures to achieve full economic restoration.

I concur with these views and insert his complete testimony at this point in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF LEON H. KEYSERLING ON H.R. 5247, AUTHORIZING LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS

[Charts not reproduced in the RECORD]

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee: I appreciate this opportunity to testify on H.R. 5247. I heartily approve of this proposal. The need for local public works is there. From the viewpoint of the economy and the unemployment situation, the need is urgent. The details of the bill seem well considered, and I will address my remarks rather to the general issues.

My Chart 1 shows that we have never been near full production nor full employment since 1953. We have had five periods of stagnation and are now in the fifth recession, by far the worst of the lot. Full time unemployment in March 1975 was 8.6 percent, and I estimated the true level of unemployment at 11.5 percent, or 10.7 million. Projected from a 1953 base, the economy in the 4 Q.1974 was running at an annual rate of 23.4 percent or 416.5 billion dollars below full production. The chronic nature of these difficulties should move us to take vigorous action now.

My Chart 2 shows that, during 1953-1974, we forfeited more than 2.6 billion 1974 dollars of total national production, and 52.7 man-years of employment opportunity, through falling so far short of our potentials. These projections are from a 1953 base. Even projecting from a 1968 base, total production at

an annual rate in 4 Q.1974 was more than 247 billion dollars short and the true level of unemployment was 4.2 million too high. And even writing off productivity gains which are gone forever, we are now between 200 and 225 billion dollars below full production, and about 5 million (full-time concept) below full employment. The same chart also estimates the tremendous losses we will suffer from now through 1980, if the national policies and programs now in being, including the recent tax reductions, are not fortified by far more extensive and far more responsive policies and programs.

My *Chart 3* shows that, to achieve full production and full employment by the fourth quarter of 1976, which is a feasible and necessary goal, civilian full-time employment needs to be 7.7 million higher than in 4 Q.1974, and total national production measured in 4 Q.1974 dollars needs to be up more than 300 billion dollars. It is very pertinent to the bill now before this Committee that, in a viable model for this economic restoration, Government outlays need to rise very much more rapidly than consumer spending or gross private domestic investment.

My *Chart 4* shows that the average unemployment rate in contract construction since 1953 has usually been more than twice as high as overall unemployment. In January 1975, it was almost twice as high. In March 1975, it was about 19 percent, compared with 8.7 percent for the total economy.

The 23 billion dollar tax reduction, recently enacted, can go only a small part of the way toward prompt and adequate economic restoration. As some of this tax reduction will not be immediately spent, I think it will have a direct G.N.P. stimulative value of not more than 20 billion. Using a multiplier of one and a half, which is high for tax reduction, this comes to 30 billion G.N.P.—a mere bagatelle compared with the 200-225 billion deficiency today as stated above and more than 300 billion left needed by fourth quarter 1976 as stated above. This is the vital reason why the current measure is so desperately needed at once, and why other measures will be required. Every dollar of outlays for public works provides much more stimulus to the economy and much more reduction of unemployment than a dollar of tax reductions.

As my *Chart 5* shows, the problem is further complicated by the restraining influence of monetary policy upon production and employment growth, and I am sure that this will continue. My *Chart 5* shows the tremendous increases in interest rates from 1972 to 1974, and that these excess interest costs have imposed a burden of about 806 billion dollars upon those who should not suffer this burden—the benefit of those who did not need this type of unjust enlargement of their incomes.

And finally, my *Chart 6* shows the reasons why we should not let concern about inflation turn us away from immense measures to stimulate production and employment. The chart shows that, contrary to the prevalent belief translated into national policy, a healthy economy generates far less inflation than a sick economy.

Considerations of the condition of the Federal Budget should not stand in the way of this bill or similar measures. The Budget is now so seriously out of balance because we are now so far short of full production and full employment, and the Budget would now be in balance at existing tax rates if we had full employment and full production. The deficit will continue to increase so long as the economy continues to be anywhere as sick as it is now, and the only road to a balanced Federal Budget is to take those measures essential to full economic restoration. This is all in addition to the fact that a balanced economy is more important in every way than a balanced Federal Budget.

For all these reasons I submit that it

would be the part of wisdom to enact H.R. 5247 without delay.

### FLOOD DISASTER PROTECTION ACT OF 1973

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the best narrative explanations of the Flood Disaster Protection Act that I have seen to date was published in a series of three articles in the *Wheeling, W. Va., News-Register*, starting on April 6, 1975. These articles are based on a question and answer sheet on the Federal flood insurance program published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Because of the active interest a large number of my colleagues have demonstrated in this program, I am submitting this material for their information and use.

I would like to point out that the information sheet on which this article was premised strongly supports the current program. The writer has attempted to point out some of the less desirable features to make a balanced presentation.

[From the *Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register*, Apr. 6, 1975]

#### FLOOD INSURANCE: PART I

DESIGNED TO PROVIDE "AFFORDABLE" PROTECTION (By Kathy Showalter)

On Dec. 31, 1973, former President Richard M. Nixon signed into law the Flood Disaster Protection Act.

On Dec. 13, 1974, the federal government sent the city its flood hazard boundary maps identifying Wheeling as a "flood prone" community.

Sometime prior to the Dec. 13, 1975 deadline, Wheeling City Council must decide whether or not to comply with the program. Compliance offers as many negative sanctions for Wheeling as does noncompliance.

The Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 expands the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. According to a list of 45 questions and answers published by the Housing and Urban Development, the 1973 law is "designed to provide flood insurance at rates affordable through a federal subsidy."

Regulations of the program include both land use and building code restrictions within flood plains. According to HUD, these regulations were incorporated to "save lives and be helpful in assuring a community that if it makes proper use of its flood plains, the amount of potential damage from future flooding will be reduced while the overall value of the community will ultimately be enhanced."

Insurance can be purchased for residential, commercial and industrial property. "Any property owner whose building is located in a community that has been approved for the sale of flood insurance under the program" can purchase the insurance.

"The owners or tenants of such structures may also purchase contents of coverage," according to the HUD publication. The insurance can be purchased after a city qualifies for the program from any "property and casualty insurance agent or broker licensed to do business within the state."

The publication states that "virtually every type of walled and roofed building, other than a gas or liquid storage tank, that is principally above ground and affixed to a

permanent site," is eligible for insurance coverage.

Types of losses include mudflow and mudslide, flood-related erosion losses such as losses from river and stream flooding, coastal flooding, flooding along the shores of lakes and flood-related erosions losses in such areas as a result of storm-activity.

Sewer back-ups are also covered under the program "but a general condition of flooding must exist and the sewer back-up must be clearly a result of that condition."

The HUD publication states that wharves, piers, bulkheads, growing crops, land, shrubbery, livestock, road, bridges, and motor vehicles are not insurable items under the program.

Wheeling City Council would first adopt two resolutions to join the program pledging its intentions to conform the city code to the land use and building code regulations for flood plain areas required by the flood program.

Once the application is accepted, flood insurance would be available to Wheeling residents under its "emergency" program. This "emergency" program would exist until the flood insurance administration would complete a detailed "Flood Insurance Rate Map," after the city would receive this, available limits of coverage are double those under the regular program than under the emergency program.

Under the emergency program, residents pay 25 cents per \$100 worth of insurance purchased for residential property. Nonresidential property insurance can be purchased for 40 cents per \$100 worth of insurance coverage.

Insurance covering contents of residential buildings can be purchased for 35 cents per \$100 worth of coverage while insurance covering contents of nonresidential buildings can be purchased for 75 cents per \$100 worth of coverage under the emergency program.

Limits under the emergency program are as follows: single family residential property, \$35,000; other residential property, \$100,000; non-residential property, \$100,000; contents for residential property per housing unit, \$10,000; contents for non-residential property per unit, \$100,000.

These limits are doubled under the regular program but the federal subsidy is available only for the emergency program limits. Should property owners want to purchase more than \$35,000 worth of insurance under the regular program once the city complies with it, he must pay the actuarial rates for the insurance.

No insurance policy under the program can be purchased for less than \$25 annually, according to the HUD publication.

The flood insurance policies contain a deductible clause of \$200 or two per cent of the loss, whichever is greater. The deduction is applicable "independently to structure and contents coverage," the HUD report states.

Townhouses or rowhouses are eligible for insurance coverage and are considered as single family units individually.

[From the *Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register*, Apr. 7, 1975]

#### FLOOD INSURANCE: PART II

SERIOUS DRAWBACKS IN FLOOD ACT REJECTION (By Kathy Showalter)

Home mortgages will be unavailable to approximately one-quarter of all Wheeling citizens if the city does not comply with the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973.

However, the federal government will have the power to dictate both building code and land usage controls for flood plain areas over local residents if it does comply with the program.

According to a series of questions and answers prepared by Housing and Urban Development authorities in March, "no federal or federally-related financial assistance may legally be provided for construction or acqui-

sition of buildings in the community's identified flood hazard areas" if Wheeling does not comply with the program.

According to HUD, "Such assistance will remain unavailable until the community has qualified. The financing of buildings outside these areas, however, is not affected."

According to the in-bank or savings and loan institution will require persons wanting mortgages for property within a flood plain to also purchase flood insurance for the amount of the mortgage or the amount available under the program, whichever is less.

If Wheeling does not comply with the program, the insurance would not be available.

By "federal or federally-related financial assistance," the program refers to "any direct federal financial assistance as grants. Small Business Administration, Farmers' Home Administration, Veterans' Administration and Federal Housing Administration mortgage loans, and conventional construction and mortgage loans from federally insured, regulated or supervised lending institutions."

These lending institutions include banks insured by the Federal Depositors' Insurance Corporation, savings and loan institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or regulated by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, credit unions insured by the National Credit Union Administration and banks regulated by the comptroller of Currency or the Federal Reserve Board.

"Flood insurance must be purchased as conditions of obtaining federal financial assistance for construction or acquisition of buildings in the identified special flood hazard areas of communities where flood insurance is available."

Persons who are buying a home through a bank or federal savings and loan mortgage must purchase insurance coverage "up to the amount of the financial assistance or the maximum amount of insurance available under the program, whichever is less."

Also affected by this tightening of federal assistance would be federal grants to the city should the grants help finance construction of a facility within a flood plain.

Although the negative sanctions regarding the financial assistance do not go into effect until the city passes the Dec. 13, 1975 deadline for complying with the program, some area banks and savings and loans institutions have already initiated a policy of denying mortgage loans for property within flood areas.

City officials have noted that the only means why which property could be purchased without the availability of the insurance if it was a cash transaction.

Should the city comply with the program, it will adopt two resolutions pledging to adopt land use and building code regulations as determined by the Federal Insurance Administration. FIA officials refer to these as "flood plain management" regulations.

According to HUD, flood plain management "means the operation of an overall program of corrective and preventive measures for reducing flood damage, including but not limited to, emergency preparedness plans and any regulations aimed at the future use of flood plains.

"Such regulations refer to specific local codes and ordinances which provide standards for the location and design of new development within flood-prone areas.

"These regulations may be adopted in any manner that is legally enforceable for a particular community and typically take the form of portions of zoning, subdivision or building regulations, or a special purpose ordinance such as a flood plain ordinance." Any city complying with the program must meet minimum standards set by the FIA.

These minimum flood plain management standards include requiring a community to issue building permits for all new construction and substantial improvements and re-

view the permits to assure that the sites are reasonably free from flooding.

"For its flood prone areas, the community must also require: 1) proper anchoring of structures, 2) the use of construction materials and methods that will minimize flood damage, 3) adequate drainage for new subdivisions and 4) that new replacement utility systems will be located and designed to preclude flood loss."

A community must also require all new construction to be built above the 100 year flood level or floodproofed to the "level of the base flood." Garages or basements cannot be constructed under the 100 year flood level.

The flood plain management regulations are not retroactive; they apply only to new housing or to existing housing that will be renovated to 50 per cent of its market value.

Should a home be destroyed by fire or any other method by 50 per cent of its market value, the owner will be required to rebuild the structure meeting the flood insurance standards.

Buildings cannot be constructed in a flood plain or flood way resulting in raising the water level by one foot after the city has complied with the program.

Additional regulations are expected to be developed as the flood program matures. Councilmen have noted that the federal government is requiring participation in the program before the cities know fully what the restrictions are.

"The Congress recognized that federal participation in the form of a subsidized insurance program alone would not discourage the continued unwise use of flood hazard areas and would result in an even greater expenditure of tax dollars to provide economic relief to innocent flood victims," the HUD report states.

"In fact, availability of inexpensive insurance with no flood plain management measures would encourage unwise construction in the nation's flood plains and thus risk life and property."

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register, April 8, 1975]

FLOOD INSURANCE: PART III  
ACCEPTANCE MAY BE ONLY CHOICE  
(By Kathy Showalter)

Like Wheeling City Council, residents protested the "mandatory" provisions of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 at a public hearing last week, but the general consensus was that the city may have no other choice but to comply with the program.

Councilmen now are saddled with the decision of whether early compliance with the regulations in the program will deter efforts by the city to have the mandatory provisions changed. The city can comply with the program as late as November to meet its Dec. 13, 1975 deadline.

Flood insurance in Wheeling could become available within one month's time after city council adopts two resolutions necessary for program participation. The resolutions pledge the city's interest in the program and that the city will comply with the regulations as directed by the Federal Insurance Administration.

These regulations are land use and building code restrictions for flood prone areas.

Planning Director Donald Reinke told residents at the public hearing last week that it may be a year or more before the "mandatory" provisions of the 1973 law be lifted. This assumes that a bill introduced by Congressman Robert Mollohan in the House of Representatives will be passed.

Councilmen and city officials have contacted Sen. Robert C. Byrd and met with Richard Crimm of the FIA in its attempts to make the program less restrictive. Proposed revisions to the regulations now being considered offers the City of Wheeling only partial relief.

One of the revisions would allow basements to be constructed under the 100 year

flood level only in communities who have applied to the FIA to be excluded from that law.

Additionally, because the federal government does not determine the "flood way," the flow of flood waters, until after a city complies with the program, new construction could be prohibited in areas designated as flood prone.

Any part of a flood prone area could be named as part of a flood way. Nothing can be constructed in a flood way area because of the possibility of the new construction raising the elevation of the 100-year flood level.

All of Wheeling Island and that portion of land in South Wheeling located west of Route 2 and south of Thirty-third streets is designated as flood prone.

Portions of Center Wheeling, East Wheeling, and Warwood where properties border the Ohio River are also flood prone. Properties bordering Wheeling Creek through East Wheeling and Leatherwood are also designated as flood prone areas.

A flood hazard boundary map is not available for the Elm Grove area. This area may be designated as flood prone at a later date or determined flood prone at the time the FIA undertakes its detailed study of the Wheeling area.

A representative of the FIA attending last week's public hearing said that the cities of Wheeling and Charleston were among the West Virginia cities to object to the program. Charleston has just recently entered it.

Among councilmen's concerns is that entering the program may appear to federal officials that the city has accepted it.

Councilmen have suggested that officials continue to contact congressmen in efforts to have the program made less restrictive.

DR. FRANK O'HARA OF UNIVERSITY OF SCRANTON HONORED FOR 50 YEARS SERVICE

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of the House a most remarkable man in the field of higher education, Dr. Frank O'Hara of the University of Scranton. Dr. O'Hara is one of those rare individuals who has become a legend in his own time. He is known to thousands of University of Scranton alumni and friends as "Mr. University." On April 19th he is being honored for 50 years of outstanding service to the University of Scranton, by the Washington University of Scranton Alumni Society. He truly deserves this honor.

Upon graduation in 1925, Dr. O'Hara was appointed registrar at the University. Over the years has served as faculty manager of athletics, instructor in Latin and history, assistant to the president, bursar, controller, secretary of the university, director of evening and summer sessions, coordinator of civilian pilot training program, chairman of athletic council, chairman of scholarship committee, director of alumni relations, and interregnum president during 1942.

He filled all these positions with great distinction. He often went beyond the expected. For example, he obtained a barber's license so he could operate a shop enabling needy students to cut hair

and earn a portion of their tuition during the Depression.

He obtained a pilot's license so he could become director of a civilian pilot training program which was critical to the university during the low student enrollment days during World War II. He founded the "Purple Club" to provide scholarship funds to needy students.

In 1969, the University of Scranton's Business Administration Department building was named "O'Hara Hall" in his honor.

Dr. O'Hara is the only person ever to have been elected an honorary member of the Lackawanna County Medical Society.

His interest in students is remarkable. He can recall almost any student who graduated from the university during his period of service.

Mr. Speaker, of Dr. O'Hara, truly, "No one will be able to catalog his achievements much less comprehend and fathom his lingering influence on lives today."

I extend my congratulations to Dr. O'Hara on the golden anniversary of his service to the University of Scranton.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following citation for Dr. O'Hara at this point in the RECORD:

CITATION FOR DR. O'HARA

(By G. S. Connors, President)

Faithfully faithful to every trust,  
Honestly honest in every deed,  
Righteously righteous and justly just  
This is the whole of the good man's creed.  
—Cardinal Newman.

The noble ideals expressed in these immortal words summarize the salient qualities of DR. FRANK O'HARA—ideals which have motivated him during his fifty years of dedicated and devoted service to his Alma Mater.

The test of a great man is his full commitment to tested human values. Likewise the test of a great educational administrator is his eagerness to sacrifice much so that dreams of a great institution of learning might become reality. With a special skill in human engineering, Dr. O'Hara has amply demonstrated that he is both a great man and a great administrator.

Rarely has one man filled with equal distinction so broad a range of roles in the service of one institution—scholar, teacher, registrar, faculty manager of athletics, director of alumni activities, aid to the president, inter-regnum president and many others.

Especially valued has been his unusual capacity to listen with compassion to the concerns of countless many young men in search of reasonable solutions to their problems. No one will be able to catalog his achievements much less comprehend and fathom his lingering influence on lives today.

For his depth of insight, for his courageous, kind and judicious judgment, and for his devotion to the values and power of education, the Washington, D.C. Chapter of the University of Scranton Alumni Society takes great pride in presenting to Dr. O'Hara this award for his distinguished service to our beloved Alma Mater.

SUPPLEMENTAL BENEFITS RUNNING OUT IN DETROIT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, while the rest of the country gradually succumbs

to the ever widening depression, Detroit leads the way, plunging headlong into the jaws of the unemployment monster that is consuming greater numbers of working people month after month. Automobile workers have been particularly hard hit. As of the week ending April 11, 1975, there were just under 216,000 laid-off auto workers around the country, more than one-fourth of the industry's labor force.

Throughout most of the present unemployment crisis, auto workers who have lost their jobs have had two types of unemployment benefits which enabled them to collect 95 percent of their regular take home pay. Besides the State administered unemployment compensation funds, these workers have also been receiving SUB funds—supplemental unemployment benefits—which they won at the bargaining tables as part of their union contracts in 1965. In many cases these supplementary payments have offered more relief than the unemployment compensation benefits. The presence of these funds has substantially cushioned the severity of the depression in the Detroit area.

All that is ready to change now. The first of these company funds, the Chrysler SUB fund, was exhausted as of the close of business on Friday, April 11. This means 42,200 Chrysler employees still on indefinite layoffs just lost half or more of their incomes. The same thing is about ready to happen to 70,000 unemployed GM workers on or before May 1. By the end of April, there will be 115,000 UAW-represented GM workers on open ended layoffs. Of these, 20,000 have already exhausted their SUB benefits and 25,000 others were not eligible in the first place because they had less than 1 year of seniority. GM has already paid a total of \$356 million in SUB benefits since January 1, 1974.

Due to the severity of the present slump in the automobile industry, Chrysler Corp. has announced plans to trim operations and personnel to the point where it can operate profitably in a 6 million car year. The company has already laid off over 40,000 blue-collar employees and 34 percent of its white-collar employees. UAW Vice President Douglas Fraser has termed these plans suicidal, indicating that Chrysler would permanently close not one but several of its plants and lay off thousands of hourly and salaried employees. According to Mr. Fraser, if the car market goes up to 8½ or 9 million vehicles a year, Chrysler would not have the capacity to regain its traditional share of the market.

Ford Motor Co. has also announced plans for cutbacks, although the company insists that it is not conducting a major housecleaning operation as is Chrysler, but rather is doing some necessary long-range planning. Presently, the company plans a reduction of several hundred white-collar jobs as well as reducing expenses in benefits programs.

A recent Michigan Employment Security Commission news release attributed a slight rise in the State employment level to the fact that nearly all the State's auto plants were in operation at least on a limited basis last month. Mr. Fraser mentioned at a news conference last

week, however, that the report was collected during the one week when all the plants happened to be operating.

The situation in Detroit has grown desperate and can only become worse with the exhaustion of the GM SUB funds. Immediate legislative action is needed on a variety of measures which have been pending in the Congress for some time. Without quick Federal intervention, it may be too late to ward off disaster for thousands of homeowners and heads of families who may stand in jeopardy of losing all that they have worked a lifetime to acquire.

The best response the Congress could make to the recurring cycles of exorbitant rates of unemployment would be the enactment of full employment legislation. The Equal Opportunity and Full Employment Act, which is presently before the Equal Opportunity Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, would guarantee a job to every unemployed worker who is unable to secure employment through conventional channels. Even if such a bill were to be enacted immediately, however, it could not be implemented fast enough to salvage the rapidly declining economic position of millions of unemployed workers and others who have been excluded from the labor force. There are other steps that the Congress must take in the meantime to ease the individual hardships and to restore some measure of confidence in the Federal Government's ability to deal with an economic crisis.

Earlier this week the House passed the Emergency Homeowners' Relief Act, H.R. 5398. The legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to make repayable emergency mortgage relief payments for homeowners who are 2 months or more delinquent in their mortgage payments due to loss of jobs or income. A maximum payment per homeowner of \$250 per month for 2 years would be allowed. I urgently hope that the Members of the Senate will give this legislation their swift attention and approval.

Another measure which would mitigate the effects of the depression is the Emergency Unemployment Health Benefits Act, H.R. 5000. Millions of unemployed workers have lost the health care benefits they had when employed; a serious illness or injury to themselves or to a member of their family could mean financial ruin. Under this legislation, the Labor Department would purchase the same benefits for unemployed workers that they had when they were last employed.

The measure would only cover persons who are concurrently eligible for unemployment compensation; further or amended legislation would be required to extend health care benefits to all unemployed workers. This, I believe, is another matter to which the Congress should give serious attention.

Legislation which would broaden the present system of unemployment compensation to include all unemployed workers and to extend benefits without an arbitrary cutoff date is also needed to ease the country through the current malaise. I am working on such legislation and urge the Members of the House

and Senate to give serious consideration to this type of measure.

It is time for the Congress to realize that the depression is on and that spreading a few more jobs or a few more dollars around the country via stopgap legislation will not lessen the suffering or the cynicism of people who need jobs and the assurance that their homes will not be taken from them or that a serious illness cannot impoverish them. Every day that we delay the enactment of some meaningful legislation compounds the desperation of the unemployed who find themselves squeezed tighter and tighter between the bill collector and inflation on the one hand and disappearing income on the other. I urge all my colleagues to give their fullest attention and to devote their undiluted energies to the enactment of the various pieces of legislation which will ease if not erase the hardships of individuals and their families during the present economic crisis.

A recent article by Peter Milius in the Washington Post depicts the plight of unemployed auto workers in Detroit as the SUB funds were beginning to expire. I wish to include it in the RECORD at this point:

**DETROIT DEPRESSION—LAYOFF BENEFITS  
RUNNING OUT**  
(By Peter Milius)

DETROIT.—Sometime in the next few days, a big bank account here called the Chrysler SUB fund will run out of money.

When that happens, laid-off autoworker Willie Houston will no longer be able to pay his bills.

The bills are not extravagant. "I got the bills I have to have," the 50-year-old Houston said—a mortgage payment of \$196 a month, \$50 for the furniture company, somewhere between \$60 and \$70 for light, heat and a telephone, then his family's food and clothing.

He has already been to the furniture company, and for now they told him just to pay whatever he can. He does not know what he is going to do about the mortgage. What Houston is faced with, he said simply, is "losing most of what I've got."

The bills were not a problem when Willie Houston was first laid off last November. His take-home income fell only \$12 a week, from about \$152 to about \$140.

The SUB fund was what kept him solvent. SUB stands for supplemental unemployment benefits. Regular unemployment benefits, the ones that come through the government, are less than half an auto worker's wages. The SUB funds, which the companies pay for, make up most of the difference.

Thus Houston, in addition to \$67 a week from the government, has been getting \$72.80 in SUB money.

Now, however, he will have only the \$67. That comes to a little less than \$300 a month. Take the mortgage and the utilities out of that, and Houston, who has a wife and a 4-month-old son, born about 10 days after he was laid off, may have \$50 left for food and whatever else he has to buy. Take out more for food and incidentals, and he will not have enough left for the mortgage and utilities.

The economists say the country is only in a recession. In Detroit, it is a depression.

The unemployment rate in the six-county Detroit area in February, the last month for which a metropolitan figure is available, was 16.2 per cent. That is nearly twice what the national rate was; it means that one willing worker out of every six was out of a job. In the city of Detroit itself, the figure was one of four; the rate was 23.2 per cent. Among auto workers, it was 24.9 per cent. At Chry-

ler, hardest hit of the big automakers, it was 50 per cent.

The SUB funds—all the auto companies have them; the United Auto Workers union won them at the bargaining table back in the 1950s—have shielded the area from the full force of these unemployment numbers.

The SUB funds, however, were not set up to cope with 25 or 50 per cent unemployment rates; they were set up only to tide workers over the normal weeks of idleness in every typical year.

Thus the Chrysler Corp. fund, which had \$82 million last fall, before the recession really hit, is now nearly empty. The Ford Motor Co. and American Motors funds are healthier; neither Ford nor American Motors has had to cut back as hard as Chrysler. But the General Motors fund will also be empty by June unless there is an upturn in auto sales and production of a size that few people here expect.

The Chrysler fund has been paying \$4 million to \$5 million a week to about 50,000 laid-off Chrysler blue-collar workers across the country, an estimated half of them in this metropolitan area alone.

When that money stops, the economy here will shrink still further. Instead of falling, the unemployment rate could rise.

Not every laid-off Chrysler worker is in the same straits as Willie Houston.

Gary Whyte, for example, has a newborn son, and all the bills Willie Houston has, including a \$170-a-month mortgage payment plus a \$100-a-month payment on his car. But Whyte, 28, has a working wife—she is a medical technician—and so the Whytes will make it. "I'll raise the baby and she'll go to work," he said.

For Roger Muehlbrandt, salvation is that he bought his home 10 years ago, when prices and interest rates were lower, so that his monthly payments are only \$109.

There are also Chrysler workers who have found other jobs, but they are rare.

The economy here is geared to the auto plants. When the auto companies shut down, so do their suppliers. New jobs are thus hard to find.

Of those that are available, many are low-paying. "A \$2 job won't do me any good," said Willie Houston. Two dollars an hour times 40 hours a week is \$80. Take income and Social Security taxes out of \$80, and Houston might as well keep drawing unemployment.

Finally, companies that do have jobs often ask for quitslips, meaning a worker must officially quit at Chrysler before they will hire him—and thus must forfeit his rung on the seniority ladder and his right to be called back if and when Chrysler resumes full production. And so far at least, almost everyone has allowed himself to think that sooner or later Chrysler will start up production again, if not this month then later this spring or perhaps this summer or this fall.

Whyte had heard about a possible job as a maintenance man at the hospital where his wife works. A journeyman machine repairman at Chrysler, he had not wanted to apply for it. "That's really going down," he said.

But now he is beginning to think he may never be called back at Chrysler. He has only two years' seniority—he started at Chrysler in 1972—"and they've laid off now back to 1965."

What next, then? No one really knows.

It mainly depends, of course, on how much and how fast auto demand and production revive. It is one of the ironies of the present situation that just two years ago the issue in Detroit was not the unemployment rate but compulsory overtime, which the UAW was trying to stop—not too little work, but too much.

Most economists do think there will be a revival of demand, before this year is up. How great a revival is another question altogether.

For the shorter run there is legislation pending in Congress to preserve at least the health and life insurance of laid-off workers. In the interim the UAW is negotiating with Chrysler to use a reserve SUB fund of about \$19 million to pay these insurance premiums for the next several months.

The theory is that months of insurance are worth more than a few weeks of full benefits, which is all the reserve fund would pay.

There is also legislation pending in Congress to protect laid-off workers from mortgage foreclosures.

Meanwhile, at least one saving and loan association, the First Federal, the largest in the area, has set up a system of its own.

It will lend its laid-off customers three months, worth of mortgage payments—make them new loans so they can keep paying off their old one.

So far, fewer than 100 homeowners have borrowed mortgage money this way. But now the SUB money has stopped flowing, and there may be more.

**HURTS RENT-A-GUN**

**HON. ABNER J. MIKVA**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, each year thousands of innocent people are killed and injured by handguns in this country. And each year the number of dead and injured is greater than the year before. In spite of overwhelming proof that handguns create violence, not prevent it, Congress has failed to enact any effective handgun control legislation. Because of this failure, an ever-increasing number of handguns are manufactured and sold in this country each year.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an Art Buchwald column which appeared in the Washington Post on August 17, 1972, in which Mr. Buchwald in his inimitable style carries the "handgun boom" to its inevitable conclusion:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 17, 1972]

**HURTS RENT-A-GUN**  
(By Art Buchwald)

The Senate recently passed a new gun-control bill, which some observers consider worse than no bill at all. Any serious attempt at handgun registration was gutted, and Senate gun lovers even managed to repeal a 1968 gun law controlling the purchase of .22 rimfire ammunition.

After the Senate got finished with its work on the gun-control bill, I received a telephone call from my friend Bromley Hurts, who told me he had a business proposition to discuss with me. I met him for lunch at a pistol range in Maryland.

"I think I've got a fantastic idea," he said. "I want to start a new business called Hurts Rent-A-Gun."

"What on earth for?" I asked. "There are a lot of people in this country who only use a handgun once or twice a year, and they don't want to go to all the expense of buying one. So we'll rent them a gun for a day or two. By leasing a firearm from us, they won't have to tie up all their money."

"That makes sense," I admitted. "Say a guy is away from home on a trip, and he doesn't want to carry his own gun with him. He can rent a gun from us and then return it when he's finished with his business."

"You could set up rent-a-gun counters at gas stations," I said excitedly.

"And we could have stores in town where someone could rent a gun to settle a bet," Hurts said.

"A lot of people would want to rent a gun for a domestic quarrel," I said.

"Right. Say a jealous husband suspects there is someone at home with his wife. He rents a pistol from us and tries to catch them in the act. If he discovers his wife is alone, he isn't out the eighty dollars it would have cost him to buy a gun."

"Don't forget about kids who want to play Russian roulette. They could pool their allowances and rent a gun for a couple of hours," I said.

"Our market surveys indicate," Hurts said, "that there are also a lot of kids who claim their parents don't listen to them. If they could rent a gun, they feel they could arrive at an understanding with their folks in no time."

"There's no end to the business," I said. "How would you charge for Hurts Rent-A-Gun?"

"There would be hourly rates, day rates, and weekly rates, plus ten cents for each bullet fired. Our guns would be the latest models, and we would guarantee clean barrels and the latest safety devices. If a gun malfunctions through no fault of the user, we will give him another gun absolutely free."

"For many Americans it's a dream come true," I said.

"We've also made it possible for people to return the gun in another town. For example, if you rent the gun in Chicago and want to use it in Salt Lake City, you can drop it off there at no extra charge."

"Why didn't you start this before?"

"We wanted to see what happened with the gun-control legislation. We were pretty sure the Senate and the White House would not do anything about strong gun control, especially during an election year. But we didn't want to invest a lot of money until we were certain they would all chicken out."

"I'd like the franchise for Washington's National Airport," I said.

"You've got it. It's a great location," Hurts said. "You'll make a fortune in hijackings alone."

#### LAND-USE LOBBYING EFFORT EXPOSED

### HON. MORRIS K. UDALL OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, 1975, the Miami Herald published a story by David Hess of the Knight newspapers entitled "The Land Lobby—We Are Creating the Will of the People Back Home." I urge all Members to read this article, for it is an excellent description of the kind of lobbying tactics that have been employed by special interests in both the 93d and 94th Congresses to defeat the land-use legislation.

It is regrettable that a hand full of special interests who have fought for so long to block progressive land-use legislation have taken it upon themselves to "create the will of the people"—to use their phrase. The tactics being employed are deplorable and, in my opinion, point to the real need for this Congress to take a hard look at our lobbying laws.

Apparently the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is once again part of this effort, and is disseminating totally inaccurate information about the bill to its membership. The chamber of commerce did not find it necessary to testify before my subcommittee to present any specific objec-

tions, yet the chamber is once again misleading its constituency about this legislation, referring to it in a recent newsletter as a "Federal zoning ordinance" which is being pressed by "an active band of no-growth environmentalists." I would simply point out to my colleagues that this band of "no-growth environmentalists" includes, among others, the Mortgage Bankers Association, the American Retail Federation, the International Council of Shopping Centers, the League of Women Voters, and the National Association of Industrial Parks.

I commend the article that follows to the Members' attention:

#### THE LAND LOBBY—"WE ARE CREATING THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE BACK HOME"

(By David Hess)

WASHINGTON.—Opponents of federal land-use legislation have targeted 10 members of the House Interior Committee for a sophisticated lobbying drive designed to kill the land-use bill before it reaches the House floor.

The lobbying campaign is a classic example of the way special interests band together temporarily in a common effort to exert pressure on "vulnerable" lawmakers who face tough opposition in their home districts or are slow to make up their minds on crucial issues.

Led by Rep. Sam Steiger (R., Ariz.) and former GOP Congressman Dan Kuykendall of Tennessee, the lobby will feature such tactics as using the list of election contributors to bring pressure on the targeted congressmen—a tactic one committee member called "unethical."

One trade association source said the lobbying campaign will be designed "to make it appear that there is grass-roots support back in the home districts for defeat of the land-use bill."

As Kuykendall remarked during a meeting of the land-use opponents: "We are creating the will of the people back home."

Steiger and Kuykendall are moving now to forge a coalition of realtors, developers, craft unionists, cattlemen, businessmen, building suppliers, homebuilders and others to put pressure on the 10 congressmen where it hurts most—back in their home districts. A similar coalition was put together last year by Steiger and others who, with White House support, managed to defeat a land-use bill in the House by seven votes.

Interior Secretary Rogers Morton told Congress on March 18 that the administration again would oppose such legislation.

The "targeted" congressmen, who Steiger believes are straddling the fence and can be pushed either way, include Committee Chairman James Haley (D., Fla.), Philip E. Ruppe (R., Mich.), Roy Taylor (D., N.C.), Teno Roncalio (D., Wyo.), Jim Santini (D., Nev.), Allan Howe (D., Utah), James Weaver (D., Oreg.), Manuel Lujan (R., N. Mex.), Don H. Clausen (R., Calif.) and Jaime Benitez (D., P.R.).

By Steiger's count, 18 members of the 43-member Interior Committee are against or "leaning" against the land-use bill; 15 are for it. That means the 10 "undecided" are pivotal in the battle to get a bill to the floor.

According to Steiger and several other persons who attended a meeting in the Capitol called by the Arizona about two weeks ago, the lobbying campaign will consist of three major elements:

The basic strategy will be designed to stop the bill in the Interior Committee and prevent it from getting to the House floor. "Very candidly," Steiger said, "we're going to try to beat it there. If it gets out to the floor, we're in trouble."

National trade associations opposed to the bill will be urged to encourage their state and local affiliates in the targeted congressmen's home districts to write, telephone and

buttonhole the lawmakers, asking them to vote against the bill in committee.

Kuykendall—along with former GOP Congressman David Towell of Nevada and San Antonio, Tex., lawyer Ben Wallis—will coordinate the coalition's efforts and recommend lobbying techniques to the state and local groups and individuals opposed to the bill.

Kuykendall said he already has been soliciting money from the interest groups to finance the campaign.

Each targeted congressman's published list of 1974 election campaign contributors will be carefully screened by Kuykendall and Steiger to determine whether any of the contributors "are inclined to oppose" land-use legislation, according to Steiger.

"That was my suggestion," Steiger said, "that we look at those lists and enlist the contributors in contacting committee members."

When it was suggested that this kind of lobbying might offend some of the targeted congressmen and backfire on him, Steiger chuckled:

"I've never been noted for my popularity . . . Anyway, I don't think it'll offend them. I have a theory that if you don't do this surreptitiously, you don't make people mad."

Interior Chairman Haley, however, scorned this strategy and said, "These lobbyists are way out of line if they start doing that, even before they see what kind of bill the subcommittee reports . . . You know, as a general rule, when people start turning up the heat on me, I start getting as stubborn as a Missouri mule."

Another targeted committee member, Ruppe of Michigan, who says he has not yet decided whether he will support a land-use bill, fumed: "It's quite unethical for one congressman to suggest specific tactics that might be employed to change the vote of one of his colleagues—especially a colleague of one's own party."

An Interior subcommittee is now drafting a land-use bill, using Rep. Morris Udall's (D., Ariz.) proposal as a starting point.

The Udall bill would provide \$515 million in federal grants to states over a six-year period to set up state land-use planning agencies and advisory committees.

The bill is designed to encourage the states to limit unfettered residential, industrial, commercial and public development projects and require all developers to adhere to certain basic environmental principles.

"Somewhere along the line, we're gonna have to stop people from absolutely destroying and rapin' the land," Haley, a cigar-smoking Southerner, huffed.

"Land-use planning by the states is a decided departure from the tradition of letting land owners use their land any way they please, but the time has come to start conserving some of our land heritage for future generations."

Steiger and his allies see the Udall bill as a "federal monster" intended to "superimpose the judgment of Washington bureaucrats on decisions about land which they are not competent to make."

Though the lobbying drive itself has not been cranked up, the plan to put the coalition together was hatched last December when Steiger called on Kuykendall—who was defeated for reelection in November—to "feel out" the various interests opposed to land use.

Kuykendall said he contacted friends in the National Chamber of Commerce here, who told him they thought it "worth the effort" to form a coalition of opponents to the bill.

In January, Kuykendall said, he met with about 30 or 40 persons—mostly cattle ranchers, building contractors and developers—in San Antonio, and raised some "seed money" to finance a "feasibility study" to find out whether it was possible to put the coalition together.

"They gave me a 60-day deadline, ending April 1," Kuykendall said.

The Tennessean then brought Towell and Wallis aboard to contact state and local trade associations around the country.

One prominent homebuilders' representative complained that these contacts had "some of the earmarks of a shakedown" as Kuykendall's associates sought money to finance the lobbying campaign.

Kuykendall, however, complaining that the land-use opponents are dragging their feet, said: "I've got a bunch of yesses on going ahead with the lobbying campaign, but no money from them yet."

He said it would cost about \$75,000 to retain his firm, DK Consultants to coordinate the drive.

Environmentalists in support of the Udall bill complained last week that Kuykendall is engineering the lobbying campaign but has failed to register as a lobbyist, as the law requires.

David Calfee of the Environmental Policy Center said, "It appears to me that Mr. Kuykendall is winking his eye at the law."

But Kuykendall, quite sensitive to such charges, insisted that his efforts so far have been confined to "the feasibility study in order to find out whether the sentiment for a campaign exists. I have not lobbied anyone and neither has any of my potential clients."

A Common Cause expert on lobbying laws tended to agree with Kuykendall, and referred to a 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision which indicated that lobbying does not begin until actual congressional contacts are made.

"Certainly, by the spirit of the law, he probably should have registered," the Common Cause expert said, "but by the letter of the law he is technically exempt—at least until the actual lobbying begins."

Kuykendall said he will "definitely register" when the members of the anti-land-use coalition start bending their congressmen's ears.

The squabble over the lobby registration issue is symptomatic of the bitter struggle between the land-preservers and the land-developers.

"Our final goal is to bury land-use planning on the federal level once and for all," Steiger told the gathering of trade associations and other interests at his Capitol Hill meeting.

"Anytime the Feds can make a qualitative judgment, they'll start dictating to the states."

If the national associations are reluctant to make a public commitment in opposition to the legislation, Steiger implored them, "stay neutral" until after the Interior Committee votes on the bill.

Some groups, including the realtors and homebuilders, also were advised to "lie low" if they chose at the national level—but not to discourage their local affiliates from joining the campaign against the bill.

Steiger argues that the struggle is mainly a philosophical debate over the "proper role of the federal government" in the development of land.

But the environmentalists and their allies insist that the "special interests" are worried about their economic welfare.

"For a long, long time," Calfee said, "These guys have controlled the local zoning boards and have gotten their way. They don't want to change that."

FLIGHT MAGAZINE COMMENTS OF  
FAA

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, on a field inspection of the Dallas/Fort Worth

Airport facilities lately, the Aviation Subcommittee of the Public Works and Transportation Committee had an opportunity to meet George E. Haddaway, the popular and gutsy publisher of Flight Magazine.

I am happy to insert his editorial "Is There a Doctor in the House" in the RECORD, in the hope that a few Members of the House might just follow its suggestions. The editorial follows:

IS THERE A DOCTOR IN THE HOUSE?

(By George E. Haddaway)

One of the most damning indictments of a federal agency in recent years is a subcommittee report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, published last December right after the TWA approach crash near Washington's Dulles Airport. The title: "Air Safety—Selected Review of FAA Performance."

Here's a quote from the report's foreword: "It has been noted before that regulatory agencies, like people, sometimes suffer from hardening of the arteries with advancing age. Symptoms of such a process have been noted within the FAA. Administrative delay and inactivity are bad in any agency; in the case of the FAA, [these policies] may literally endanger human life. Instances of completely inappropriate bureaucratic slowness to act, and inaction, are noted throughout this report."

While most of the committee's work concerned scheduled air transport safety matters, with much emphasis on the need for mandatory ground proximity warning systems (GPWS) and on the seriousness of controlled flight into terrain (CFIT) accidents (which account for 50 percent or more of all accidents), the main thrust of this special subcommittee report emerges as the sad state we're in as far as all aviation safety and regulatory procedures are concerned.

Few people will read or digest this indictment of the agency charged with the responsibility of fostering aviation safety. But many are today following and will continue to follow with deep interest the current National Transportation Safety Board's official public hearings on the December TWA crash during a below-minimums approach to Dulles. Our own reaction from these hearings is mixed with both horror and incredulosity.

The burr-passing going on between spokesmen for the airline pilots and spokesmen for the controllers should shake us all violently out of our complacent seats and into the rude awakening that there's something rotten within our systems and within some of the men who operate them, both on the ground and in the air.

Diagnosing the basic disease affecting air safety policies, procedures and regulations is a toughie because it involves so many complex factors—slavery to outmoded methodology and systems, conflicting interests (both political and economic), and even a wide diversity of honest opinions from competent and dedicated people.

We do know that there's growing evidence the shotgun marriage of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Department of Transportation has created a disaster that only a shotgun divorce can correct because no matter who the changing politicians put in charge of these affairs, qualifications for the jobs are rarely considered. DOT Secretary Claude Brinegar, now retiring in his own wake of calamitous aviation policy, probably will be replaced by a Philadelphia lawyer, one William Coleman, whose main claim to fame in transportation experiences was during the "freedom rider" days! Lord only knows who'll replace ex-Air Force Colonel Alexander P. Butterfield as head of FAA. All that outfit needs now to self-destruct is more lawyers, or shirrtail military men.

We desperately need a cleaning out at the

top and more power in the hands of technically qualified men.

Next, while we have no built-in prejudices regarding labor unions and many of their causes, the unionized controllers and the unionized airline pilots have been acting lately more like some of their more radical rag-tag union brethren who have relegated public interest into non-existence while their union "rights" become paramount, all in an atmosphere of arrogance, total self-interest and, worst of all, bad faith. There is a pitiful lack of dedicated professionalism and statesmanship in an area of human endeavor demanding both these attributes, with out which safety goes down the drain.

As far as the aviation industry itself is concerned, many non-technical observers would heap a lot of blame on its shoulders. But most of the hard evidence reveals that civil aviation has been victimized, hamstrung and confused for years by proliferating bureaucracy run by unqualified mental pygmies who come and go with the political winds. If industry should share some of the blame for our Federal aviation policies it would be for not driving hard enough in trying to correct basic organizational faults or by the tolerating too long the worn out regulatory system that's still geared to the tube and rag days.

We must develop up-to-date procedures and policies now and not wait until a tragedy strikes to initiate change or corrective action.

This industry has never been so rich in technical knowledge and engineering genius as it is today. And we think it should be out of this wealthy bank of human expertise the nucleus for a revolutionary overhaul of our regulatory agencies must come, and it must come quickly.

The aviation safety matters now getting the limelight are merely symptoms of the disease that inspired a congressional committee to compare it with hardening of the arteries. It goes much deeper than that, and requires radical surgery beginning with cutting the infected umbilical cord between FAA and DOT, the appointment of qualified men to high office rather than political quacks, and active participation with all the technical and administrative skills that we can possibly muster. It will take this to lift our Federal agencies into the jet age, which "even more than the sea is terribly unforgiving of carelessness, incompetency or neglect."

STANLEY K. HATHAWAY FOR U.S.  
INTERIOR SECRETARY

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, criticism of the nomination of Wyoming's Stanley K. Hathaway for U.S. Interior Secretary is continuing to mount throughout the Western States. The most recent organization to express strong disapproval is the Denver-based Colorado Open Space Council, a statewide environmental coordinating group whose member organizations number 30,000 people. COSC's board of directors voted unanimously to oppose the Hathaway nomination on the basis of the former Wyoming Governor's aggressive and often pro-hasty development stance—the hallmark of his 8 years in office from 1967 to 1975.

On the basis of Mr. Hathaway's record, I cannot support his nomination to this vital post. In this regard, I would like to insert a release of the Colorado Open Space Council detailing Mr. Hathaway's

record during his years as Governor of Wyoming in several important environmental areas:

#### EAGLE SHOOTING

In 1968, 1969, and 1970, Hathaway petitioned the Interior Department for blanket eagle-shooting permits in up to 14 of Wyoming's 23 counties. The purpose of these open seasons, some as long as 5 months, was to combat alleged predation on sheep.

#### PREDATOR POISONING

In 1973, Hathaway's office testified for open use of sodium cyanide, strychnine, and the deadly and persistent "1080" sodium monofluoroacetate—to kill predators on public lands—both those administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service. In 1974, Hathaway's State filed suits against the Interior Department and the Environmental Protection Agency alleging their failure to control predators.

#### ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

Throughout his two terms, Hathaway has been a strong partisan of rapid energy development in the Western States generally and Wyoming in particular. He has opposed the Interior Department's moratorium on coal leasing, given the green light to the leasing of Wyoming's State lands coal, criticized Interior's prototype oil shale leasing program for being too slow—1973; defended the oil depletion allowance—1974; defied former President Nixon's recommended 50-miles per-hour speed limit—1973; opposed a 3-percent minerals severance tax in Wyoming—1973; and repeatedly praised his State's weak mined land reclamation law.

#### TIMBERING IN THE NATIONAL FORESTS

In 1971, Hathaway openly opposed a possible Federal moratorium on clear-cutting national forest timber while the practice was studied. During his two terms, he was a steady ally of the timber industry, defending them against their critics, and pushing for increased logging in the Shoshone, Bridger, and Teton National Forests. He also tried, unsuccessfully, to lure a pulp mill to his State.

#### WILDERNESS

In the late 1960's, Hathaway opposed any expansion of the Washakie Wilderness near Dubois, Wyo. In 1969, he assailed then U.S. Forest Service Chief, Edward Cliff, asking:

When are you going to stop looking for new wilderness areas. You could turn my whole state into a wilderness and then nobody could make a living.

He has consistently fought wilderness designation, and labeled those who disagree "extreme conservationists who would fence the entire state."

#### NATIONAL PARK DEVELOPMENT

At hearings in 1973, Hathaway reaffirmed his long standing support of an enlarged jetport within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park. He has also pushed for the increased commercialization of Yellowstone National Park.

#### CLEAN AIR

In 1970, Hathaway tried to undermine Wyoming's Clean Air Act by inserting loopholes which would grant variances to new firms locating in Wyoming, and to

any industry locating in an area of low population, meaning most of his State.

#### PUBLIC LANDS

In 1972, Hathaway urged that certain public lands administered by the Interior Department's Bureau of Land Management should be sold to private enterprise for development.

#### WATER DEVELOPMENT

In 1971, Hathaway authored legislation which would have enabled dams on the Upper Green River near Pinedale, Wyo., and piped their water a considerable distance eastward across the Continental Divide. This river has been proposed for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Hathaway has also pushed other water projects in his State, especially those which would aid energy development.

#### GROWTH

Hathaway has repeatedly stumped for growth throughout both his administrations. He criticized a Wall Street Journal article extolling his State's wide-open spaces; he has praised new industries for bringing more people into Wyoming; and he has attacked concern for liberalized abortion laws as a gesture of the ecological fringe.

It is because of this consistent and pervasive record, and because of Hathaway's persistent labeling of all conservation-minded citizens who opposed his views as radicals, extremists, and newcomers who "don't know anything about Wyoming" that I feel he is an unsuitable candidate. The Interior Department is charged with managing the National Park Service, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Land Management, the Federal rare and endangered species program, all National, Wildlife Refuges and Game Ranges, the Outer Continental Shelf oil leasing program, the Bureau of Reclamation—the agency responsible for building most Western dam and water projects—major portions of the National Wilderness Preservation System and the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and the bulk of energy development programs in the Western States—including oil, gas, coal, and oil shale. Interior is also the agency primarily responsible for the fate of 80 million acres in Alaska now under consideration for national parks, monuments, and wildlife refuges. To put these bureaus, programs, and services under Mr. Hathaway's direction would be to seriously jeopardize the environmental progress that has been made thus far.

#### ARIZONA RESCUE TEAM DEMONSTRATES AMERICAN COURAGE

### HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Old West was characterized by rugged, self-reliant individuals noted for their willingness to help a friend or a stranger in need and not to give up until the mission was accomplished or all hope of success had vanished. And then they took the bit in their teeth and gave it

another try. I am proud to say that that spirit prevails today in the modern West. It was demonstrated again a few days ago in Yavapai County, Ariz., my home county, and a young lad lost in a rocky, snow-bound canyon literally owes his life to a volunteer rescue team from Prescott.

The Yavapai County Search and Rescue Team, headed by Mr. Jimbo Buickerood, is made up of 11 students, including 6 women from the Prescott College for Alternative Education. None of the members knew John Pellanich, who had become separated from companions on a hiking trip and who had spent 2 days alone without food or warm clothing after an unseasonal storm dumped heavy snow in the mountainous area. They did know, however, that unless they made a final, successful effort the teenager most surely would be doomed. Their efforts paid off.

The story of Jimbo Buickerood and his volunteer search and rescue team was told by Mr. Ken Wayman in the Arizona Republic and it is an inspiring story, which I want to share with my colleagues. Mr. Wayman's article follows:

"LAST LOOK" BY SEARCHERS SAVES LIFE OF CANYON HIKER

(By Ken Wayman)

PRESCOTT.—A final look into a remote canyon area by the Yavapai County Search and Rescue Team, minutes before the search was to be called off Tuesday, saved the life of John Pellanich.

Pellanich, 17-year-old Moon Valley High School senior, was discovered when the rescue team took one last look down into rugged Gap Creek Canyon in the Verde Rim County, 25 miles northwest of Cordes Junction.

Pellanich, of 3216 W. Crocus Drive, Phoenix, son of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Pellanich, was found by Jimbo Buickerood, team leader of the rescue unit. The unit is composed of 11 students, including six women from the Prescott College for Alternative Education.

Pellanich was reported Wednesday afternoon to be in stable condition in the intensive care unit at St. Joseph's Hospital in Phoenix. He was suffering from possible frostbite and other complications.

Pellanich was found only 30 minutes before the search was to be called off until deep snow in the area melted. The search for the youth began late Sunday after he was reported missing by two companions near Tule Mountain. Pellanich, an inexperienced hiker, wore only a sweatshirt, levis and tennis shoes and had no food or matches.

The decision to end the search by sundown had already been made, according to Yavapai County Sheriff's Lt. E. J. Smith. He said it seemed useless to continue searching in the deep snow after up to 40 rescuers looking for two days failed to turn up any trace of the youth.

Smith and other searchers agreed Wednesday that Pellanich could not have survived until the time the search was to have resumed.

Buickerood said he found Pellanich after hearing the youth weakly call for help.

Although Pellanich could talk, he was too weak to move from a ledge area into the open. He told his rescuers he twice saw a helicopter flying through the canyon at low levels Tuesday afternoon, but he was unable to move to the open so that he could be seen.

While Buickerood and other team members were helping Pellanich, the youth told them he had been thinking a lot about dying.

"I was sure I was going to die," Buickerood quoted Pellanich as saying.

The rescue team members and three other searchers worked about an hour administer-



ing to Pellanich on the canyon floor. They built a fire to get him warm, dressed him in heavy clothing and fed him some honey and hot chocolate.

Pellanich was then placed inside a sleeping bag to make a stretcher of sorts. It took rescuers more than two hours to relay Pellanich about 1,000 feet up the steep canyon wall, Buickerood said.

Other rescuers were already at work at the top of the canyon clearing an area in the snow for a Department of Public Safety helicopter to land in the dark to pick up Pellanich and fly him to St. Joseph's Hospital in Phoenix.

Pellanich became separated from his companions, George Sharp, 17, 3402 W. Corrine Drive, Phoenix, and Kelly Osborne, 18, 6500 W. Glendale, Glendale, in mid-afternoon Sunday.

Pellanich told Buickerood he tried to find his way to a cabin at the top of the rim but failed when he missed a trail.

He said he spent Sunday night under a bush while up to 18 inches of snow fell in the area. When he became weak Monday and still could not find his way to the cabin, he holed up on the cliff side of Gap Creek.

LEGISLATION DRAFTED BY A  
CONSTITUENT

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Thomas James Dougherty, of Quincy, Mass., is an outstanding scholar in both the fields of law and economics. Mr. Dougherty will soon earn a Ph. D. degree in economics, as well as a J.D. degree in law from Harvard. He is currently a staff member of the Harvard Journal on Legislation where he has combined his talents to undertake a thorough study of the wage and price control issue.

As a result of that study, he has drafted proposed legislation in this area, and has asked that I share his proposals with my colleagues here in the Congress. I am more than happy to comply with his request. I hope that all of my colleagues will take the time to read Mr. Dougherty's proposal, and of course, I would welcome any comments which they might wish to make with regard to it.

A copy of the legislation drafted by Mr. Dougherty follows:

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A bill to amend the Council on Wage and Price Stability Act (Pub. L. No. 93-387, 88 Stat. 750, 12 U.S.C.A., § 1904, August 24, 1974) to provide continuous stand-by authority for a sectoral approach to wage and price stability and provide the Council with expanded powers and staff with which to implement the approach

MAIN FEATURES OF THIS BILL

This Bill establishes a new approach to the problem of controlling inflation. It recognizes that response to inflationary signals must be tempered by an appreciation of the different economic and social contexts within which they arise. It eschews the macro-approach of a universal wage/price freeze, with the attendant bureaucracy that would be needed to administer it, in favor of an approach characterized by flexibility and sectoral specificity, directed by Congressional guidelines and oversight, and implemented by a relatively small knowledgeable staff. The hallmark of the Bill is its provision for *continuous stand-by authority* under which

direct controls within a tailored regulation program can be imposed quickly and removed as soon as can be done safely. The Bill authorizes invocation of stronger control powers only after certification that a sector is an "inflationary sector." It sets out standards for certification on both the wage and price sides. Clear guidelines establishing criteria to which the sector should conform before controls will be lifted will reduce uncertainty, stabilize business expectations and facilitate an even-handed program.

This Bill charges the Council on Wage and Price Stability with the job of controlling inflation. It gives the Council a range of policy tools for dealing with inflation; these include: certification that an industry is a "subject of concern," negotiation with industry representatives, the power to hold hearings and subpoena witnesses, to suspend wage or price increases pending the hearings and/or for 90 days thereafter, to impose full wage and price controls on a sector by sector basis for a limited time, and to retain price control on an industry with market power. Non wage income is subject to control. Pay increases that are justified by productivity increases in one sector but are unjustified in another will be permitted in the former but not in the latter. Price increases that reflect market power rather than competitive processes will be disallowed. The federal government's role as purchaser of goods and services is coordinated with Council policy.

The effect of the Korean Economic Controls Scheme was weakened because there was a five month delay from the point when the need for controls was recognized by Congress to the point when they were used. In 1971, recruitment, training and job design for Phase II Pay Board staff had to take place while the Board wrestled with a rising backlog of tough cases. (See "Phase II Wage Controls" by Daniel J. B. Mitchell in *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 27, No. 3, April 1974, pp. 351, 359, reprinted by Brookings Institution as General Series Reprint 293, August 1974.) Even if public opinion is today divided about whether a permanent bureaucracy for pay and price controls should be established, stand-by authority for selective controls of increasing strength and limited duration should be created to minimize the harm of a long lag between renewed inflation and governmental response. A caveat to this, however, is that premature governmental action could be more disruptive than beneficial. This Bill meets both these problems first by acting early, while economic recession has checked inflation at the cost of high unemployment and loss of output and before the stimulus of monetary and fiscal policy (particularly the tax cut recently passed) have taken effect, and second by providing that the Council cannot fully control pay and prices in a sector unless and until inflation there exceeds a threshold level. [An economic controls program can take at least three alternative approaches to the controversial question of how income differentials are to be treated: it can say nothing; it can freeze differentials or prohibit their alteration except as the incidental and unavoidable side effect of the control program; it can expressly adjust them according to some norm. Each of these alternatives is stated in the Bill. See Sec. 10. The choice among them is political.

This *Journal* recommends that the third alternative, the most radical, be adopted. The first alternative would not give a clear mandate to the Council and is the least democratic in that either the Council or the courts would exercise maximum discretion in construing the Bill toward the second or third alternatives. If that discretion is not exercised explicitly the result could be *ad hoc*, haphazard, or inarticulated and thus unsupervised. The second alternative, on the other hand, does not recognize that controls could strengthen the advantages of the economically organized and powerful. The

third approach recognizes that the logical implication of controls is that we drop the pretense that compensation is established by the market. It recognizes that compensation is the product of human agency, that power is decisive in determining who gets how much. That is, a just price theory is implicit, therefore articulate it and subject it openly to the political process.]

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) section 2(d) of the Council on Wage and Price Stability Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Director of the Council may employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, including attorneys, as are necessary to perform the functions of the Council at rates not to exceed the highest rate for grade 15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code. Except that the Director, with the approval of the Chairman may, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code [Title 5, Government Organization and Employees] relating to appointments in the competitive service, appoint and fix the compensation of not to exceed fifty positions at the rates provided for grades 16, 17, and 18 of such General Schedule, to carry out the functions of the Council."

(b) Section (3) of the Council on Wage and Price Stability Act is amended by deleting section 3(b), by striking out "(a)" so that the first line reads "Sec. 3 The Council shall—", by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (6), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting a semicolon in lieu thereof, by relabeling paragraphs "(1)" through "(7)" as paragraphs "(a)" through "(g)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(h) have the authority to promulgate, by rule, for each sector of the economy, guidelines for noninflationary price and wage adjustments;

"(i) have the authority to promulgate, by rule, reporting requirements which direct persons to give prior, written notice to the Council of all price and wage increases;

"(j) have the authority to prohibit any person which the Council finds violating its price guidelines from obtaining any contract during the one-year period commencing on the date of such finding to provide goods or services to any agency or instrumentality of the United States;

"(k) have the authority to suspend any wage or price increase for a period of ninety calendar days or for a longer period not to exceed ninety calendar days from the end of a hearing held to consider evidence regarding the increases in question, provided that hearing is conducted without undue delay;

"(l) have the authority to retain full wage and/or price control on a sector only after certifying that the sector is a 'subject of concern as an inflationary sector' as provided in Section 5.

"(c) Section 4 of the Council on Wage and Price Stability Act is relabeled "Sec. 7", Sections 5, 6 and 7 of the Council on Wage and Price Stability Act, are struck and new sections are inserted before "Sec. 7" [Sec. 4 of the unamended Act] as follows:

"Sec. 4. (a) The Council may for the purpose of carrying out this Act hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Council may deem advisable. The Council may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

"(b) When so authorized by the Council, any member or agent of the Council, may take any action which the Council is authorized to take by this subsection.

"(c) The Council shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and

testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence necessary or proper to carry out this Act. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing with the United States.

"(d) If a person issued a subpoena under paragraph (c) refuses to obey such subpoena or is guilty of contumacy, any court of the United States within the judicial district within which the hearing is conducted or within the judicial district within which such person is found or resides or transacts business may (upon application by the Council) order such person to appear before the Council to produce evidence or to give testimony touching the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"(e) The subpoenas of the Council shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas issued by a United States district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States district courts.

"(f) All process of any court to which application may be made under this section may be served in the judicial district wherein the person required to be served resides or may be found.

"Sec. 5(a) The Council shall have the authority to certify that a sector is a 'subject of concern as an inflationary sector' upon determining at a hearing, held pursuant to Section 4, and held for this purpose, that

"(1) wage settlements are out of line with those of other sectors considering comparable work in other sectors, unemployment, demand for products and other factors normally taken into account in collective bargaining, or that

"(2) price rises are greater than needed to call forth long run supply (regardless of immediate costs) or do not otherwise reflect competitive processes, or reflect market power or excess profits in a concentrated industry.

"(b) Wage and price certifications in a given sector under Section 5(a) shall be coordinated by the Council, but the Council shall not be constrained to define each sector for wage purposes as identical to a sector for price purposes (i.e., wage sectors and price sectors must overlap but need not be perfectly congruent).

"Sec. 6(a) Pursuant to Sections 3(1), 4 and 5 the Council shall have the power to control wage increases and to issue recommendations as to the terms of labor disputes which are referred to it by the disputing parties or by the President. To this end, it shall establish and act through tripartite boards composed of an equal number of representatives chosen from labor, industry and the public. These wage boards shall be responsible both for dispute settlement, including enforcement of settlement decrees, and for stabilizing the wage level.

"(b) The wage boards shall be directly responsible to the Director of the Council who shall coordinate wage board policy with price control policy and establish liaison between wage and price control personnel.

"(c) The Council shall remove controls imposed on a sector when it determines that the sector no longer meets the criteria which brought it within Section 5(a) unless there exist good reasons to retain controls, such as other Section 5(a) criteria, or the need for:

"(1) completion of economic shifts required by the new situation;

"(2) psychological adjustment of the community to the new situation;

"(3) adoption of ancillary fiscal or monetary measures.

(d) The following sections are added to the Council on Wage and Price Stability Act:

"Sec. 8. The Council shall report to the President and through him to the Joint

Economic Committee of the Congress which shall oversee its activities. The Joint Economic Committee shall review the activities of the Council each year and make a recommendation to the Congress regarding the Council's program for the forthcoming year. The Joint Economic Committee's recommendation shall be voted on by the House and Senate without amendment.

"Sec. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

[Three alternative approaches to the issue of whether the Council ought to concern itself directly with income differentials are presented. This *Journal* recommends the third approach.]

(a) [Say nothing at all.]

(b) "Sec. 10. Nothing in this Act authorizes the Council to narrow existing wage or income differentials, except that it is recognized that the unavoidable effect of controlling pay or price increases in different cases may be to alter these differentials."

(c) "Sec. 10. Wage controls should not freeze wage or income differentials. In determining allowable wage increases the Council should follow these guidelines:

(1) Sectors that have not yet regained lost parity with other sectors after the last inflationary period should be allowed to catch up; (2) Lower wage sectors should be allowed to catch up with comparable higher wage sectors; (3) Within a given sector, allowable increases should decrease (ultimately to zero) at higher levels of pay."

#### TRIBUTE TO DOUG HOLSCRAW

#### HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1975

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, when I was a freshman senator in the Arizona State Legislature in 1961, one of the stalwarts of the house of representatives was Mr. Douglas Holsclaw of Tucson, at that time a veteran of many years of lawmaking. Mr. Holsclaw moved over to the State senate in 1967 and served with distinction through 1974.

On April 12, Mr. Holsclaw was honored by the Arizona Recovery Centers for his many years of civic work in the field of alcoholic rehabilitation. Mr. Bernie Wynn, widely read and highly respected political columnist for the Arizona Republic has written a fine tribute to Mr. Holsclaw, which I want to bring to my colleagues' attention. Mr. Wynn's article follows:

HOME FOLKS FORGOT LEGISLATOR'S RECORD  
(By Bernie Wynn)

Former Sen. Douglas Holsclaw, 75-year-old Tucson Republican, is proof that the home folks don't really pay close attention to a legislator's record of good deeds.

When a lawmaker is defeated for reelection it usually is because he committed a gross no-no, or he was the victim of a political trend that reacts automatically against the

It was the latter case that last November incumbent.

ended the 22-year career of Holsclaw, who began his record (GOP) legislative service in the House in 1952.

Down in District 12 in Tucson, Holsclaw's constituents dumped him and elected Mrs. Sue Dye, a Democrat.

Without disparaging Mrs. Dye, who appears to be a responsible person doing a conscientious job, it still remains a fact that Holsclaw was recognized in Phoenix as an out-

standing legislator. But not in his home district.

On April 12, the Arizona Recovery Centers, an umbrella agency for 18 alcoholic rehabilitation homes, will present Holsclaw with its annual award for his pioneering work in the field of alcoholism treatment.

The banquet, expected to attract 500 citizens to honor the veteran legislator, will be in the Thunderbird Room of Hotel Westward Ho.

It will be one of many awards Holsclaw has received in recent years for his humanitarian deeds and consistent championship of the underdog.

Holsclaw is deceptive in appearance, frail of figure, mild of manner, bordering on meekness, with snow white hair and a shy grin. He doesn't look like a fighter.

Ben Avery, the Arizona Republic's retired outdoor editor, once described Holsclaw as "the gray fox."

But I've seen him more as a spiritual bulldog, one who clamps his jaws on a target and never lets go until his mission is completed.

Back in 1954, The Republic's former political writer, Arren Beaty, polled the newly elected lawmakers just before the 22nd legislature convened.

Holsclaw, completing his first term in the House, used the questionnaire to expound at length on his legislative goals.

He said he'd sponsor bills to curb drunken driving, to provide new commitment laws for the mentally ill, a memorial to Congress to return mineral rights to the Papago Indians, to create five-member boards of supervisors to encourage schools to set up night classes for adults, to repeal the merchants' inventory tax and calling for a national cemetery for Arizona military veterans.

All in all, Holsclaw sponsored more than 200 bills in his career, about 40 dealing with alcoholism-treatment and alcohol-related problems.

In fact, he had a basketful of bills ready for introduction in this session, prepared well before his defeat Nov. 5.

By now, every one of the bills mentioned as his objectives in 1954 has been enacted into law. Gov. Raul Castro just recently signed a memorial to the Veterans Administration petitioning for establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona.

Not all of his legislative endeavors have been greeted with enthusiasm by some of his colleagues, such as his authorship of the implied-consent law requiring suspected drunken drivers to submit to blood tests.

It wasn't long after the law took effect that the Pima County delegation started to get drunk in alphabetical order, one representative being arrested in Phoenix after a spectacular chase down N. Central.

Holsclaw, who originally intended to become a doctor, was forced to drop out of Harvard Medical School because of tuberculosis.

He returned to Tucson with his bride, Alice Young of Indianapolis, in 1927. The bridegroom was in a hospital bed during the ceremony.

A native of Grangeville, Idaho, Holsclaw first came to Tucson in 1921 to enroll at the University of Arizona. He operated a real-estate agency until retiring in 1947.

To prepare himself for legislative service; Holsclaw enrolled in the UofA Law School in 1949, and careful preparation became a Holsclaw hallmark in his legislative service.

At any moment, Holsclaw could produce volumes of facts and figures on any bill he sponsored, causing endless filing problems for his long-suffering secretaries.

Maybe the folks in Tucson's 12th District are unaware of his contributions, but what Holsclaw achieved in law-making will affect all the people of Arizona for the next 100 years.