

H.R. 13664. May 10, 1976. Government Operations: Rules. Abolishes certain Federal regulatory agencies unless, within the next three years: (1) the President recommends to Congress that any agency or agencies should not be abolished; (2) the relevant committee investigates and publishes a report on such agency; and (3) the Congress adopts a concurrent resolution disapproving the abolition of such agency or agencies.

Requires three year automatic abolition of existing agencies unless similar positive approval is given by the President and Congress.

Allows for the transfer of agency functions to the President or a successor agency with the continuation of the present rules and proceedings.

H.R. 13665. May 10, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Solid Waste Disposal Act to prohibit the issuance of solid waste management regulations with respect to the sale or distribution of beverage containers at Federal facilities.

H.R. 13666. May 10, 1976. Ways and Means. Amends the Social Security Act by including the services of optometrists under the Medicare supplementary medical insurance program.

H.R. 13667. May 10, 1976. Small Business.

Provides financial assistance to persons whose small businesses are displaced by Federal and federally assisted programs so that they are able to lease, rent or purchase replacement quarters.

H.R. 13668. May 10, 1976. Small Business. Amends the Small Business Act to allow the Small Business Administration to provide disaster loans to small businesses in areas which the Administrator declares to have been struck by impacted disasters.

H.R. 13669. May 10, 1976. Small Business. Amends the Small Business Act to increase the maximum Small Business Administration share on a business loan.

H.R. 13670. May 10, 1976. Small Business. Amends the Small Business Act to provide that a small business concern shall include a nonprofit organization the purpose of which is to provide economic benefit or valuable service to its members and which possesses such financial structure and prospects as would reasonably assure that it is able to meet financial obligations.

H.R. 13671. May 10, 1976. Small Business. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Small Business Act to authorize loans by the Small Business Administration to certain small businesses in the petroleum and petrochemical industries.

Prohibits certain large petroleum refining companies from acquiring or controlling an interest in the marketing of petroleum or petroleum products.

H.R. 13672. May 10, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Reaffirms the intent of Congress with respect to the structure of the common carrier telecommunications industry rendering services in interstate and foreign commerce. Reaffirms the authority of the States to regulate terminal and station equipment used for telephone exchange service. Requires the Federal Communications Commission to make specified findings in connection with Commission actions authorizing specialized carriers.

H.R. 13673. May 10, 1976. Armed Services. Authorizes the President to sell one landing craft repair ship and one inshore patrol craft to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines.

H.R. 13674. May 10, 1976. Ways and Means. Amends the Tariff Schedules of the United States to lower the custom duty on vanadium pentoxide imported for processing into ferrovandium.

H.R. 13675. May 10, 1976. Veterans' Affairs. Extends the period in which veterans may use their veterans' educational assistance.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DR. HARRY RONALD FISHMAN

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Harry R. Fishman is retiring after 43 years as an inspirational teacher, dedicated educator, and humanitarian.

Dr. Fishman, who I have known personally for many years, has spent his life helping children and adults learn and to overcome physical handicaps as well as those limitations placed upon them unfairly by society.

Dr. Fishman was first recognized for his pioneer work in the field of corrective physical education. As a teacher in the Philadelphia school system, he devised over 50 pieces of therapeutic equipment which enabled boys and girls enrolled in the classes to improve or correct their functional disabilities.

His work in this field became nationally known and men and women in the field of education and medicine came to his school from all over the Nation and even from foreign countries to observe this new trend in corrective therapy.

Dr. Fishman was presented the Gold Medal Award by the National Podiatry Association for sharing his knowledge with the members of their profession. His success can be attested to by people who best could evaluate his contributions to the betterment of the health and welfare of the youth he served.

The City Council of Philadelphia:

### RESOLUTION

Relative to the Outstanding Contributions to the Physical Welfare of Young People by Harry R. Fishman.

Whereas, Harry R. Fishman, of 906 Knorr Street, a Physical Education instructor at Fels Jr. High School, has gained national acclaim for his work in correcting functional disabilities in children; and

Whereas, Dr. Fishman has designed more than 50 devices to correct such weaknesses as round shoulders, flat feet, muscular and defective posture; and

Whereas, Harry R. Fishman has given these devices free of charge to the Philadelphia Public School System and to many hospitals and has offered to demonstrate the devices to physical education people in foreign lands who have inquired about the appliances; and

Whereas, Mr. Fishman has received citations from the University of Kentucky, University of Pennsylvania Hospital, Pennsylvania State University, the State of New York, Temple University and Wayne University, for "his advancement of scientific knowledge in remedial gymnastics"; and

Whereas, his contributions to the well-being of youth was the main topic at a recent session of the President's physical fitness program committee in Washington; therefore

Resolved, by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, that we hereby extend a public tribute, on behalf of all of the people of this committee, to Harry R. Fishman, a teacher who is devoting his life to the development of sound and strong bodies among our children and by so doing is bringing much praise upon himself, our public school system and the City of Philadelphia.

Resolved, that a suitable engrossed copy of this resolution be presented to Harry R. Fishman.

Certification: This is a true and correct copy of the original Resolution passed by the Council of the City of Philadelphia on the seventh day of February 1957.—James J. Tate, President of City Council.

The Northeast Junior Chamber of Commerce also lauded his efforts and presented him with their Man of the Year Award. The inscription on the plaque and scroll stated:

### RESOLUTION N.E. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The N.E. Junior Chamber of Commerce is signally proud this year to honor Dr. Harry Ronald Fishman as its "Man of the Year" in recognition of his outstanding endeavors which have been aimed at improving the health and welfare of children, not only in the Northeast, but throughout the country.

He has pioneered in the field of remedial gymnastics to aid in the correction of pupils

with functional disabilities. Inventor of more than 50 therapeutic devices to aid the treatment of these disorders, he has turned them over to schools, hospitals and clinics throughout the country as a public service.

The N.E. Junior Chamber of Commerce is proud to number Dr. Fishman as one of our rising community, and prouder still to cite him as "1956 Man of the Year".

Most noteworthy was a letter of commendation from then Governor Shaffer of Pennsylvania:

### LETTER FROM GOVERNOR SHAFFER

DEAR DR. FISHMAN: Your outstanding work in the field of physical welfare for the children of your city deserves my congratulations.

It is my firm opinion that the children of Pennsylvania represent our greatest natural resource and to devote your life to the development of sound and strong bodies can mean nothing but a selfless devotion for the betterment of mankind.

Dr. Fishman's efforts in the field of civil rights were also exceptional. When he first began to coach swimming and gymnastics at the Bok Vocational School, black students had never tried out for these teams. Dr. Fishman encouraged the black students to try to make the teams, but he discovered that no swimming pool was available to blacks at that time.

Going about the city, he pleaded with various pool owners to permit his youngsters to make use of their facility. Finally, through the help of the local YMHA a pool was made available to the Bok team. For the first time, blacks and whites shared the swimming pool and competitive swimming with other school teams became a reality.

Another first was achieved by Dr. Fishman, when he was called upon by the school district of Philadelphia and the Crime Prevention Association to organize and conduct the school district's first community recreation center. It operated every evening from 7 until 10, and he opened its doors to members of

the black community. The area around the school was predominately white and the resentment was bitter by people who did not share Dr. Fishman's desire to welcome blacks to the program. It was a known but subtle fact, that blacks at that time were being denied access to the local city recreation center within the vicinity. He fought off opposition to reject black children in the school and achieved his objective in making it a real asset to the community.

Again visitors flocked to the school to see a new and vital program which served both blacks and whites. It became a model for other centers which were established in the city.

In 1956, before a capacity crowd assembled in the school auditorium, Dr. Fishman became the first white man to receive an award from the local NAACP. It read in part:

To Dr. Harry Ronald Fishman:

A sincere friend of all youth and intelligent champion of their welfare, who has ably served as Principal of the FitzSimons Community Teen Center—a real contribution in the field of human relations.

CHARLES A. SHORTER,  
Executive Secretary,  
Local Branch NAACP.

For 16 years Dr. Fishman served as principal of the center. He labored unceasingly to make it grow and to make its offerings available to as many teenagers as could possibly enter its doors. Its enrollment became so large, that the doors had to be closed early in the evening because of the vast number of boys and girls who came every night. Needless to say, it proved to be a haven for those who attended and enrichment of the lives of thousands was its by-product. Boys and girls no longer roamed the streets at night—they had a place to go.

Dr. Fishman's educational leadership was manifested once again when, in 1974, he became principal of the West Philadelphia Standard Evening High School. He took a school which was run down, in a community where people feared to venture upon the streets at night, and transformed it into a vital institution. Thousands of men and women, who were employed in the daytime, returned to school after Dr. Fishman hired a sound truck to travel through the community to personally exhort its people to come to the school and complete their education. The message got through, and men and women who had never received a high school diploma returned and completed their education. Others availed themselves of the school curricula to improve their job skills and improve their monetary earnings. The highest enrollment figures in the school's history attested to the success of Dr. Fishman's leadership.

Here at the school, Dr. Fishman labored for the rights of all people. It was through his efforts again, that for the first time in the history of the school's operation, that a woman was recognized as an outstanding student by the city's chamber of commerce. Prior to this, only men were so honored for being head of a family, gainfully employed in the daytime, and being an outstanding student.

The sentiments of the student body of the school can be attested to by a card

presented to him upon his leaving the school for medical reasons:

DEAR DR. FISHMAN: We are sad at the thought of your leaving and hope that you will get well and return again.

The school remains, but the man who brought the breath of life within its walls will be missed.

Your humanitarian leadership is reflected in symbol by the gold chain and emblem of Scorpio that the Students of West Philadelphia Standard Evening High School present to you.

May it always be a reminder of the depth of feeling that we have for you and may it add to the lustre of the golden years that your future holds.

MANDY ADDISON,  
President of School Senate.

Dr. Fishman served both at FitzSimons and then West Philadelphia Standard while still serving as vice principal of the Fels Junior High School. It was at Fels that his efforts in the remedial physical education field crested. His promotion to vice principal of the school did not diminish his efforts to help boys and girls physically as well as academically.

It was during the early years at Fels that he set up the first free rehabilitative clinic for foot and allied defects at the Cleveland College of Podiatry. It also was a model for other clinics that emulated his work in the field. One would be remiss if mention was not made that all the apparatus in the clinic was donated by Dr. Fishman at his expense.

It is noteworthy to record that he has been the recipient of over a hundred citations, degrees, and commendations, and I am proud to have been able to help to honor Dr. Fishman at this time.

#### PENSIONS FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS: THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, I filed with the Clerk of the House a motion in writing to discharge the Veterans' Affairs Committee from further consideration of H.R. 3616, the World War I Pension Act, a bill which I introduced 15 months ago.

I have taken this action because I believe that it is imperative that the full House of Representatives be afforded an opportunity to discuss and vote on World War I pension legislation as soon as possible.

H.R. 3616 would provide \$150 a month pension for either the World War I veteran or his widow, without regard to any other source of income that he or she may have.

I recently presented testimony on this legislation which I would like to include at this time for the purpose of explaining the need for this legislation:

STATEMENT OF HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of this committee. I appreciate this opportunity to present testimony in behalf of legislation

which I have introduced relative to pensions for World War I veterans.

The bill, H.R. 3616, the "World War I Pension Act", would provide a \$150 a month pension for either the World War I veteran or his widow.

Mr. Chairman, it has been 60 years since these Americans trooped off to Europe. It is easy for us to choose not to reflect on that part of our history, but I believe it is very beneficial and appropriate for us to recall the climate of those times.

When in April of 1917, the United States entered the war, Germany was winning. The United States was ill-prepared to declare war on Imperial Germany—the odds seemed hopeless. The French Army was demoralized and in the midst of mutiny. The British and the French were losing men not by battalions and regiments but by divisions, virtually by armies.

The young Americans who reported to the recruiting offices that year were not seeking adventure. They were convinced, that regardless of the cost, America had to enter the war—and they were well aware of what their part in such an effort would be.

They left this country to face the awesome trench warfare of the Western Front. Due largely to the valor of these men, the bolstered Allied forces began to experience victory after victory—we know the rest of this history.

What did a grateful nation provide to these valiant veterans? On the day of discharge we presented him with \$80—a happily received sum in the day when a dollar had considerably greater buying power. Later, the Congress passed the Adjusted Service Compensation Act which provided the veterans with an average payment of \$547.50. This total amount of \$607.50 was his reward and "thanks" from the nation which he served.

In 1919, when most World War I veterans were discharged, there was no educational aid system. If there had been, the plight of these veterans might be quite different today, as the average educational level of World War I veterans is the sixth grade.

For a majority of these veterans, their education handicap prevented any large number of them from achieving even moderate economic success. Also, by 1935, when the Social Security system was created, World War I veterans were too old to have time to build up maximum benefits.

In 1919, the Government did not help the veteran find employment, as in the case of recent veterans. Nor were there veterans hospitals as there are today. The only assistance provided to these men was vocational rehabilitation for those disabled in the war.

Has this caused these men to be bitter—quite the contrary. I have always been impressed by the support which World War I veterans have provided for the granting of educational and other benefits to veterans of later wars. In spite of the meager show of gratitude by this nation to World War I veterans, they have always maintained the attitude that such benefits for later veterans have led to better citizenship and thus a better America.

The legislation which I propose—a \$150 a month pension for either the World War I veteran or his widow—will not cost as much as simple arithmetic might indicate. Many veterans are receiving welfare payments, and this pension would permit many to cease drawing such benefits. I believe that it is a national disgrace that men who served this nation with such valor are now forced upon the welfare rolls.

My bill, H.R. 3616, will rapidly drop in annual cost to the government. In the meantime it will be a godsend to the 893,000 World War I veterans still alive and to the surviving widows of deceased veterans. I might add, that at the present time, only 340,873 of these veterans are receiving any kind of a veteran's pension.



The pension system that is in effect now is a type of welfare that is really beneath the dignity of those who have contributed so greatly to our nation. For example, a married veteran of World War I, whose annual income is \$300 or less, is entitled to \$186 a month pension maximum—\$2,232 per year. No pension is payable to such a veteran whose annual income exceeds \$4,500.

The veteran without dependents is eligible for a pension only if his annual income is less than \$3,300. His maximum monthly pension, based on an annual income of less than \$300, is \$173—\$2,076 per year.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the pension which I propose is not a special privilege, but rather, this legislation will serve to bring the Nation's treatment of World War I veterans to a point approaching equity with the benefits that veterans of later wars have received.

I thank you Mr. Chairman and members of this committee for allowing me this opportunity to share my strong views on this subject. I urge you to report the "World War I Pension Act" to the floor of the House as soon as possible.

#### RABBI ISRAEL M. GOLDMAN HONORED

#### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, Rabbi Israel M. Goldman will celebrate with his many friends in Baltimore the 50th anniversary of his ordination to the rabbinate and mark his retirement after 28 years of service to the Shizuk Amuno Congregation in Baltimore.

The rabbi's remarkably varied interests throughout his career have encompassed not only a deep concern for the continuation of Jewish heritage and tradition, but interfaith understanding and cooperation and civil rights and individuals' welfare.

Rabbi Goldman has been nationally recognized for his pioneering work in the field of adult Jewish education, and has developed both materials and techniques to foster the Jewish tradition of lifelong study and learning. He was an early advocate of schools for adults as well as children as parts of congregational programs.

As a leader within the Jewish community, Rabbi Goldman has served with distinction as president for numerous organizations: The Baltimore Jewish Council, the Baltimore Board of Rabbis, the Baltimore Zionist District, the Jewish Historical Society of Maryland, and the Rabbinical Assembly of America.

As a leader in interfaith understanding, Rabbi Goldman cofounded and cochaired the Interfaith Council of Greater Baltimore, the first known instance in Maryland history in which the three predominant faiths joined to launch a practical program of social action for the entire community.

For 18 years, Rabbi Goldman served as vice chairman of the Maryland Com-

mission on Human Relations, and chaired its Personnel Committee. He edited the published study of Baltimore intergroup relationships, "An American City in Transition."

Not only has Rabbi Goldman served actively in the rabbinate, and contributed generously of his time, energy, and knowledge to the community at large, he has been a scholar and author. Awarded a doctorate in Hebrew literature from the Jewish Theological Seminary, he has also been awarded honorary doctorates in divinity from the seminary and from Brown University. He has written "The Life and Times of Rabbi David Ibn Abi Zimra" and "Henry W. Schneeberger—His Role in American Judaism."

Prior to his service as rabbi for the Chizuk Amuno Congregation, Rabbi Goldman was founding rabbi for Temple Emanu-El, Providence, R.I., and served from 1940 to 1954 as the first director, National Academy for Adult Jewish Education, Jewish Theological Seminary.

As Rabbi Goldman retires from active service, my best wishes go with him for a pleasant and productive retirement. I know that his many friends will continue to count on his wisdom and experience in the years to come.

#### THE FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION AND THE NEED FOR REGULATORY REFORM

#### HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, one of the rarest hybrids produced by the political process is an election year issue upon which both Democrats and Republicans agree. Among the many surprises of this election year, none has been quite so unexpected as the emergence of one of those rare hybrids under the generic name of regulatory reform.

The most popular, and I think wisest, of the reform proposals has been the "sunset" concept which establishes a definite date for termination of the operations of a Federal agency unless Congress and the President take certain prescribed steps to maintain the agency.

Unfortunately, the recent House decision to extend the life of the Federal Energy Administration indicates that while regulatory reform is a fine topic for a rousing campaign speech, it is considerably less popular when the opportunity to translate talk into action arises.

The Federal Energy Administration was created to respond to the emergency situation caused by the OPEC oil embargo. That embargo, at least for now, is over, but the FEA lives on to duplicate the functions of the 11 other Federal agencies and departments with jurisdiction over energy matters. This kind of inefficiency is at the heart of the calls for regulatory reform. Divisions and subdivisions of responsibility within and

among Federal agencies not only wastes the efforts of dedicated agency employees, but also results in excessive confusion in the regulated industries. The continued existence of the FEA under the mandate of this bill impedes, rather than aids in the quest for solution to our energy problems.

The House has performed a disservice to the energy industry by not providing for an orderly transfer of FEA duties to other agencies. However, the failure of the House to measure up to the standard regulatory reform which the general business and consumer communities have come to expect and demand is an even greater disservice.

#### KOCH CLUB FLAG DAY PARADE AND CEREMONIES

#### HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a description of this year's Koch Club Flag Day parade and ceremony. The Koch Club holds this parade and ceremony every year, and is one of the highlights of Quincy's calendar year.

The Koch Club has been in existence for 25 years, and it is fitting that this Bicentennial Year is also the silver anniversary of the Koch Club. The Koch Club has a record of community service which the city of Quincy is very proud of.

#### KOCH CLUB FLAG DAY PARADE AND CEREMONIES

The Koch Club of Quincy will sponsor its 25th Annual Flag Day Parade and Observance on Monday, June 14, 1976 starting at 6:15 P.M. with a parade stepping off from the Hancock Parking Area on McGrath Highway, proceeding onto Mechanic Street, onto Elm Street, onto Hancock Street and continue onto Southern Artery and into Veterans Memorial Stadium for the Flag Raising Ceremonies.

In commemoration of this event annually sponsored by the Koch Club of Quincy for the past quarter of a century, a flag flown over our nation's capitol and presented to the organization by United States Congressman James A. Burke will be raised to open the Flag Day Observance at Veterans Memorial Stadium.

During these past twenty five years, the Koch Club of Quincy has continued to encourage its youth and community to recognize Flag Day with special significance.

On this year, the 200th Birthday of our Nation, the Koch Club of Quincy observes its 25th anniversary of sponsoring the Flag Day Parade and Observance by assembling the boys and girls of Quincy and the South Shore to pay tribute and honor to the flag of our country by setting aside a period of time during Flag Day for participation in ceremonies to properly recognize the importance of this day in our nation's history.

To commemorate Quincy History along

the route, the parade will stop to pause at the Church of the Presidents while wreaths will be placed on the tombs of John Adams, Second President and his wife Abigail and John Quincy Adams, the Sixth President and his wife, Louisa Catherine.

The parade will again halt at the John F. Kennedy Health Center while a wreath is placed to honor the memory of the thirty fifth President of the United States and the only person ever conferred with honorary membership in the Koch Club.

Last, but not least, the parade will stop at the Dorothy Quincy House to recognize the first lady of Massachusetts, when her husband John Hancock was elected the first Governor of the Commonwealth.

In the period of the late sixties and early seventies when some felt it more popular to defy and abuse the flag, the Koch Club continued in its efforts to foster respect for our Flag, the symbol of our country's tradition of Liberty and Justice For All.

Each year at the Flag Day Parade, through the generosity of a number of donors, 18"x12" are distributed to each boy and girl participating in the parade for them to carry proudly in the line of march and keep as a memento following the event. It is hoped that involvement in this patriotic event by thousands of youths will instill a lasting impression and greater appreciation of their country's heritage and history.

First started in 1952 with 100 members of the Koch Club boys baseball and girls softball leagues marching through the streets of Norfolk Downs to Cavanaugh Stadium in North Quincy for the Flag Raising Ceremonies, the numbers involved each year has continued to increase until the 1975 event last year included 2500 marchers each proudly displaying their new 50 star flags.

Lieutenant General George S. Patton was guest speaker on the 24th year and Captain Richard A. Stratton, U.S. Navy Commanding Officer, will address the participants and spectators at the 25th Observance on Monday, June 14, 1976.

Clergymen of each faith have been invited to attend the program and express prayers of thanksgiving to God for the blessings bestowed on our nation in freedom, abundance and national resources and ask guidance that we may share these gifts with our neighbors and brothers in need throughout our country and our world.

Mr. John C. Comer, Massachusetts State Commander of the American Legion, will be Honorary Marshall of the Parade and City Parade Coordinator Thomas M. McDonald, Past Commander of the Quincy Veterans Council and George F. Bryan Post V. F. W., will be Parade Marshall.

Mr. Richard J. Koch, Executive Director and Founder of the 28 year old Koch Club of Quincy, will be Master of Ceremonies of the Flag Day Parade and Stadium Exercises.

City and state dignitaries will be led by Mayor Joseph J. LaRala, City Council President and State Senator Arthur H. Tobin, members of the Quincy City Council, School Committee and State Representatives. All appointed officials have been invited to attend and participate.

To climax the program, the Quincy Symphony Orchestra and Park and Recreation Board will jointly sponsor an hour long "Pope Concert" at the stadium at 8:30 P.M. to close out the evening.

Mr. Joseph E. Burke, Chairman of the Park and Recreation Board and Mr. Andrew T. Walsh, President of the Quincy Symphony Orchestra will participate in the evenings activities.

June 14, 1976 should provide an enjoyable

evening of family entertainment with boys and girls marching as participants in a parade rather than spectators; parents and children joined together celebrating Flag Day in this our nation's Bi-Centennial Year.

#### DEFINITION OF PRESIDENTIAL RURAL POLICY

### HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, because I am from a rural-based economy district, I am very interested in how the persons who are running for the highest office in our country feel about the development of a comprehensive rural/small town/small business policy for the State. For this reason, I have written to the candidates for President to receive their views on what should be done for the forgotten people of the rural States and small towns. I include in the Record a copy of the letter that I sent to the candidates, and their answers as I receive them. I shall also send their replies to farm publications:

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 26, 1976.

DEAR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES: I know that you are very busy with the primaries in many of the states, but as a member of the Congressional Rural Caucus and representing the rural-based economy state of South Dakota, I feel strongly about the development of a comprehensive rural/small town/small business policy. I am originally from a farm, and I grew up in a rural environment. In looking at the race for nominee for President in both political parties, I would like to ask you to answer the questions that follow in order to gain an idea of what directions you will be moving if you are elected President.

With some 30% of the American population living in towns of 10,000 or less or on farms, I feel that the "forgotten people" in the country are those who live and work in our rural areas and small towns. Conversations with people in my district indicate to me the concern of many people that the rural areas are not given much attention in Washington. For this reason, I feel the following questions are important to our state, and would ask that you return the answers to me:

1. What is your policy on international agricultural trade? What steps would you take to give agricultural imports/exports the same treatment our industrial exports receive? Would you use food as a foreign policy tool? Would you consider creating a "food cartel" against the Arab oil cartel?

2. Will you appoint a family farmer as your Secretary of Agriculture? In international trade agreements that affect agriculture, will the Agricultural Secretary be given the same negotiating power that the Secretary of State and the Treasury now enjoy?

3. What are your policies on rural/small town/small business development—specifically in the following areas:

- (a) Business Development.
- (b) Transportation (Airline, Railroads, and Trucking).
- (c) Credit (FmHA, SBA, etc.).
- (d) Conservation (Topsoil preservation, shelterbelts, etc.).
- (e) Housing.
- (f) Rural Water Systems.

(g) Estate Tax Revision.

(h) Rural Post Offices.

Upon receipt of your answers, I plan to have them printed in the *Congressional Record* and make them available to the news media.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

LARRY PRESSLER,  
Member of Congress.

#### BURDEN OF FEDERAL GRANTS FALLS UNEVENLY ON STATES

### HON. HELEN S. MEYNER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mrs. MEYNER. Mr. Speaker, now that the House of Representatives has finished its most pressing business of the day, I would like to call to the attention of this body a problem that affects New Jersey and several other States.

In this time of ever-tightening budgets, taxpayers everywhere are concerned that they get what they pay for. It is disconcerting, therefore, to learn that New Jersey residents have been shouldering an excessive share of the Federal tax burden for a number of years. In fiscal year 1975, for example, New Jersey received \$1.5 billion in Federal grants-in-aid but paid more than \$2 billion in Federal taxes. This means that taxpayers in New Jersey paid \$1.36 for each dollar of Federal grant money in 1975.

Only five other States paid more for less benefits.

In an article that appeared in *Monthly Tax Features*, which is published by the Tax Foundation, Inc., a breakdown of receipts and outlays by States indicates that several States, notably those in the Southeast, benefit greatly at the expense of others.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members in this Chamber to take note of the following article and to seriously consider a more equitable tax burden/benefit ratio for all States:

#### BURDEN OF FEDERAL GRANTS FALLS UNEVENLY ON STATES

Federal grants-in-aid to state and local governments totaled \$48.2 billion in fiscal 1975, the highest ever and up \$3.6 billion from the 1974 grants of \$44.6 billion.

The tax burden for such grants fell unevenly on taxpayers across the nation, ranging from 42 cents per dollar of grants in Alaska to \$1.46 in Florida, according to calculations just completed by Tax Foundation.

Close behind Florida was Indiana, whose taxpayers had a burden of \$1.41 per dollar of aid. Ohio paid \$1.40, and Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois and New Jersey each paid \$1.36.

Thirteen other states had a tax burden for grants greater than the grants they received. All the remaining states but two, and the District of Columbia, received more than they paid for. Arizona and Pennsylvania came out even.

Revenue sharing grants totaled \$6.1 billion in Fiscal Year 1975.

The formula under which the tax burden is allocated to the states was developed by Tax Foundation in cooperation with other organizations. The method and bases for estimating the allocations have been in use for the past 13 years.



States that got the most for their money besides Alaska were New Mexico, which paid 50 cents, Mississippi, 52 cents, and South Dakota, 55 cents. The District of Columbia had a tax burden of only 28 cents for each dollar of aid.

New York, contrary to some opinions, also received a good deal on its grants from the Federal Government. Its burden was 83 cents per dollar of aid. New York led the nation, however, in the total amount of grants it received at \$5.7 billion. Its tax burden for this aid was \$4.7 billion.

California, on the other hand, was a loser. Its tax burden for grants was \$5.3 billion, while it received only \$4.9 billion in grants. California taxpayers bore nearly eleven percent of the total U.S. tax burden to fund grants. New York paid just under ten percent of the total.

Other states receiving substantial grants were Pennsylvania at \$2.7 billion, Illinois and Texas with \$2.2 billion, and Michigan, \$2.1 billion. Florida received \$1.3 billion in grants against a tax burden of \$1.9 billion, four percent of the total.

The Tax Foundation formula for allocating tax burden is designed to show more accurately than the U.S. Treasury figures, where the tax dollars actually originate. U.S. Treasury figures show where taxes are collected. For example, tobacco taxes are collected in a few southern states, but the burden of the tax falls on smokers in all states.

FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND ESTIMATED TAX BURDEN OF FEDERAL GRANTS—FISCAL YEAR 1975

State	Grants (millions)	Estimated tax burden for grants <sup>1</sup>	Tax burden per dollar of aid
Total	\$48,195.5	\$48,195.5	\$1.00
Alabama	809.7	597.6	.74
Alaska	251.0	106.0	.42
Arizona	458.8	457.9	1.00
Arkansas	508.6	332.5	.65
California	4,892.9	5,267.8	1.08
Colorado	565.1	568.7	1.01
Connecticut	672.7	915.7	1.36
Delaware	120.1	163.9	1.36
Florida	1,316.5	1,918.2	1.44
Georgia	1,176.9	949.4	.81
Hawaii	246.6	216.9	.88
Idaho	203.9	154.2	.76
Illinois	2,226.1	3,017.0	1.36
Indiana	805.5	1,137.4	1.41
Iowa	555.6	592.8	1.07
Kansas	444.0	496.4	1.12
Kentucky	832.4	578.3	.69
Louisiana	878.0	655.5	.75
Maine	291.1	192.8	.66
Maryland	965.1	1,065.1	1.10
Massachusetts	1,455.9	1,426.6	.98
Michigan	2,112.2	2,236.3	1.06
Minnesota	899.2	833.8	.93
Mississippi	632.9	327.7	.52
Missouri	905.9	978.4	1.08
Montana	221.1	144.6	.65
Nebraska	337.3	327.7	.97
Nevada	138.1	159.0	1.15
New Hampshire	170.7	178.3	1.04
New Jersey	1,500.4	2,043.5	1.36
New Mexico	375.4	188.0	.50
New York	5,681.7	4,728.0	.83
North Carolina	1,047.7	1,002.5	.96
North Dakota	169.6	120.5	.71
Ohio	1,787.5	2,496.5	1.40
Oklahoma	652.9	496.4	.76
Oregon	558.1	506.1	.91
Pennsylvania	2,696.2	2,689.3	1.00
Rhode Island	248.7	216.9	.87
South Carolina	572.5	486.8	.85
South Dakota	211.9	115.7	.55
Tennessee	887.6	785.6	.89
Texas	2,197.5	2,501.3	1.14
Utah	287.9	212.1	.74
Vermont	154.0	91.6	.59
Virginia	1,002.5	1,084.4	1.08
Washington	780.0	848.2	1.09
West Virginia	550.9	308.4	.56
Wisconsin	918.2	988.0	1.08
Wyoming	97.9	86.8	.89
District of Columbia	722.5	202.4	.28

<sup>1</sup> Excludes shared revenues; general revenue sharing and trust fund aids.

<sup>2</sup> The total burden for aid payments is assumed to equal aid payments.

FEA—UNNECESSARY FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1976, the House passed H.R. 12169, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Energy Administration. I voted against this measure.

The FEA has become another bureaucratic agency which has grown in size and in desire to further regulate our domestic energy industry. The increased involvement of the Federal Government in our energy policy will not assist our country in becoming self-sufficient in the energy field. Additional Federal controls hamper our domestic developments in the energy field and make us more dependent on foreign sources.

I wish to include in the RECORD excerpts from a column entitled "Federal Energy Office: A Costly Outrage" by Alan W. Bock—Anaheim Bulletin, May 19, 1976. Mr. Bock points out the defects in the FEA:

FEA—UNNECESSARY FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

FEA has provided a case study of bureaucratic growth and abuse. It began as a "temporary" agency to meet a short-term emergency. It has grown to well over \$100 million in budget and 3,400 in employees. The administration's bill to extend FEA for another three years calls for tripling the budget to \$440 million.

FEA has spent more on press agency and lobbying than most people can understand. It wanted to run television commercials which were so blatantly anti-Arab and noxious that the Madison Avenue flacks who had volunteered to help through the Advertising Council were turned off and refused to continue. When you offend an ad-man's sense of decency you've done something. FEA then asked Congress for \$20 million to do its own commercial advertising. FEA has more than 100 professional publicists with a \$3.5 million budget now. They turned out more than 1,000 press releases in a few months and stored them in computers for instant retrieval. Aren't you glad you're paying for that?

Lobbying and press agency are supposed to be forbidden to federal agencies. Fine points of law don't seem to bother FEA. Last Winter, though the Federal Power Commission clearly has regulatory authority over natural gas FEA coordinated a massive lobbying effort for deregulation and cranked out all kinds of nice booklets. That brought on some suits by taxpayers, which failed to stop distribution.

Later, FEA Administrator Frank Zarb wanted to expand into meddling with nuclear energy. He hired 20 new employees and asked Congress to come up with another \$2 million. Congress rejected the request and ordered the new office abolished. The Wall Street Journal reported that Zarb abolished the NAME of his Office of Nuclear Affairs, but kept the newly-hired employees working on nuclear issues.

You'd think that FEA's efforts to deregulate some aspects of the petroleum industry would mean fewer FEA employees. (Well, maybe you're not so naive, either). Somehow FEA, under the "phased deregulation" process found a way to add an additional 600 employees to its army of regulators.

FEA, though the confusion, inhibition of the search for domestic energy, paperwork and imposition of artificial costs on energy, has been the best friend the OPEC oil cartel

could have had. The longer we have FEA, the more dangerous our dependence on foreign oil is likely to grow.

The reasons for abolishing FEA are manifold.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NEW YORK STATE FOOD STAMP COALITION

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, the New York State Food Stamp Coalition is comprised of concerned citizen groups whose objective is to insure that those with low incomes have a real opportunity to obtain adequate nutrition. Their efforts to end the administrative bottlenecks and inequities of the food stamp program are commendable.

Recently the conference met in Albany, N.Y., to discuss the current problems of food stamp reform. The following members who participated in the conference should be praised for their work. The resolutions adopted at the meeting blaze the trail toward true reform which provides sufficient food stamps without bureaucratic redtape, and with a recognition of the real needs of millions of Americans. I wholeheartedly endorse the recommendations of this conference, and trust that my colleagues will take a few moments to thoughtfully consider them:

NEW YORK FOOD STAMP CONFERENCE SPONSORS

Buffalo Hunger Task Force.  
Capital Area Hunger Action Coalition.  
Capital District Community Nutrition Advisory Committee.  
Community Service Society.  
Food Stamp Task Force (Community Action for Legal Services).  
Hunger Task Force (Community Council of Greater New York).  
Inter Community Center for Justice and Peace (NYC).  
Legal Aid Society of Albany.  
Monroe County Nutrition Task Force (Rochester).  
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (Saratoga Chapter).  
National Organization of Women (New York Chapter).  
New York State Association for Human Services.  
New York State Catholic Conference.  
New York State Council of Catholic Charities Directors.  
New York State Council of Churches.  
New York State Health and Welfare Coalition.  
New York State Senior Action Council.  
Nutrition Task Force (New York State Alliance of Community Action Programs).  
Program Funding, Inc.  
Rensselaer County Food Stamp Task Force.  
Troy Area Labor Council, AFL-CIO.  
United Methodist Church, Board of Global Ministries (Women's Division Central Conference).  
Welfare Workers for Justice/WRO (NYC).

NEW YORK FOOD STAMP COALITION

In Albany, Wednesday, April 21, 1976, the conference of the New York State Food Stamp Coalition adopted the following recommendations for legislative reform as a result of the concern that the Food Stamp Program is in fact intended to guarantee a

nutritionally adequate diet to all low income households:

I. The program should be made truly accessible to the neediest households by eliminating the purchase requirement:

A. The Purchase Requirement should be eliminated because:

1. Less than 50% of the persons with incomes below the OMB poverty level currently participate due to their inability to afford the cost of the stamps.

2. Elimination of the Purchase Requirement would reduce program administrative costs by \$36 million annually.

3. It would reduce or eliminate vendor fraud, which currently exceeds \$25 million.

B. If the Purchase Requirement is not eliminated, the cost of food stamps should be set at a level no higher than 25% of a household's net income.

II. The program should incorporate a system of deductions which allows for expenses of employment and a standard deduction which represents the actual expenses of recipient households:

A. Expenses of employment which must be deducted include mandatory payroll deductions, and the cost of maintaining employment (such as child care, transportation, etc.), so that working households are not penalized, but are provided with an incentive to seek and maintain employment.

B. The standard deduction must reflect the actual monthly household expenditures for necessities, provide for an additional deduction for households which contain an elderly member, and reflect the higher expenses of larger households.

C. The standard deduction must be updated semiannually to reflect changes in the cost of living.

D. Deductions should also be allowed for households which are the victims of casualties of disasters.

III. Income for eligibility and benefits must be based on the income which is currently available to a household and not past earnings:

A. The use of a retrospective accounting period would deny benefits to persons who are recently unemployed and persons with seasonal income.

B. Current income use would allow the program to meet the actual needs of households.

IV. The assets test currently in effect should be frozen until a study of the effects of proposed changes can be studied by Congress:

A. The Administration has proposed the adoption of the SSI assets test which would eliminate elderly homeowners and the temporarily unemployed from the program.

B. The SSI assets test would greatly increase administrative costs and create the potential for massive new program errors and inequities.

V. Administrative procedures must be simplified and not further complicated by costly and burdensome procedures such as counter-signing food stamps, monthly income reporting and the use of photo I.D.S.:

A. The State of New York estimates that the above procedures would increase their administrative costs by as much as \$50 million per year.

E. Maladministration of the above procedures would result in the denial or termination of benefits to thousands of poverty stricken households.

which I polled the citizens of the Fourth District of Kentucky. Some 17,000 of my constituents responded to the questionnaire and I think the returns adequately demonstrate the views of the people in the district which I represent. Since the policy areas addressed are of national concern and are by no means local issues, the results may well be of interest to my fellow legislators.

The questionnaire was made up of two parts. In the first section respondents were requested to rank nine issues of current interest in order of importance. There was such a wide variance between the responses from different areas within the fourth district that I have listed the returns on the basis of counties, to avoid distortion. On the second section of the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to answer yes or no to a question of policy on a single issue. Throughout this section there was an amazing level of agreement throughout the district on practically every point. The only exception was the question on detente, upon which the votes were evenly split.

Although busing ranked as the most important issue, only in Jefferson County and neighboring Oldham County, and was ranked as a much less important issue in the counties which have not been closely affected by busing orders, I think it is worth noting that there was virtually unanimous opposition to busing throughout the district. Also noteworthy are the importance placed on crime by nearly all respondents and the solid agreement on the need for welfare reform, reduced Government spending, and mandatory minimum sentences. The results of the questionnaire follow:

#### WHAT DO YOU THINK?

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I present for the interest of my colleagues, the results of my recent questionnaire, through

#### ENCLOSURE A QUESTIONNAIRE

(1) Of those listed below, which do you believe to be the most important issues facing the American public? (Please list in numerical order with "1" standing for the area of greatest concern and "10" the least.)

County	No. 1	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4	No. 5	No. 6	No. 7	No. 8	No. 9
Jefferson.....	Busing.....	Crime.....	Government spending.....	Economy.....	Inflation.....	Government regulations.....	Energy.....	Education.....	Environment.....
Boone.....	Crime.....	Government spending.....	Economy.....	Inflation.....	Government regulations.....	Energy.....	Education.....	Busing.....	Do.
Kenton.....	do.....	Economy.....	Inflation.....	Government spending.....	Energy.....	Government regulations.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
Carroll.....	Government spending.....	Inflation.....	Economy.....	Energy.....	Crime.....	do.....	Busing.....	Education.....	Do.
Gallatin.....	Crime.....	do.....	do.....	Government spending.....	Energy.....	Busing.....	Government regulations.....	do.....	Do.
Oldham.....	Busing.....	Crime.....	Inflation.....	do.....	Economy.....	Government regulations.....	Energy.....	do.....	Do.
Trimble.....	Economy.....	Inflation.....	Government spending.....	Crime.....	Energy.....	Busing.....	Government regulations.....	do.....	Do.
Campbell.....	Crime.....	do.....	do.....	Economy.....	do.....	Government regulations.....	Busing.....	do.....	Do.
Composite 4th district.....	Crime.....	Inflation.....	Government spending.....	Economy.....	Busing.....	Government regulations.....	Energy.....	Education.....	Environment.....

[Please answer the following questions either yes or no]

	Yes	No	No response		Yes	No	No response
2. Some experts believe that we must move to a balanced budget in order to control the rate of inflation. Do you agree with this view?	85.0	12.8	2.2	8. Would you favor a direct federal payment to persons in need rather than the current welfare system?	50.4	38.6	11.0
3. President Ford and others have proposed coupling a tax cut to a reduction in Federal spending. Would you favor a dollar-for-dollar reduction in Federal spending to equal the amount of any tax cut?	85.0	10.8	4.2	9. Do you support court-ordered busing as a means of achieving racial balance in our schools?	2.7	96.2	1.1
4. Should Congress impose a binding ceiling on the amount of Federal spending?	79.6	16.9	3.5	10. Would you be in favor of a constitutional amendment to prevent the court-ordered busing of school children?	90.3	9.0	.7
5. Do you support mandatory minimum sentences for crimes committed with a firearm?	88.7	8.7	2.6	11. Do you think the United States should continue to pursue a policy of detente (a relaxation of tensions) with the Soviet Union?	47.8	46.0	6.2
6. Are you in favor of capital punishment?	85.9	11.7	2.8	12. Do you think the United States should re-evaluate its role in the United Nations?	91.2	5.7	3.1
7. Do you believe that the present welfare system is in need of reform?	98.1	.4	1.1				



## AN EFFECTIVE GRAIN RESERVE

## HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the attached editorial from the Illinois "Farm Week," May 24, 1976. Many of my colleagues who have called for a grain reserve should recognize that we already have one. As the editorial points out, our grain reserve today is "held in reserve by farmers, their cooperatives, processors, and private traders instead of the Government."

It is in the hands of those who produce, the farmer. At the same time, contrary to the comments of critics, the United States has remained by far the dominant donor of aid to food deficit countries.

The article follows:

## AN EFFECTIVE GRAIN RESERVE

You can count on it. Once the electioneering is over and Congress settles back down to business, the matter of grain reserves will probably be advanced.

Consumer activists will hail the idea of government-held grain reserves as a way to cheaper food and protection from hunger. The internationally-minded will assert that government grain reserves are necessary to continue Uncle Sam's role as the chief provider of food aid to hungry nations.

It was probably with that in mind that Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz served up a few reminders the other day to those proponents of government supply management.

Just because the government doesn't have its finger in the pie certainly doesn't mean that the United States suddenly has no system of reserves, or that there is no cushion of grain stocks in this country, said Butz.

Butz pointed out that farmers are producing tremendous quantities of grains. The excess grain today is held in reserve by farmers, their cooperatives, processors, and private traders instead of the government.

The free enterprise system, Butz reminded guarantees an efficient system of private grain stocks because it provides individual opportunities for farmers to make a profit and a system based on cash incentives for farmers from the marketplace.

As an example of the way the price system makes adjustments quickly and automatically, the secretary pointed to the short feed grain crop in 1974 which occurred at the same time total world grain production was down.

Even with the resulting shifts in livestock production and marketing, consumers felt little impact of the grain shortage, Butz said.

The lack of government-held grain reserves certainly has not threatened our food aid to needy nations. The United States remains by far the dominant donor of aid to food deficit countries.

Even with the lessons learned about agriculture and the grain reserve policy in the last three years, there are strong pressures to return to the old, outmoded system of high price supports and government-held grain stocks, Secretary of Agriculture Butz noted.

Such a reversal would indeed be unfortunate not only for farmers but for all Americans, Butz believes. "The benefits we have seen from our current experience of minimal government interference in agriculture should convince every American of the val-

ues of the traditional free enterprise system," Secretary of Agriculture Butz concluded.

## OUR ENDANGERED TRADITION

## HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a recent commentary in *Field and Stream* on the issue of gun control legislation deserves the attention of our colleagues as well as the American public in general. The article by E. B. Mann appears in the June issue and I commend it to all who have an interest in this important issue:

## OUR ENDANGERED TRADITION

(By E. B. Mann)

Pro-gun people, already critical of President Ford's track record on firearms issues, are voicing mixed emotions over his State of the Union pronouncements. "The way to cut down on the criminal use of guns," the President said, "is not to take guns away from the law-abiding citizens but to impose mandatory sentences for crimes in which a gun is used, make it harder to obtain cheap guns for criminal purposes, and concentrate gun control enforcement in big crime areas."

If the President had stopped after the word "used," he would have earned the pro-gun vote. But what follows is sheer political gobbledegook. "Cheap" guns are no more dangerous in criminal hands than expensive ones, and the word "cheap" here can only be an echo of the clamor over those "Saturday night specials," which no one has yet been able to define. Similarly, the proposal to "concentrate enforcement in big crime areas" by adding "500 additional federal agents in the eleven largest high-crime areas" is not only utterly lacking in logic, it is also bad politics. High-crime areas are exactly the areas in which law-abiding people most desperately need guns for self-protection; and Americans, from colonial days forward, have had no love for, nor trust in, federal "gestapos"—a fear and distrust by no means lessened by the smash-in and shoot-'em-down tactics of the IRS Alcohol Tobacco & Firearms goon squads in their six-year-long failure to make a stupid law—the Gun Control Act of '68—effective in crime control. The ATF has already used that law as a ladder for empire-building and budget inflation, and it is at least reasonable to doubt that the thought of further expansion in that direction will win much favor with voters.

We wonder who is advising the President on these matters. Whoever they are, better advisors are available! We suggest that President Ford (and you, before you vote) write the Citizens Committee For the Right to Keep and Bear Arms (1721 DeSales St. N.W., Dept. FS, Suite 203, Washington, D.C. 20036) for a listing of the 115 Congressmen who have authorized the use of their names as members of the Advisory Council of that Committee.

That's right: 115 Senators and Representatives who are on record against anti-gun (and anti-hunting) legislation by casting their names, their prestige, and their personal efforts into the pro-gun, pro-hunting cause. A year ago, only thirteen members of Congress were enrolled on that Advisory Council (then newly formed). During 1975, the number rose to 115—an increase of over 750 percent, and growing. This is not enough to control either House, but these men can, and do, make it more difficult for the Kennedy-Conyers-Mikva-Javits-Bayh bloc to achieve their ends.

When you write the Citizens Committee, ask them for a list of the state and local

organizations also dedicated to our cause. There are dozens of them, surely one or more in your area. Support them, too. Then, as the Ides of November approaches, get out and do some grassroots campaigning for the right candidates. If you, enough of you, do all these things, perhaps by 1977 we can sit back and enjoy our guns and our shooting sports with greater confidence in our rights under the Second Amendment.

Polls keep popping up in the news, and many of them show results remarkably dissimilar to those reported by the professional pollsters. U.S. Congressman Bill Wampler (R-Va.) recently polled his constituents with ten questions on national issues. The fact that two of those questions concerned guns and gun legislation is indicative of the importance with which these issues are regarded by many legislators. Wampler reports "nearly twenty thousand" replies to his mailing—a significantly greater number than the 1,519 that controlled the recent Harris poll. I quote the questions to enable you to decide whether they were "fair" or otherwise:

*Do you favor the federal registration and licensing of handguns? To this 67 percent of the answering Virginians wrote "No."*

*Do you believe judges should be required to impose heavy prison sentences on criminals who use guns or other weapons to commit crimes? To this 95 percent of the answering Virginians voted "Yes."*

Bill Wampler is one of the 115 Congressmen whose names appear on the Advisory Council of the Citizens Committee For the Right to Keep and Bear Arms.

Another member of the Citizens Committee Advisory Council, Representative John Ashbrook (R-Ohio), speaking before the House, read into the Record the statement of Los Angeles Police Chief Ed Davis that "The whole idea [that anti-handgun legislation would reduce murders and other gun-related crimes] is absurd. We have countless legal restrictions on guns now, but they don't prevent [would-be assassins and others] from receiving \$50 fines or probation."

Ashbrook added his own comment that "If we really want to reduce gun-related crimes, all we have to do is to require judges to impose an additional penalty on those using guns in crime."

Justice Nathaniel Helman of the New York State Supreme Court ruled (December 1975) that New York City police have no right to ask a person to establish need when applying for permission to keep a pistol in their homes or places of business. (New York Times, 12/24/75)

This is a ruling New Yorkers should note and remember. It is a knockout blow to the Sullivan Law if the police can be forced to observe it. But it's a big "if!"

Divots from the TV weekly commentary, "60 Minutes": According to a criminologist introduced as "an authority," only one in thirteen serious offenders serve time at all; and "rehabilitation does not work, as is proved by the fact that two out of every three criminals are repeaters." The statistics are his, not mine.

So maybe we should go back to the old-fashioned idea of "crime and punishment," instead of the theory that the criminal is just a poor, underprivileged victim of our opulent society. At least the old way kept them off the streets for an appreciable period—a period during which they were no longer permitted to share in the vast profits—estimated to be "more than 40 billion dollars annually"—that crime takes out of our national economy.

Representative James H. Quillen (R-Tenn.) is another Congressman whose name appears on the roll of the Citizens Committee Advisory Council. In the October 22, 1975 issue of *Illinois Wildlife*, Congressman Quillen argued strongly against the provision in the proposed Criminal Justice Reform Act that would make it a federal crime for a citizen to shoot a nighttime

prowler in the home. "If this piece of idiocy is enacted, the criminal element in this country will cheer. . . . Obviously, the police cannot protect citizens against every gunsel and thug bent on violence. . . . More gun control will only make life easier for the crooks while undermining the constitutional freedoms of citizens. . . . I am totally opposed to these proposals."

So the news is not all bad. But it is bad enough to warn all gun owners and shooting sportsmen that the time to get crackin' in pro-gun politics is now. Letters to lawmakers are fine, and they do help; but electing the right lawmaker is better.

### SHOULD WE BREAK UP THE OIL COMPANIES?

#### HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned with an attempt to convince the American people that we need to break up the oil industry. If successful, this divestiture movement would be a serious blow to the efforts of our country to become self-sufficient in the energy field and would greatly increase the price of energy for the American consumer.

Fortunately, a number of newspapers throughout the country have looked at this issue and produced some thoughtful and informative editorials on the consequences of divestiture. I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials from the Columbus Ledger of Columbus, Ga., April 8, 1976; the State Journal of Topeka, Kans., April 22, 1976; and the Lewiston Daily Sun of Lewiston, Maine, April 23, 1976. My colleagues should read these editorials carefully before this issue comes before the House of Representatives:

#### DISMEMBERMENT NO ANSWER

There are those in Congress who believe that by breaking up the major oil companies most of the problems concerning oil and gasoline will be solved.

A Senate subcommittee has approved a bill that would affect 18 of the top 20 oil companies operating in the United States.

The bill, sponsored by Sens. Birch Bayh and Philip A. Hart, would prohibit companies from both producing crude oil and refining or marketing it. Refiners would also be prohibited from directly operating any service stations they didn't already operate as of Jan. 1, 1976.

Several things are obvious if this oil break-up bill actually becomes law.

This legislation would reduce the capability of the oil industry to explore for new sources in the United States. In turn, it would cause the United States to become even more dependent on foreign oil.

The consumer would pick up the tab for increased costs of operating separated oil producing and oil refining systems.

W. T. Slick Jr., senior vice president of Exxon company, recently gave a Senate subcommittee an idea of what would happen if the dismemberment of these oil companies becomes a reality.

He said the move would increase unemployment and reverse the current trend of economic recovery. It also would reduce the nation's domestic energy supplies, increase international payments deficits and increase the cost of energy to consumers.

Congress should think twice before tampering with a system that has helped pro-

duce a standard of living unequalled in the world.

#### FACTS DON'T SUPPORT DIVESTITURE

A mass of legislation has been started through Congress with the stated intent to split up the nation's major oil companies into producing, pipeline transportation and refining-marketing segments, each independent of the others.

Advocates charge the oil companies with lack of competition and monopolistic practices, a charge the facts do not support. There are 10,000 oil-producing companies, about 130 refining companies, 100 interstate pipeline companies and about 300,000 gasoline retailers.

While concentration ratios in the oil industry range from 29 to 38 per cent for the largest four companies, in other lines of business ratios range from 30 to 92 per cent. Consider this: The four largest oil companies control 33 per cent of the U.S. refinery output; the four largest chewing gum companies control 86 per cent of the output; the four largest office machine firms control 81 per cent of the output of typewriters; the four top greeting card makers control 67 per cent of the greeting card output and the four leading light bulb makers control 91 per cent of the output of electric lamps.

The real question facing the nation is not whether the oil industry should be torn apart, but how it can most effectively meet our energy needs.

It takes money to develop alternative sources of energy in advance of the day when the oil wells literally run dry. A recently published directory lists several hundred organizations now working on proposals to develop solar energy. Among them, predictably, one finds oil companies busily at work. Solar energy will only be developed if there are economic advantages.

Shell Oil is one of the first. Several years ago Shell's Houston headquarters received a letter from a New York bank advising them a noted researcher in the solar energy field had developed a method of converting and storing energy from the sun. This was one among thousands of letters received.

Shell invested \$3 million in the idea. Under new agreements, the oil company put in another \$3.6 million.

This year, the company will market long-life solar energy modules for special uses in remote or mobile applications—similar to the use of flashlight batteries. So far, solar energy has not produced electricity in commercially marketable quantities for utility distribution lines.

The interesting fact is that only an oil company had the courage and resources to back this research. Dismemberment would have prevented it from doing so.

Congress should be wary of cutting off that source of energy development capital. Facts indicate it would do only harm.

#### BREAKING UP BIG OIL

A fixation on the part of the American public that bigness in business is bad is behind the current efforts to persuade Congress to break up the oil industry. Actually, bigness is essential in many fields and the oil industry is one of them.

Congress has before it a bill which would attack what is known as vertical integration in the oil industry, forcing the companies to limit their operations to one, but no more, of the four basic functions: Searching for and producing oil and natural gas; making products from oil; transporting the raw materials and products; and marketing petroleum products. The legislation would require Big Oil to divest itself of the assets and operations in other than a single function.

At first glance, it appears like a good way to cut Big Oil down to size. But the long

range impact on the industry, the economy and the American consumers would be little short of disastrous.

Bigness is essential to the oil industry, with its massive financial requirements and huge facilities. Big Oil just could not do the job on a small scale. Divestiture would force smallness on the industry, in the name of more competition. But it would be at the cost of crippling an essential industry at a time when the U.S. is trying to become more self-sufficient.

If Big Oil becomes the victim of divestiture, other large American industries likely will be next in line. There would be a serious threat to the survival of private competitive enterprise in this country.

Congress must move slowly and carefully, and in full recognition of the facts, not suspicions or misconceptions.

There is a need for better regulation of the oil industry. But there is a vast difference between controls and destruction.

### A LOOK INTO THE WORLD OF THE EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE

#### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in late March of this year, the Trenton, N.J. Times conducted a major series into the operations of the Educational Testing Service. The series was written by two staff members of the Times, J. Stryker Meyer and Jim Landers.

In recent years, there has been growing concerns registered among educators and students alike about the validity of the standardized tests which are conducted by the ETS for prospective students seeking admission into colleges and universities as well as medical schools, law schools.

The concerns have been triggered as a result of sharply dropping scores of students on these examinations.

The article I am inserting today discusses the Educational Testing Service as a company. The article shows the remarkable growth of the ETS in its 28-year history to such a point that it now provides tests for more than 5 million students as well as conducts research projects, provides financial aid services and a whole range of other programs and services. Their expansion can be seen in their financial situation. In the words of the authors "the corporation has grown from a small test development company with an operating budget under \$2 million to a burgeoning, multifaceted testing/research industry that had a \$58.5 million budget in 1975." The regular ETS staff has grown from a few hundred to nearly 2,000 employees.

I and several of my colleagues have been looking into various facets of the operations of the Educational Testing Service over the past several months. My attention has been focused on the administration of the law school admission test, and whether it is a reliable indicator of a student's ability to succeed in school. I have also been looking into how the Federal funds obtained annually by the ETS are used. Other investigations into the subject have focused on



the maintenance of individual student records by the ETS and their relationship to the individual's right to privacy.

I am pleased to provide my colleagues with the benefit of this article. Subsequent articles from this series will follow in the near future.

The Trenton Times article entitled "The Company Under a Halo" now follows:

#### THE COMPANY UNDER A HALO

(By Jim Landers and J. Stryker Meyer)

(First of four parts)

In October 1969, at the height of the anti-war movement, Educational Testing Service put aside designing tests for a day to hold in-house workshops on the American presence in Indochina. It was an expression of corporate conscience.

Two years later, when the Navy's ROTC program asked the testing company to supply it with the names of scholarship applicants with superior test scores, an ETS employee sent the Navy 100,000 names of students who had performed dismally on ETS exams. It was an expression of individual conscience, according to one former company official, that ETS hastened to correct but later regarded with a certain amount of bemusement.

Those acts of protest seem long ago. But they reflected the current of moral passion that has run through ETS since it was created, a moral passion that has given it the image of a company with a halo.

ETS has been gathering the best and the brightest in the fields of testing and research for 28 years, providing them with the amenities of academia's Ivory Tower and turning them loose on the task of reforming education in America.

From its lowly beginnings on a Princeton street corner, ETS has grown into a nationwide company testing five million people each year and conducting research into the education of other millions.

The company is best known for its work with the College Entrance Examination Board; it writes the Scholastic Aptitude Test. But ETS has moved far beyond the examiner's role for would-be freshmen.

State and local governments throughout the country are agonizing over school finance reform, and ETS is there, testifying in courtrooms where judges strike down the property tax as a tool that denies equal educational opportunity.

School boards in Louisville, Detroit, Richmond and a host of other cities worry over formulas for successful school integration. ETS is there, studying communities across the country in an effort to define effective desegregation.

Colleges struggling to fill sparsely populated dormitories are wondering where to recruit, and ETS is there, providing these schools with information about prospective students from a data bank that includes the names of an estimated 15 million Americans.

And then there are the tests, hundreds of them, the examinations taken by millions of Americans each year at thousands of schools, universities and companies. For ETS these are the spearpoint of a lance aimed at barriers to equal opportunity in the United States. They are seen by the company and by admissions officers and personnel directors as objective yardsticks to use in reaching decisions about who gets into college, who gets a job, which students need remedial school work or special education.

If ETS could be summed up in a single word, from top executives to clerical workers, the company's 1,968 regular employees might well choose "service." They see themselves as the servants of American education. That service takes them out to fight the holy war

for educational democracy, attacking barriers to learning and work that often have prevented the black, the poor, the disadvantaged and the scorned in society from realizing the American dream of unlimited opportunity.

But a growing number of critics, from outside professionals in the education community to students groping through three-hour exams, might choose another word for ETS: Power. The power of an organization that shapes national and local policy, that sways judges in their decisions, that stands like the mute doorman of fate before the gates of school and work deciding who shall get in, and who shall not. For the critics of ETS, the halo is tarnished; the company itself is the barrier to equal opportunity; power has been concentrated in the hands of a few men and women, whose professional accountability to society is ambiguous.

"Far too many educators appear to believe that standardized tests were constructed in heaven by God and His angels," said Norman R. Dixon, an associate professor of higher education at the University of Pittsburgh. "Yet, standardized tests have telling effects on the aspirations and opportunities of those who are powerless, poor, and insignificant to local, state and national governments."

There is ample evidence to support both views of ETS: there is service and there is power, merit and abuse, opportunity and obstruction in the workings of a nonprofit corporation with annual revenues now exceeding \$58.5 million and a net income of more than \$1.1 million.

ETS and the College Entrance Examination Board point with pride to a vast array of Cinderella stories that describe how disadvantaged youngsters, with no strong sense of self-esteem or ambition, took the Scholastic Aptitude Test in high school, scored well, were encouraged to go on to college and eventually found thriving careers in the American mainstream.

There are other stories to remind the listener of what the country was like before the tests came along.

"I can think of no better example of how standardized tests have changed America than Paul Robeson," the famous athlete, singer, actor and civil rights leader, said William H. Anghoff, executive director of college boards programs with ETS.

"Robeson's story is tragic. Here's a man who was born on Witherspoon Street, a brilliant man who was rejected by the school just up the street (Princeton University). He was Phi Beta Kappa at Rutgers, and a remarkably talented man, yet (in 1915) Princeton would not have him. If we had had a different kind of selection system, like the SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test), back then, things might have been very different."

The case of Robeson, a black presumably denied admission to the Ivy League because of his race, illustrates the high moral purpose of providing objective, color blind tools of measurement that ETS views as the cornerstone to its function in society.

But of late, the power of ETS and its tests has reached unprecedented proportions across the nation. It is a power transferred, with few sanctions guiding its use, to test administrators who have repeatedly abused it. It is a power under attack and investigation on at least seven different fronts, ranging from Ralph Nader's institutional gadfly to Congress. Principals, teachers, students, psychologists, politicians and professors are questioning the pervasive influence of standardized tests. Some have now called outright for their abolition.

The questions these people are asking focus on ETS at the flagship of the \$170 million standardized testing industry. They have seen the tests abused, they have seen them challenged as biased and they have seen them work as profoundly defeating influences on the lives of students. And they see more of

the same in the future if testing remains as deep in the fabric of American life as it is today.

Willard Wirtz, director of the National Manpower Institute in Washington, D.C., and former U.S. Secretary of Labor under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, currently chairs a panel of experts investigating why the Scholastic Aptitude Test scores of millions of American high school students have been declining for 12 years. As part of that inquiry, Wirtz feels the panel must begin investigating the power of testing itself.

"The extent to which we are putting ourselves as a country at the mercy of a series of tests is a hell of a thing—and not a little disturbing," he said.

William W. Turnbull, the president of ETS, has been with the company since its birth. He acknowledges that the critics of testing and ETS are more numerous today than at any other time.

"Some of their criticisms are thoughtful, and others are not," he said. "It is roughly in proportion to the centrality testing has been achieving in our way of life."

ETS tests are now a major, and often central, part of the lives of 2.5 million elementary school children; 1.4 million high school students hoping to get into college; 319,000 college graduates hoping to earn higher degrees; and hundreds of thousands of people aspiring to careers in gynecology, teaching, the CIA, architecture, radiology, law, auto mechanics, stock brokerage and even professional golf.

For those taking the occupational tests, jobs often depend on the scores. ETS now writes tests used by professional licensing boards that determine who shall gain certification in fields such as dentistry, podiatry, psychiatry and nursing. Even policemen are now certified on the basis of ETS tests.

Examples of the abuse of these tests abound.

Consider Ralph Dungan, the state Chancellor of Higher Education. Faced with a perceived decline in student abilities, and an abundance of college graduates seeking jobs in fields already overcrowded, Dungan has called for the use of predetermined Scholastic Aptitude Test scores as minimum requirements to New Jersey's state colleges and universities.

Dungan proposes to use "cutoff scores." According to a memorandum he presented to the State Board of Higher Education, he would like to see cutoff scores—a minimum achievement level—applied either to individuals or to an entire class of students hoping to become freshmen.

According to various executives at ETS, Dungan's proposal would be an abuse of the test.

As ETS Executive Vice President Robert J. Solomon explained recently, cutoff scores can make the Scholastic Aptitude Test a barrier to educational opportunity.

"Narrow, technocratic approaches are bound to deny opportunity," he said. "The question of college admissions is not a testing issue, not even an educational issue—it's a social issue."

In the literature and guidelines explaining its tests, ETS repeatedly warns against the dangers of using only a student's test scores in making decisions. The only thing the Scholastic Aptitude Test has ever been shown to indicate is a student's grade performance in his first year of college; and even then, a high school record is a better forecast. Cutoff scores, Solomon said, when used with the Scholastic Aptitude Test may even be unconstitutional, "a violation of due process for the student."

ETS is often caught in the middle in situations of this kind. The public and its educators, demanding a means of accountability for the performance of students and teachers are making demands on tests that they were never intended to service. The

resulting abuses have led to demands for abolition of the tests themselves.

ETS tests have been used in many parts of the country to deny thousands of school children, college candidates, teachers and others an equal chance at school and work.

Historically, test barriers have stood highest before those who come from the lower socio-economic backgrounds. They are imposed by test administrators who use test scores as their only guidance in making decisions that can have enormous consequences on an individual's life: scores that often have not been valid instruments, when taken in isolation, for assessing the abilities of people.

Elementary school youngsters in several states have been segregated into classes for the mentally retarded or slow learners classes solely on the basis of test scores.

Teachers in Virginia, Louisiana and North Carolina (primarily blacks) have been demoted, fired or refused work on the basis of invalidated cutoff scores for the National Teachers Examination, an ETS test that some of the company's own researchers have charged is biased against anyone not from a traditional, middle class background.

Law firms have made use of the ETS Law School Admissions Test in making hiring decisions, despite the company's protestations that the exam serves only as an indicator of a student's performance during the first year of legal studies—and not his work performance.

Mississippi has used the ETS Graduate Record Examination to deny educators, again primarily blacks, a chance to teach in state public schools.

All of these practices violate the intent for which ETS says the tests were designed, and courts have ruled most of them unconstitutional. Cutoff scores are a legal approach to hiring practices, ETS agrees reluctantly, but only if such uses have been proven through lengthy validity studies.

But test abuse constitutes only part of the concern critics have with ETS. A look at the complaints of test takers and others who use the company's services, coupled with an examination of confidential ETS documents, shows the company acting by itself on occasion to create obstacles for those seeking entrance to the mainstream of American life.

More than 1,000 students applying to law schools in the 1970-71 school year were prevented from having their applications reviewed because of the inability of ETS to forward their college transcripts, according to current and former company employees.

The snafu was one of information overload. Acting at the request of one of the company's regular customers, the Law School Admissions Council, ETS designed the Law School Data Assembly Service. The program involves compiling transcripts, Law School Admissions Test scores and grade averages of students hoping to get into law schools and forwarding these figures to the colleges.

According to an assessment of the difficulties encountered during the 1970-71 year contained in the company's confidential memos, ETS went into the project completely unprepared to handle the numbers of students who used the service (80,000 more than anticipated). The number of students who called in to complain about delays in the processing of their applications was 15,515.

"Lots of cases were handled as they came up to rectify complaints, and we went to bat for the students with the law schools on admissions deadlines," said John Winterbottom, the former head of ETS law programs who now serves as a special assistant to the company's president.

Winterbottom is skeptical about the figure of 1,000 students prevented from having their law school applications processed, but he conceded that the company never went back to come up with a figure of its own.

"As far as the students that fell through the cracks, they were just so botched up that we never heard about it," he said. "That was just a bad scene, no question about it."

Other complaints against ETS deal with the potential for abuse. These are mostly concerned with two issues: privacy and test bias.

Within the computers and microfilm libraries at the ETS site in Lawrence Township are the names of an estimated 15 million people. Several million of these (no one at the company is sure how many) are the names of students who participate in the ETS Student Search Service, a program contracted for by the College Entrance Examination Board on behalf of more than 1,000 colleges and universities that are looking for recruits.

Before the colleges are allowed to participate in the service, they must sign a pledge saying the information will be used only by them in their hunt for students. Yet, on three different occasions in the last four years, that pledge has been broken. The company refused to discuss these violations.

As for bias, contradictory reports swell the research literature. At the heart of the issue are the persistently lower scores of disadvantaged minority groups on ETS tests. The company's critics charge that the tests are written unfairly and discriminate against minorities. For its part, ETS points to a group of its own validity studies that show how the test results continue to predict the performance of students once they reach higher school years and college, and for testing job applicants, work performance. If there is a bias, ETS says, it is merely a reflection in the tests of a larger bias in society.

Many of these problems and potential problems are the result of failings by those who make use of ETS materials, others are, perhaps, better laid directly on the company's doorstep. ETS is aware of them all; its actions in dealing with them range from inertia to reform in the way it conducts its business.

"I think the only way you can get valid tests is if they serve as indicators for the country," said Turnbull. "There are those who charge that our indicators may be good for conservative institutions of higher education, but not for a McLuhanesque society. Certainly, this is no frivolous argument, but I'm not sure how you would set standards for a fast-changing society. Institutions are conservative. Insofar as we follow them with our measurements to service their needs, we are conservative."

Turnbull, Solomon and others with the company said in recent interviews that much more needs to be done to curb the abuses of standardized tests, including the possibility of licensing test administrators. Statements were also made about exploring directions in which the company itself should change.

"It can always be said that we're not doing enough, and some of it is constructive criticism," said Ronald Flaughner, a senior research psychologist at ETS. "Right now, the halo is slightly tarnished when it comes to our efforts at communicating proper test use."

Solomon, however, feels the critics miss the point when they accuse ETS of being irresponsible with its products.

"Tests are neutral tools by themselves. The question is how people use them," he said. "They can be used to close doors, and they can be used to open them."

ETS, its conscience stung and its halo tilted, has begun to regroup, tacitly agreeing that testing carries much more power than the company initially felt itself capable of generating. The corporate self-portrait has expanded the definition of service to accommodate this power while insuring that the cause of educational democracy is not lost.

K. Patricia Cross, a senior research psychologist with the company's Berkeley office, sketched this picture of ETS in a paper delivered in 1973 before an audience of education writers and editors:

"Agencies such as ETS are shaped by, and in turn help to shape, the directions of educational innovation. . . . Professionals at ETS must play the role of educational statesmen and reformers by recognizing educationally sound ideas and helping to influence the development of the tools that would make possible their implementation. Our role as scientists and educational researchers is to understand the implications of data that extend the frontiers of knowledge about the educational process. And our role as soothsayers is to recognize, even before they articulate it, what colleges and students are going to want."

It is a remarkable guiding philosophy. How well it suits a company like ETS is a question being debated right now both within and without the nation's small community of test makers.

#### STATE DEATH TAXES: CHARITY BEGINS AT HOME?

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is currently considering legislation to reform Federal estate and gift tax laws. During the committee's hearings last March on estate tax reform proposals, we listened to a long list of witnesses from all parts of the Union, ranging from Maine to California. By my count, witnesses from 29 States and the District of Columbia appeared before the committee to offer their versions of how these laws should be changed.

I certainly do not mean to imply that they should not have come before the committee, for I wholeheartedly support the committee's efforts for full discussion of the issues and due process. However, these deliberations call to mind the old adage, "Charity begins at home."

An examination of the State taxation laws that many States impose on estates and gifts leads one to wonder what efforts these individuals and lobbying groups are making to change their own State's laws. In many States, the lion's share of estate taxes for estates under, say, \$150,000, which is no small estate, goes to State tax collectors.

The State of Maryland, for example, charges a flat 1 percent inheritance tax on money received from an estate. Spouses as well as adult children are allowed a specific exemption of \$150 from this tax. This means that Maryland actually charges more for smaller estates than does the Federal Government. On an inheritance with a gross value of \$60,000, Maryland levies a tax of \$598.50. The Federal estate tax on this amount is zero. When a person inherits a spouse's estate worth \$100,000, Maryland raises its tax to \$998.50, but the Federal estate tax is still zero. It is not until the value of the estate rises to almost \$150,000 that the Federal estate tax for a spouse rises to an amount greater than the Maryland inheritance tax. The Federal estate tax on a \$150,000



estate is \$1,650, and the Maryland tax is \$1,498.50, or a difference of \$151.50.

Mr. Speaker, time and again, the witnesses testifying before the committee stressed that they were after relief for the small farm, the small business, and the small individual. However, it appears that in cases such as Maryland's this relief could be first coming from the home State. In the case of a marital transfer, Federal estate taxes have no consequence until the estate reaches more than \$120,000, thanks to the combined effects of the 50-percent marital deduction and the \$60,000 specific exemption.

Ohio taxes on \$60,000 estates that are transferred between spouses amount to \$600 and to \$1,310 for transfers to adult children. However, the specified \$60,000 exemption permits freedom from Federal taxation for this size estate. A \$100,000 estate is taxed at \$1,700 for interspousal transfer in Ohio, but again, the Federal tax is zero. For estates transferred in their entirety to adult children or others, however, Federal estates do begin to rise at this level. The Ohio estate tax on a \$100,000 estate that is transferred to an adult child amounts to \$2,510, while the Federal tax on this estate amounts to

\$4,800, or nearly twice this amount. However, it should be noted, that this Federal tax amount does not include consideration of other estate tax loopholes that may be employed to escape paying Federal taxes, such as the generation-skipping trust, or other deductions for settlement and funeral-related expenses.

Pennsylvania taxes inheritance at a flat 6 percent and allows no specific exemption. This State's taxes are the highest of the States I examined. A \$60,000 estate which is free from Federal taxation gets socked with \$3,480 due in Pennsylvania inheritance taxes for interspousal transfer. Pennsylvania's death taxes appear to be among the highest in the Nation. A person who inherits his spouse's \$150,000 estate must pay Pennsylvania \$11,840 in estate taxes, or seven times the Federal estate tax of \$1,650. Federal tax relief will do little to ease the problems of the widow or widower in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, the following table compares the amounts of Federal taxes that would be paid with the amounts of State taxes that would be paid on estates amounting to \$60,000, \$100,000, and \$150,000. These sizes were chosen, since

they represent the current level of the specific exemption, and two proposals for raising the specific exemption, respectively. Certainly, it must be agreed that estates over \$100,000 are large by any standards. The sample of States used in this comparison were among the most heavily represented during the Ways and Means Committee's considerations of gift and estate tax reform, and represent a fair cross-section of death tax treatment by States. I would like to stress that the figures used in this table do not take into account other tax-saving devices such as the generation-skipping trust, charitable deductions, administrative expenses, or casualty or other losses. For the sake of simplicity and the ease of comparison, this table assumes that the entire estate has been transferred to the recipient named.

Mr. Speaker, it is only as estates approach a size of \$150,000 that Federal estate taxes begin to really outdistance State death taxes. I believe that this should be kept in mind as the Ways and Means Committee and Congress consider proposals to ease further the gift and estate tax levels.

The comparison follows:

COMPARISON OF FEDERAL AND STATE DEATH TAXES

Size of gross estate	Amount of taxes paid						
	Federal	Maryland	Ohio	Pennsylvania	Massachusetts	Iowa	Nebraska
Transfer to spouse:							
\$60,000	0	\$598.50	\$600	\$3,480	\$845	0	\$500
\$100,000	0	998.50	1,700	5,880	2,805	\$425	900
\$150,000	\$1,650	1,498.50	3,400	11,840	5,815	2,575	1,400
Transfer to adult child:							
\$60,000	0	598.50	1,310	3,480	1,490	1,375	500
\$100,000	4,800	998.50	2,510	5,880	3,630	3,425	900
\$150,000	17,500	1,498.50	4,480	11,840	6,835	6,775	1,400

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$400 allowable tax credit for State death taxes paid.

## CONGRESSIONAL STAFFER DENOUNCES 30 MEMBERS

### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it may interest those Members who joined with me in calling attention to the leftward course of events in Mexico to learn that they have been denounced in the Mexican press as kukluxklanescos—Klansmen—and “irresponsible slanderers” by a congressional staff member.

The source of the eight-column headline is William Leon Higgs, legislative assistant to Representative AUGUSTUS HAWKINS. A summary of Mr. Higgs' public activities, delicately omitting his congressional connection, can be found in the RECORD—September 10, 1975, page 28533. Mr. Higgs, who was disbarred after conviction for a serious morals offense against a boy, later rendered such sterling legal aid to the New Mexico radical, Reies Tijerina, that Tijerina received a 3-year prison term. Since then, Mr. Higgs has amused himself with CIA-baiting and other fashionable Communist Party-directed pastimes, such as the disarming of America—see RECORD, March 22, page 7726.

Since Mr. Higgs has chosen to thrust himself forward by providing the Mexican press with banner-headline denunciations of Members of Congress, calling them “irresponsible slanderers,” he is once again asking for public exposure.

## NEED FOR FEDERAL ESTATE TAX LAW CHANGES

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Federal estate tax laws are seriously outdated. The present estate tax exemption is \$60,000. Previously I have introduced legislation which would have doubled the exemption, but inflation over the past half dozen years has made that increase too low. To remedy this situation I have introduced legislation (H.R. 12277) which would increase the exemption to \$200,000.

The House Ways and Means Committee is currently considering legislation to change the estate tax laws. I am heartened to see recognition of the problems of farmers and small businessmen. The present \$60,000 estate tax exemption has hit hard. For example, when a farmer has died, many families are un-

able to pay the high estate taxes. They are forced to sell the family farms.

I have also introduced H.R. 5131. It would, at the election of the executor, allow a farm estate to be assessed at its value for farming purposes. This is a valuable alternative to present tax policy of valuing land at its highest potential value.

Farmland should be assessed at its value as farmland. Computing the estate tax based on a nonfarm use often forces a family to sell the farm.

Action is needed on these proposals. Inflation has made current law seriously out of date. Present exemptions work against the best interests of the United States.

## PATTERSON ASKS FOR HAYS RESIGNATION

### HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. PATTERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask you and my colleagues to act in the best interest of the American people and the House of Representatives in urging Representative WAYNE HAYS to resign the chairmanship of both the House Administration Committee and the Democratic Congressional

Campaign Committee until the charges against him are resolved.

The alleged misuse of taxpayers' money that Hays has been accused of is a very serious matter. We must set our own House in order.

I commend the House Ethics Committee in its unanimous decision to "proceed immediately with a full investigation" of the charges against Congressman Hays. Public confidence in the integrity of Congress has been shaken and prompt action is needed to begin restoring that confidence.

The actual guilt or innocence of the parties involved is, of course, a matter to be decided by the House Ethics Committee and the Federal grand jury after their thorough investigations now underway are completed. However, in the interest of preserving the integrity of the House of Representatives, I feel it is our responsibility as Members of the House to insist that Representative Hays relinquish his authority as chairman of the two committees.

#### REVENUE-SHARING EXTENSION

**Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days, I have had the opportunity to read rather thoroughly the legislation to extend the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 and the committee report accompanying this legislation. To say the least, I am quite disturbed with several of the amendments added in committee to a bill that started out as a simple extension of revenue sharing.

Before going further, let me explain that in 1972 I had very serious reservations about the entire concept of revenue sharing because of the lack of Federal moneys to be shared. However, since then I have seen evidence that the program is worthwhile and does provide a means for local government to meet its obligations to its citizens without the need to raise further revenues themselves. Under the 1972 legislation, we are, in simple terms, returning to the taxpayers of America the taxes they have paid to be used by their local elected officials for those projects to benefit the most people and with the least amount of Federal strings attached.

However, this noble concept has been completely reversed in H.R. 13367. Rather than keeping the Federal Government and its bureaucratic redtape out of the picture, the Committee on Government Operations, by rather narrow margins, has decreed that one Federal string after another will be attached to the revenue-sharing funds.

Mr. Speaker, I may be reading between the lines too much, but I have the very distinct impression that some members of the committee are trying to kill the revenue sharing program through crippling amendments since they know they cannot kill it outright through an up or down vote on the House floor. It appears

that they are trying to make the revenue sharing program so unpalatable to local Government officials that they will no longer want to receive these badly needed funds.

As pointed out in dissenting views, efforts have surfaced to employ the revenue sharing concept as the vehicle for a variety of regulations and restrictions on the independence of local governing units. The original concept of revenue sharing was based on the reasonable belief that local governments, which are much closer to the citizens than the Federal bureaucracy, could better decide how to utilize tax revenues most wisely. There is no justification whatsoever for the Federal strings which are now attached to revenue sharing—strings which can only lead to greater Federal intervention in local affairs, and greater local dependence on the Federal bureaucracy. What is also unfortunate is that many of the smaller communities will have to spend an amount almost equal to the revenue sharing funds they receive in order to comply with the new rules and regulations which means they will not have a net increase in revenue.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to read H.R. 13367 and the accompanying committee report very carefully before it is brought to the House floor for consideration. I feel sure they will be just as alarmed as I am over the redtape and Federal strings that will be attached to revenue sharing if the bill in its present form is passed. I fully intend to support those amendments on the House floor which will remove these totally unnecessary and overly stringent regulations on local governmental units participating in the revenue sharing program. The bill in its present form is nothing more than a wolf in sheep's clothing that must be shorn of its unnecessary provisions if we are to prevent the wool being pulled over the eyes of the American people.

#### COMMERCE SHOULD VETO OIL TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER TO SOVIETS

**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I discussed Soviet efforts to gain American aid in developing their natural gas resources. Now they appear to be attempting to obtain about \$2 billion worth of oil refinery equipment.

On a number of occasions I have discussed the Soviet need for American technology. Much of the advanced energy technology can only be obtained in the United States. Is this country now in the process of giving up its lead in energy technology to the Soviets?

So-called East-West trade has been largely a one-way street. The Soviets have gained needed technological advances often at little cost to themselves. From the world's largest truck plant on the Kama River to a ball bearing machine that has helped the Soviets in

their missile building, the story is the same.

The article from the Baltimore Sun detailing the proposal states that the Secretary of Commerce has the power to veto this technology transfer. That is exactly what he should do.

At this point I include the text of the article "Soviet Seeks Oil Equipment Deal" from the Baltimore Sun:

#### SOVIET SEEKS OIL EQUIPMENT DEAL

"Soviet oil specialists have approached American companies about putting together a deal for oil-refinery equipment potentially worth \$2 billion.

"If the deal goes through, it will be the first sale since World War II of American oil-refining technology.

"Commerce Department officials, according to businessmen in Moscow, have warned that part of the deal may be jeopardized by government guidelines on the sale of materials affecting the strategic capability of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union wants to buy eight basic machinery units for improving the quality of its oil.

"In two weeks, Western sources here said, the Soviet Ministry of Oil Refining will issue specifications and seek bids for the equipment. It hopes to have the units in operation by the end of the current five-year plan in 1980.

"Most of the money in the deal would be made by Europeans. Because the United States government does not subsidize financing for trade with the Soviet Union, the credits and construction are expected to come from Western Europe.

"The required technology, however, exists only in the United States, according to a local representative of an American engineering firm. As he outlined the deal, American companies would supply blueprints to the European manufacturers of the equipment. Then the American firms would supervise installation in existing Soviet refineries.

"Even this roundabout route would amount to selling American technology to the Soviet Union. The Commerce Department, acting from a set of policy guidelines, blocks those sales that it believes are harmful.

"In the past, these guidelines have included anything to do with oil refining.

"Negotiators for the Soviet deal have made preliminary inquiries to the Commerce Department, the American representative in Moscow said, and been told that sale of at least one of the units might violate the guidelines.

"He said the sale still might go through if an American company licensed the process to a European company, which would not be affected by the guidelines, and the European company then sold it to the Soviet Union."

#### PAUL FLACKS TO RECEIVE JUSTICE LOUIS D. BRANDEIS DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD

**HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to learn that the 1976 recipient of the Justice Louis W. Brandeis Distinguished Service Award will be Paul Flacks, of Dayton, Ohio. This honor will be accorded Mr. Flacks on Sunday evening, June 6, 1976, at the Dayton District's American Zionist Fund Award Dinner.

Mr. Flacks is currently the national



director of public affairs for the ZOA. In this capacity, as in so many other undertakings, he has compiled an outstanding record.

Through the years Mr. Flacks and I have met frequently on legislative matters of mutual concern. While he states his views with passion and force, his positions invariably are buttressed by fact and logic. It is this dedication and articulateness which have made him such an effective spokesman for the Zionist cause. And, it is these qualities which have made him so deserving of the honor which is being bestowed upon him Sunday evening.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to join Mr. Flacks' many friends in paying tribute to him this weekend. He is without question an outstanding member of the Zionist Organization of America and one most deserving of praise for his efforts.

#### A COMPREHENSIVE AND LOCAL APPROACH TOWARD INSURING EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

**HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which I believe will be the beginning of a constructive, comprehensive and local approach toward insuring equal educational opportunities. This bill would establish a 15-member commission to study alternatives to the forced busing of schoolchildren. It would not alter any current law. Rather, what it "says," is that it is time we sit down and take a thoughtful, long-range look at a variety of methods for effectively integrating our public schools. And it is time we use local people to develop local solutions.

The Commission on Alternatives to Busing would be composed of individuals who know educational problems first-hand: school administrators, teachers, parents of schoolage children, local elected officials and students. We have had our ivory-tower theorists for too long; it is time we asked those who live and work with youngsters and it is time we use their expertise. The bill directs the commission to prepare a study of alternatives to busing such as redrawing school zones, relocating buildings, restructuring curricula, and pairing and clustering. Additionally, the commission would be required to hold a national conference of parents, educators, local officials, students and others in order to compile opinions and recommendations on achieving equal educational opportunity. This study would then be transmitted to the Congress. It would give the Congress a firm, knowledgeable basis for formulating legislation that provides practical, sound solutions to this problem. The emphasis in this bill is at the local level—not directives from Washington or the courts. The commission would be encouraged to study and suggest ways local school people could develop long-range, com-

prehensive plans for achieving effective and positive desegregation.

Legislation of this type is needed for several reasons. No branch of the Federal Government has provided clear direction or meaningful assistance to local school officials to help them determine and implement the most effective, least disruptive and most educationally sound means for achieving desegregation. We have let the courts decide. The Congress has not given this issue a long hard look. Now and then an effort is made to enact an amendment to the Constitution or a knee-jerk attempt is made to tack an inappropriate rider on to something like a major energy bill. We, the Congress, have not done our part either. Political posturing is achieving nothing except feeding emotionalism.

The harms and benefits of busing are still very much in dispute. In fact, busing often is counterproductive in that it results in "resegregation." James Coleman notes that white parents often take their children out of schools where busing is mandated, thereby creating again, separate white and black schools. Also, I have heard that frequently when students are bused, they are put into academic tracks. Such ability grouping, however valid and useful, often creates segregation within a particular school.

In this day and age, no one questions the need to provide quality and equal educational opportunities. This is the law of the land and I believe it is widely accepted. However, people are tired of the Bostons and the Louisvilles. No one wants the strife and agony and disruptiveness that forced busing sometimes causes. I am convinced that we can provide equal educational opportunity to all in a humane and educationally sound way. This bill could lead the way and I urge my colleagues to join me in support.

#### A MORAL HERE

**HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine has expressed the penultimate last word:

#### A MORAL HERE

Editor—A federal employee by the name of Elizabeth Ray is the subject of current attention.

Whether this lady was originally employed for her secretarial skills or for her more engrossing talents is a matter under debate. Undenied, however, is the fact that her congressional services—whatever they may have been—commanded a salary of \$14,000 a year.

It is also undeniable that the Congress is currently debating legislation which would put into production a fleet of 144 B-1 bombers at a cost of \$92 billion.

If the Congress in its wisdom decided to provide each of its 435 members with the same service Ms. Ray provided, the cost for a year would be a paltry \$6,090,000. Since that body is not known to be miserly when it comes to its own perks, the bill would probably provide that the same service be accorded not only in Washington, D.C., but in the district as well. Add another \$6,090,000.

To pass the Senate the bill would have to satisfy equivalent Senatorial needs. Add \$2,800,000 more for a grand total of \$14,980,000—\$15 million in round figures.

Then congressmen, being otherwise pleasantly diverted and having blunted their aggressive edge, would reject the \$92 billion bomber bill. The result: at a cost of \$15 million taxpayers would save \$91,985,000,000.

Moral. Make love, not war.

HOWARD H. JEWEL.

OAKLAND.

#### HAZARDOUS PRODUCTS AND THE CHALLENGE OF LAWYERS

**HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege today of inserting in the RECORD an excellent and distinctive article by Edward M. Swartz, Esq., of the Massachusetts Bar. Mr. Swartz is the author of the book "Hazardous Products Litigation" and is a former chairman of the Continuing Legal Education Division of the Association of Trial Lawyers of America. His article, "The Hazardous Products Plague," appears in the May 1976 issue of Trial magazine, the journal of the ATLA.

Mr. Swartz' article cites the astronomical incidence of product-related injuries and the horrendous suffering these injuries cause. Mr. Swartz asserts that lawyers must help to educate the public and must work to influence the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the National Bureau of Standards to act in the public interest, particularly when the public interest differs from the interest of industry.

Mr. Swartz' reasoning with respect to influencing the Consumer Product Safety Commission is particularly timely now. Although the Commission has thus far failed to fulfill its promise to radically increase the safety of products, the Senate last week confirmed a candidate of very questionable fitness, S. John Byington, to become a member of the Commission for 2½ years. Due to President Ford's intention to appoint Byington chairman, the Senate in effect confirmed Byington to head the Commission.

According to the Washington Post of May 27, after the Senate vote Byington pledged a "vigorous attack on the many problems of consumer safety" and said, "I intend to demonstrate the Senate's confidence is well-placed."

If the Senate's confidence is indeed justified, the severe problems cited in Mr. Swartz' article will be alleviated by end of Mr. Byington's term. If the Senate's sanguinity is unfounded, however, it will be well for the private bar to pay special heed to Mr. Swartz' call to action.

The article follows:

#### THE HAZARDOUS PRODUCTS PLAGUE

(By Edward M. Swartz)

The number, the variety, and the severity of product-related injuries in the United States today are simply astonishing. Deaths from product-associated incidents are in the tens of thousands and injuries are in the millions. The dollar costs to our society of these tragedies are in the billions. The suf-

fering is enormous, often excruciating, frequently unrelievable. This hazardous products plague pervades every home, every office, every factory in our nation. It threatens every farm. It lurks in every schoolroom and playground. It is ubiquitous, insidious, and pandemic. And it presents a direct and urgent challenge to the trial lawyers of America.

The challenge is threefold, and I believe that our response thus far has been excellent on one level, but insufficient on the other two. This article explores the threefold challenge, and suggests some ways of responding to its demands.

First, some facts and figures. The National Safety Council has estimated that more than 50,000 people die each year in non-automotive "accidents." Of these, at least 30,000 are killed in directly product-related incidents. At least 20 million people are so severely injured by products that they require treatment in hospital emergency rooms, while 27 million more are treated in doctors' offices or at home for less disabling product-associated injuries. And these incidents most often involve the people who are least able to defend themselves—children and the elderly. (The startling truth is that the leading cause of death among American children through age 14 is "accidental death," and that these accidents kill more of our young ones each year than do cancer, pneumonia, influenza, and congenital anomalies—the next leading causes of death among children—combined.)

#### PRODUCTS THAT CAN MAIM OR KILL

The variety of products involved in these injuries and deaths is astonishing. In my own trial practice, over the past decade, we have been called to represent people killed or injured by the following products, among others: drain cleaners, lawnmowers, ladders, floor wax, stools, color television sets, hair dryers, room vaporizers, refrigerators, electric ovens, vacuum cleaners, cooking oil, hair curlers, charcoal lighter fluid, paint remover, children's blankets and sleepwear, flammable clothing, glass doors, gas heating and hot water systems, gas stoves, soft drink cartons and bottles, automobile steering mechanisms, and tire-changing and tire-mounting equipment.

Also, slingshots, model cars, toy tops, air rifles, darts, model planes, swings, slides, swimming pools, snowmobiles, dune buggies, bicycles, boats, tents, sunglasses, parachutes and parachute harnesses, rifle cartridges, goalie masks, golf carts, football helmets, soap, laundry detergents, spray paint, peanut butter, canned foods, antibiotics, tranquilizing drugs, contraceptive foam, IUD's, and massage belts.

Also, slipcovers, safety matches, carpets, automobile seat belts, balloons, ski boots and bindings, spray deodorants, liniments, battery booster cables, charcoal briquets, tractors, snowblowers, catheters, altimeters, building nails, laboratory safety equipment, conveyor belts, bulldozers, gas masks, fire extinguishers, and kites.

And just as the variety of products is almost infinite, so are the injuries sustained quite often fearfully terrible. I have represented children who have had their flesh sliced to the bone or chemically melted into soap by contact with burning synthetic fibers or splashing household cleaners made of caustic lye. A young father lived only long enough to tell his wife and children how much he wanted not to die, before the exquisitely painful burns he suffered when the family's hot water heater exploded claimed him forever. A young girl of great promise was decapitated when "safety" equipment in the research laboratory in which she was working blew up and fired large shards of glass across the room. The catalogue of these depressing and unnecessary tragedies is nearly endless.

#### THE ENORMOUS ECONOMIC TOLL

This maiming and killing by product involves extraordinary human and economic costs as well. In addition to the 47 million deaths and injuries a year, the enormous and sometimes unrelievable suffering, the shattered families, and the broken bodies and spirits, there are medical expenses involved which run into the millions of dollars, with millions more required for physical and psychological rehabilitation and therapy, and for the support of widows and orphans, and for the care of the disabled and dependent victims themselves. The 1974 National Safety Council dollar estimates of the economic consequences to society of "accidents" are staggering: \$13 billion in present and future wage losses from death and permanent disability; \$5.7 billion in medical and hospital fees and expenses; \$7.4 billion in time lost because of accidents which do not permanently disable or kill. The total cost of these items comes to a round \$33 billion!

With this background in mind, you can see why I have denominated the high and costly incidence of product-related injuries and deaths a "plague," and have spoken of the "challenge" which it presents. I see this challenge—as it relates to trial lawyers—as composed of three related elements.

First, there is the challenge with which all of us are conversant: the challenge to our skills, as attorneys on behalf of the victims of this plague, to gain for them, through the legal process, that "full, fair and reasonable compensation" to which they and their families are entitled as a matter of simple justice. The plaintiff's bar in hazardous products litigation does, on the whole, an excellent (and compassionate) job in representing individuals who have been harmed by dangerous products.

#### IMAGINATION AS A TOOL

Yet, if I were asked for one suggestion which could further improve our performance in this area, I would say this: we lawyers must constantly expand our range of vision and imagination. This very general principle translates into quite specific details in the handling of products liability cases. For instance, in most hazardous products litigation which is brought under a theory of negligence, the negligence which is pleaded often reduces to the proposition that the product was defectively manufactured or had a hidden hazard or didn't work the way it was supposed to.

But, there are much broader concepts of negligence which are often equally appropriate, and negligence in the labeling (failure to warn adequately, failure to instruct adequately), in the design of the containers (unstable bottles for caustic cleaners), in the advertising ("safe"), and so on, is also a fertile ground for liability.

This is especially true when there are several defendants in the case, one whose negligence is primary and obvious, others whose activities did in fact contribute to the ultimate injury but whose contributions seem, at first glance, relatively secondary. This can become critical when, for one reason or another, the primary defendant is unavailable. (We had a case, for instance, in which a young mother was horribly burned from neck to knees when her flammable nightgown caught fire as she leaned into the family oven. Her second child, which she had been carrying for eight months, was stillborn a few days later. The nightgown had been completely consumed by the fire. She had no recollection of where or from whom she had bought it, and no memory of the maker's label in the gown itself. We sued the stove manufacturer for negligence in the design of the oven and recovered a quite substantial sum for the young mother.)

#### LAWYERS AS EDUCATORS

We have all been more or less effectively conditioned by the folklore that "accidents will happen" into the assumption, ordinarily unspoken and implicit, that when something terrible happens to us, it is usually either our own fault or just one of those things that make life a risky business at best. The assumption is false. In almost every instance of "accidental" injury, there is a discoverable human error which can be identified, assessed, and, where appropriate, sued upon. But, it sometimes takes imagination to perceive this. Most of the people who have been injured in "accidents" never think of getting a lawyer. They blame themselves, lick their wounds, and try to "take it like a man." This unfortunate state of affairs leads me to the second aspect of the threefold challenge which I think the hazardous products plague presents to trial lawyers: the challenge of public education.

Public education with respect to product safety has two complementary functions: on the one hand, we should all try constantly to become more aware of sound safety practices; and on the other hand, we should also be aware that when we have been hurt, we have a right to seek redress. The first function is carried on chiefly by those individuals and organizations charged with direct responsibility for safety education, although lawyers should participate in this. But the second function is one in which we trial lawyers especially should take an active part.

There are many ways in which we can do this and do it more effectively than we have done so far. One is by lecturing on safety and on the rights of injured consumers to school and community groups. Another is by writing on these topics for the popular press, including newspapers. A third is by lecturing to the bar itself and writing in legal periodicals, not only on the principles of effective hazardous products litigation, but also on the possibilities for effective litigation in situations where most lawyers, like most people, simply would not think a lawsuit was feasible or likely to be successful. There has been some heartening progress made of late in this last area, but much more needs to be done. And even when it is done more thoroughly, it will not suffice as a defense against hazardous products.

#### PUSHING THE GOVERNMENT

This suggests a third dimension to the challenge which the hazardous products plague presents. It is much more difficult. It is the challenge of using our professional skills and our personal qualities of persistence, persuasiveness, and logic to bring a truly effective governmental presence into the field of product safety. I am pessimistic about this because of my own experience, particularly in the field of toy safety.

There are four sets of players involved in the struggle to get the government genuinely and significantly working for product safety in an effort to reduce the deaths and to mitigate the severity of the injuries which these hazardous products so often cause: the government itself; the public, especially as the public are consumers of the products which kill and injure them; the manufacturing and distributing and retailing companies (and their marketing and advertising staffs); and, the independent professionals—doctors, teachers, engineers, and lawyers.

But, the government only moves when it is pushed, and the public is so amorphous and so dispersed that its push is felt only gently, if at all, by government. The manufacturers and their collaborators, however, are pushing, and pushing forcefully and cleverly. They know where the pressure points are, and they have their hands firmly on them. As for the independent professionals, we lawyers, like the doctors, the teachers and the engineers, have been so far largely



ineffective in the battle to get the government working on the side of the public and not on the side of the manufacturers. The reasons for this are complicated and beyond the scope of this brief essay. But, what we can do now is, though difficult to execute, not so hard to sketch in principle.

First, we each should individually develop a personal expertise in the field of governmental regulation of product safety. This means acquiring a detailed familiarity with the specific provisions of the various state and federal acts, such as the Hazardous Substances Act, the Flammable Fabrics Act, and so on, as well as with the all-important regulations issued under these acts. It also means developing a working knowledge of the structure and the operations of such entities as the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the National Bureau of Standards.

#### LOBBYING THE CPSC

The CPSC has statutory authority to issue mandatory product standards and to have products which do not meet these standards removed from the market. The NBS promulgates "recommended" standards which, although voluntary, establish an effective level of safety compliance. Since these standards are critically important, it is also critically important that there be substantial consumer-oriented input into their formulation. But so far there has been relatively little consumer-oriented input and a great deal of manufacturer-oriented input. Moreover, the CPSC has opted for a philosophy of product safety regulation which puts the stress on long-range standards development and leaves it off short-range imminent-hazard enforcement.

This means that the agency's budgetary and personnel resources will be less available for the investigation and recall of dangerous products out in the field and more available for the quiet, barely-noticed work of developing standards back in the office. But this "barely-noticed work back in the office" is noticed thoroughly by the industry lobbies, whose very skillful agents are in frequent and effective contact with the people developing the standards which will set the level of product safety for probably years to come. Thus, the public is less protected in the short run and not very influential in the long run either.

Therefore, secondly we should organize ourselves as a profession so as to have a salutary and measurable impact on the process of standards development, as well as on the decisions, such as the decision to accentuate long-range work and de-emphasize enforcement. Most of us who are trial lawyers have a disinclination to get involved in tedious and arid arm-wrestling with bureaucracies. But, if we are going to get the government going in the right direction, we are going to have to do some of this and do it soon.

Thirdly, because of the specialized nature of our skills as trial lawyers and because of the nature of the skills of the legal profession as a whole, this organizational work must include a vigorous effort to establish some inter-disciplinary bodies which, far more than any or all of their separate constituent parts, can really contribute intelligently to product safety. A lawyer, for instance, can tell you whether a bill, as drafted, or a regulation, as proposed, will get done what its proponent intends should be done. But, he is rarely qualified to assess the technical engineering specifications which may be found in a complicated product safety regulation. The well-financed corporate lobbyist, however, draws on not only the legal, but also the technical and the public relations specialists in his company or his company's trade association. And, when he arrives at the agency with a proposal or an amendment, it

is at least technically plausible and he can argue its merits from a background which is technically adequate.

#### TAKING DIRECT SAFETY ACTION

Fourthly, we should be alert to the possibilities which arise in our own watch over hazardous products. When an injured client comes to us in search of some monetary substitution for his lost eye or his dead child, we should not only give him as strong forceful representation as possible, but we should also see whether it is possible to take action directly and immediately against the product itself. We could, in appropriate instances, petition the CPSC to ban the product as an imminent hazard forthwith or to set emergency standards for the product at issue.

We can organize safety information committees which disseminate information about product injuries to local merchants and consumer groups. We can use the Freedom of Information Act to get information about product hazards and complaints out of the files of the CPSC and out to the public. And we can do as many other things in this area as our imaginations can suggest.

Let me note, not so incidentally, that all of these activities will inevitably make us better products liability lawyers for our clients, better able to handle their individual cases. Imaginatively developing new theories of liability for product injuries, more fully educating the public to its rights to redress for product injuries, and informing the bar of the less obvious possibilities for hazardous products litigation—all these contribute to a more favorable climate for these cases generally. Familiarity with governmental regulation of products (and product advertising) may equip us with additional bases for liability (failure to meet a standard, false advertising, deceptive warranty, etc.). Cooperation with other disciplines in working for product safety will give us a broader understanding of the products themselves and of their hazards as a foundation for suit, and a fuller notion of where and how to find experts for our own cases, as well as a certain basic familiarity with the technical language and fundamentals of several different sciences. We may then be better able to perceive unusual but valid causes of action and to penetrate technically inadequate defenses for our clients.

The hazardous products plague is abominable, and the challenge it offers is demanding. I have no doubt, however, that the trial lawyers of this nation can respond to that challenge and make great strides in the effort to eradicate the plague.

#### THE WAXMAN-MAGUIRE AMENDMENT AND THE CLEAN AIR ACT—III

##### HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, proponents of the Dingell and Brodhead amendments on automobile emissions have claimed that going forward with meeting the full statutory standards would cause enormous increases in the price of new cars—to the detriment of the consumer and the recovery currently underway in Detroit.

I have long believed, however, that the auto industry has unfairly and unjustifiably singled out environmental and safety standards as the main cause of rising

car prices. It seemed to me that inflation in materials, labor, and overhead was primarily responsible for the ever-higher cost of cars.

To gain some perspective on this controversy, I asked the Congressional Research Service to undertake a study of the historical impact of automobile emissions standards on the inflation in automobile prices with a view toward quantifying how much of the increased costs in car prices in recent years was due to the Clean Air Act's requirements, and how much to other factors. I also asked CRS to project the degree of automobile worker unemployment which might result if we proceeded to meet the statutory standards in 1980 or 1981.

The CRS study, "The Economics of Auto Emission Controls: An Historical Overview" throws grave doubt on the validity of the arguments being made on behalf of an extended freeze of the current emissions standards. In brief, the study's major conclusions were as follows:

First. Although automobile emission control requirements have increased automobile prices noticeably, these increases are relatively small in comparison to the costs of other options.

Second. The data and aggregate demand studies suggest that emission control-related cost increases are by no means the most significant factor affecting auto sales and employment.

Third. Although the auto industry contends that safety standards and pollution controls are major reasons for decreasing fuel economy, a study of the evidence does not lead to the conclusion that they are the primary cause of the increases in automobile weight—the most significant variable affecting fuel economy.

Fourth. Nor are they primarily responsible for the increases in car prices. Most of the price rises can be attributed to the purchase of numerous accessory, luxury, or power options.

Fifth. Even at the statutory standards, with the price increases that might result, industry analysts predict only a 1 percent reduction in new car sales. Meeting the California standards in 1978 would appear to have little potential for affecting production or employment.

The Waxman-Maguire amendment, in other words, would not adversely affect the growth or profitability of the auto manufacturers, or the job security of the automobile labor force. The CRS study leads one to conclude that pollution controls are being singled out as the fall guy for a whole host of other economic ills which have plagued the industry.

Following, for the benefit of my colleagues, are excerpts from the CRS study:

#### THE ECONOMICS OF AUTO EMISSION CONTROLS: AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

(By Joseph P. Biniek, Specialist, Environment and Natural Resources Policy Division, May 14, 1976)

#### SUMMARY

The report represents a partial study of the impact of implementing the Clean Air Act Amendments. It is partial in that it does not attempt to equate benefits with costs.

The data in this report suggest that emission control requirements do increase automobile prices noticeably; however, these increases are relatively small in comparison to the costs of other options. Studies by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) show that current levels of control of 1.5 g/mi., 15 g/mi., 3.1 g/mi. for HC, CO, and NO<sub>x</sub>, respectively have increased "sticker prices" by \$78 to \$123 for a six cylinder car. Industry testimony suggests that additional costs of \$23 to \$50 are required to move to a 0.9 g/mi., 9.0 g/mi., 2.0 g/mi. level for HC, CO and NO<sub>x</sub>, respectively. Further reductions to 0.4 g/mi., 3.4 g/mi., 0.4 g/mi., HC, CO and NO<sub>x</sub>, respectively, according to NAS, could result in sticker price increases of \$273 to \$377.

Increases or decreases in lifetime costs are considered by many to be a more meaningful basis for comparison. Such comparisons include sticker prices, fuel and maintenance. The NAS study suggests that a direct-fuel-injection, stratified charge engine could achieve 0.4 g/mi., 3.4 g/mi., 0.4 g/mi., HC, CO, NO<sub>x</sub> levels with savings in fuel and maintenance. With this option, the overall impact of emission control could decrease discounted lifetime costs by \$40 to \$418 from current levels.

Sticker prices of cars have increased significantly from 1966 to 1976. For example, a Cadillac de Ville has increased about \$3,000; a Buick Le Sabre about \$2,100; Dodge Dart \$1,100; Volkswagen Beetle \$1,900; Chevy Nova \$1,100, and so on.

In addition to base sticker price, power, luxury-comfort and other options add significantly to final purchase prices. Addition of an automatic transmission, power brakes, power steering, radio and air conditioning adds \$900 to \$1,000 to the base price. Vinyl tops and other options contribute additional upward price pressure.

The price elasticity for the demand for cars, according to Thomas Dyckman, is -0.6. This suggests that a 1 percent decrease in car prices could be expected to increase demand by 0.6 percent. Disposable income elasticity appears to be about 4.0.

Changes in price, income and inventories are not the entire story. Major changes in tastes, attitudes, credit terms and other factors, according to Dyckman, can be very important determinants of sales volume. Nevertheless the data and aggregate-demand studies suggest that emission control cost increases are by no means the most significant factor affecting auto sales and employment.

#### AUTOMOBILE SIZE AND PRICE

A common argument of the auto industry is that regulations for safety and pollution are major reasons for decreasing fuel economy. Furthermore, the industry contends that the required components are responsible for weight increases, directly or indirectly during the period 1971 to 1974.<sup>1</sup> The data in Table 1, Comparison of Selected Automobiles, does show substantial increases in weight and price during the period 1966-1976. However, there is no consistent pattern to the increases in prices or auto weights prior to or after 1971 that would allow one to conclude that safety or pollution control equipment were the primary cause of the increases in prices or weight. Nonetheless, the data indicate that nearly all cars increased their weight steadily during the decade. Price increases, however, have been more drastic. Figure 1 illustrates the change of auto prices in terms of the wholesale price index. This figure provides the reader with a graphic comparison of automobile prices with other commodities. Compared with the 1967 index of 100, the passenger car wholesale price index rose to 130.9 by February 1975. Fuels, iron and steel, and other commodities rose to significantly higher levels during the same period.

The average year-to-year price changes on U.S. cars (Table 2) have fluctuated over the past two decades from decreases of \$17 in 1962 to increases of \$449 in 1975. Translated in percent change from previous year prices the range is -0.57 to 10.19 percent. The *Automotive News* reports:

FIGURE 1

AVERAGE ANNUAL WHOLESALE PRICE 1973-FEBRUARY 1975 (1967=100 PERCENT)

ANNUAL AVERAGE WHOLESALE PRICES, 1975

[In percent]

	1967	1973	February 1975
Passenger cars.....	100	115.4	130.9
Trucks.....	100	123.0	148.8
Iron and steel.....	100	136.2	200.5
Nonferrous metals.....	100	135.0	176.1
Rubber and plastic products.....	100	112.4	150.0
Chemical and allied products.....	100	110.0	178.1
Synthetic textile products.....	100	121.8	129.3
Metalworking machinery.....	100	125.2	167.1
Fuels and power.....	100	134.3	232.3
Average hourly earnings (SIC 371) motor vehicle manufacturing.....	100	153.5	173.0

It should not be inferred that high prices were the only reason for the horrendous sales figures in the early months of the 1975 model year, but prices were unquestionably a major factor.<sup>2</sup>

The base or sticker price presented in Table 1 provides only a partial basis for trend comparisons. The actual purchase price is determined by the numerous accessory, luxury, or power options offered to or desired by the purchaser.

#### POWER, LUXURY, AND ACCESSORY OPTIONS

Suggested retail prices provide only the base figure for determining the price of a car. Data in the *Automotive News* indicate that options and accessories add significantly to the final purchase price of new cars. Options purchased by the average buyer increase the purchase price by \$800 according to the *Los Angeles Times*.<sup>3</sup> Radios, bucket seats, vinyl tops, adjustable steering column and speed regulating devices are among the luxury-comfort options. About 85 percent of the cars were equipped with radios in 1967, about 92 percent in 1973 and 87 percent in 1975. Vinyl tops were purchased on 22 percent of the cars in 1967; this increased to 49 percent in 1973 and then decreased to 47 percent in 1974 and 1975. The growth of other luxury-comfort options from 1967-1975 are presented in Table 3.

In addition to the luxury-comfort options, power equipment are popular options on U.S. automobiles.

They include power brakes, air conditioning, power assisted seat adjustments, power steering and power assisted side and tailgate windows. As indicated in Table 4 power brakes, air conditioning and power steering are most popular and were included in 77, 72, and 90 percent of the cars respectively in 1975.

Power train options also influence the final price of an automobile. Of the 1975 cars, 92 percent had automatic transmission, 72 percent had V8 engines and 93 percent had disk brakes (Table 5). The purchase price of options, whether included as standard equipment or as "selected options," can account for significant increases in the consumers investment in a new car. For example, the purchase of an automatic transmission, power steering, power brakes, radio and air conditioning on a Chevy Nova would raise the price by about \$1,000 (Table 6) in 1976 models. The same options in 1966 could be acquired for about \$660.

A question that cannot be answered by secondary data is, how many of the options purchased are fostered by industry's pre-determined inventories? In other words, how many people buy cars as they want them, versus how many buy "over equipped" cars in order to avoid "special order" delays?

#### EMISSION CONTROLS

No secondary data are available to establish an historical industry construction cost baseline. Nevertheless, a study by the California Institute of Technology provides some insight into the costs of various components, and the mark up to arrive at sticker prices. According to this study, emission controls account for \$86 of the total cost of \$1,321 for a subcompact 1972 car (Table 7).

Estimates of component costs of pollution control equipment are presented in Table 8. Since the costs are represented in 1972 dollars they do not represent current costs, nevertheless, they do provide a basis for comparison of emission control costs with other options. For example, the \$86 emission control costs multiplied by 1.6 gives a sticker price of \$137 for emission control, to which \$22 for "tool up" costs must be added to bring the total cost to \$159.

A more complete analysis of emission control hardware has been prepared by the National Academy of Sciences.<sup>4</sup> They estimate that "sticker prices" for emission controls could reach \$392 for meeting statutory requirements in 1976. Table 9 presents increases by model years as well as cumulative price increases due to pollution control.

Table 10 presents a chronology of emission controls beginning with the PCV addition in 1966. The table reflects the interim standards and assumes complete compliance with the statutory standard by 1976. Since the chronology does not reflect suspension and current proposals under debate on emission controls, it might be useful to review them.

"Background.—The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970 (Public Law 91-604) required manufacturers of new cars to clean up exhaust emissions by 90 percent from the allowable levels in effect for the 1970 model year. For two pollutants—hydrocarbons (HC) and carbon monoxide (CO)—this clean up was to be achieved by model year 1975. For the third pollutant—oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>)—this was to be achieved by model year 1976.

#### SUMMARY OF THE AUTO EMISSION STANDARDS

[In grams per mile]

	HC	CO	NO <sub>x</sub>
Uncontrolled cars (Pre-1968).....	8.7	87.0	3.5
1974: <sup>1</sup> Federal standards.....	3.0	28.0	3.1
1975: <sup>2</sup>			
Federal 49—State standards.....	1.5	15.0	3.1
California.....	.9	9.0	2.0
1976: <sup>3</sup>			
Federal 49—Standards.....	1.5	15.0	3.1
California.....	.9	9.0	2.0
1977: <sup>4</sup> Federal 50—State standards.....	1.5	15.0	2.0
1978: Statutory standards.....	.41	3.4	.4
Administration bill:			
1977-81—50 State standards.....	.9	9.0	3.1
Post 1981—50 State standards.....	( <sup>5</sup> )	( <sup>5</sup> )	( <sup>5</sup> )
EPA proposal:			
1977-79.....	1.5	15.0	2.0
1980-81.....	.9	9.0	2.0

<sup>1</sup> Imposed administratively by EPA.

<sup>2</sup> Imposed by EPA as interim standards after suspension of statutory standards, except for California's HC and NO<sub>x</sub> standards which were set by the State.

<sup>3</sup> Imposed by Congress in Public Law 93-319, except for California's NO<sub>x</sub> standard, which was set by the State.

<sup>4</sup> Imposed by EPA as interim standards after suspension of statutory standards, except for NO<sub>x</sub> standard which was imposed by Congress (Public Law 93-319).

<sup>5</sup> Administrative discretion.

Footnotes at end of article.



"In the same Act, Congress authorized the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to grant a one-year delay of these standards. EPA later did grant a delay. Thus, the 1975 requirements for HC and CO were pushed back to 1976, and the 1976 requirement for NO<sub>x</sub> was pushed back to 1977.

"When EPA granted this one-year delay, it set interim standards for 1975, as was required by law. One set of standards was set for the 49 States. A more stringent set was in effect for California in 1975. Neither was as stringent as the full 90 percent reduction requirements.

"In June 1974, Congress amended the Clean Air Act, by adopting the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act (Public Law 93-319). That Act further delayed the new car emission standards. The 1975 interim standards prescribed by EPA were carried over through model year 1976. In addition, Congress authorized EPA to grant one more year's delay of the HC and CO standards through model year 1977. Finally, Congress postponed the full 90 percent NO<sub>x</sub> reduction requirement until model year 1978.

"The March 5, 1975, decision of EPA has suspended the statutory HC and CO standards for that year equal to the 1975 49-State standards. The 1977 interim standards also apply to California. Although EPA found that catalytic converter technology was available to permit the statutory HC and CO standards to be met without undue fuel penalty or cost increases, due to emission of sulfuric acid mists. Until the extent of the risk could be accurately determined, the Agency concluded that it would be unwise to force application of this new technology on a nationwide basis."

When the Administrator suspended the 1977 standard, he commented on the cost of achieving a standard of 0.9, 0.0, and 2.0 for HC, CO, and NO<sub>x</sub>, respectively. He stated:

"There was somewhat more variation in estimates of auto price increases that might accompany attainment of the statutory emission standards than was the case for fuel economy. Still, the estimates were all in the same basic area with the auto companies once again tending to the pessimistic side.

"General Motors estimated that a sticker price increase of \$130-\$150 over present systems would result if a 'warm-up' converter were used and \$35-\$50 (with possible upward adjustment for catalyst change) if it were not. These figures were in 1975 dollars. GM App. 1-b-2, 4-b-4.

"Ford's estimate is likewise about \$150, mostly for increased size and precious metal loading of the catalytic converter, though this was inflated by factoring in an inflation adjustment for 1977 which was estimated at 15 percent. F. App. I-C-2; Appendix 6 p. 7; Tr. 831-32.

"Chrysler was significantly higher at \$260, C. App. IV-H-8, a figure adjusted to account for the effect of an estimated 20 percent total inflation by 1977, Tr. 152.

"These figures are at the high end of the range estimated by my technical staff, see Status Rept. p. 4-4, and significantly more than the estimate of the National Academy of Sciences, NAS Rept. p. 89. The National Academy, however, did not attempt to account for the use of 'start catalyst'."

"There is even more agreement as to the impact of emission standards set at the current California levels. GM estimates that sticker price increase at about \$23 over that of the current national system, GM App. I-C-2. That increase was set by Ford at \$50 (presumably once again with an adjustment for inflation), F. App. I-C-2, by the NAS at about \$40, see NAS Rept. p. 89, and by my own technical staff at about \$40, Status Rept. p. 4-4. Chrysler did not provide an estimate.

"As for the suggestion that the standards be set at .9 g/mi. CO, and 3.1 g/mi. NO<sub>x</sub>, the

resulting price increase was described by Chrysler as 'nominal, an additional \$10', Tr. 49 and by General Motors as \$20 to \$25, Tr. 313."

#### ECONOMIC IMPACT OF CONTROLS

The suspension document also continued a terse appraisal of the economic impact of imposing more stringent standards. The Administrator stated:

"Both prices increases and reductions in fuel economy that might result from tighter emission standards could in theory be expected to affect new car sales adversely. However, a study by my staff indicates that even at statutory levels the impact on sales would be on the order of a 1 percent reduction."

Other studies appear to confirm the Administrator's assessment. Professor Thomas R. Dyckman concludes that the disposable income elasticity appears to be about +4.0, while price seems to be inelastic at about -0.6. Changes in income, prices and car stocks, he states, is not the whole story. The state of the economy, major changes in tastes, attitudes, credit terms and other factors can be important.<sup>22</sup> His conclusion is based on numerous studies which are summarized below:

#### PRICE AND INCOME ELASTICITIES OF VARIOUS STATISTICAL DEMAND STUDIES<sup>1</sup>

Study	Elasticity	
	Price	Income
1. Suits [43].....	-0.6	+4.2
2. Suits [44] <sup>2</sup> .....	-7	+1.7
3. Equation (4) <sup>3</sup> .....	-7	+1.7
4. Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly [52]: <sup>4</sup>		
Study No. III.....	-6	+4.4
Study No. I.....	-7	+4.1
Study No. II.....	-1.2	+3.9
5. Equation (5) <sup>5</sup> .....	-8	+4.0
6. Nerlove [34].....	-9	+2.8
7. Chow [9].....	-1.2	+3.6
8. Atkinson [2].....	-1.4	+2.5
9. Roos and von Szelski [41].....	-1.5	+1.5-2.5 +2.5-3.8

<sup>1</sup> These studies are based upon Suits' model.  
<sup>2</sup> The standard errors of the elasticity estimates in the present study may be compared to those of Suits' 1960 study. They are: for study items 2, 0.3, and 0.2, respectively for study items 3, 0.1 and 0.2; and for study items 5, 0.1, and 0.2.

<sup>3</sup> Supernumerary income.

<sup>4</sup> Disposable income estimate: given by Suits [43], p. 278.

Source: Dyckman, Thomas R., "An Aggregate-demand Model for Automobiles," *The Journal of Business*, vol. XXXVIII, July 1965, p. 261.

In light of these studies, the price increases of \$23 to \$50 to move from 1.5 15, 3.1 g./mi., to .9, 0.0 and 2.0 g./mi. respectively for HC, CO, and NO<sub>x</sub> appear to have little potential for affecting production or employment.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> *Automotive News*, 1976 Market Data Book Issue, April 28, 1976, p. 64.

<sup>6</sup> "Most GM Prices Top \$4,000," *Los Angeles Times*, August 28, 1974, Part III, p. 11.

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Congress, Senate, Decision of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency Regarding Suspension of the 1975 Auto Emission Standards. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works, 93rd Congress 1st Session, April 1973.

<sup>8</sup> U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (Staff report) Clean Air Act Amendments—1975, Committee Print No. 5 94th Congress 1st Session March 1975.

<sup>9</sup> National Academy of Sciences, Report by the Committee on Motor Vehicle Emissions, November 1974, pp. 88-95.

<sup>10</sup> Application for Suspension of 1977 Motor Vehicle Emission Standards Decision of the Administrator, *Federal Register*, Vol. 40, No. 51, March 14, 1975, p. 11915.

<sup>11</sup> Federal Register, Ibid., p. 11915.

<sup>12</sup> Dyckman, Thomas R., An Aggregate-Demand Model for Automobiles, *The Journal of Business*, Vol. XXXVIII, July 1965.

#### SAUDI ARABIAN OFFER TO AID SOMALIA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in early May, James Akins, former U.S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia, testified before Congress that the United States did not pursue a 1975 Saudi Arabian offer to finance military and economic aid programs to Somalia as a possible means of eliminating Soviet presence in Somalia.

I wrote the State Department asking for its reply to this assertion. The Department replied that it studied the Saudi Arabian offer but felt that on balance "we could not propose to undertake a major arms relationship with Somalia."

I enclose for the interest of my colleagues my letter of May 10 to the State Department, the Department's reply of May 21, and the Washington Post article of May 5 reporting on Ambassador Akins' testimony:

May 10, 1976.

HON. HENRY A. KISSINGER,  
Secretary of State,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I read with concern reports in the newspaper that the Department of State did not pursue a 1975 Saudi Arabian offer to finance military and economic aid programs to Somalia as a possible means of eliminating the Russian presence there and that the Department of State discouraged a Congressional visit to Saudi Arabia on a trip to Somalia to learn about the Soviet presence there.

I would like to know the particulars of this Saudi offer, when it was made, why it was not pursued, why the Congressional delegation was discouraged from visiting Saudi Arabia and why it is not in our interest to work with all states to diminish Soviet influence in the Horn of Africa.

I would appreciate an early reply to this letter and would also like to see any rebuttal to the statement former Ambassador James Akins made that the Department issued.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,

Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Investigations.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1976.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,  
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Investigations, Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to respond to your letter of May 10 concerning newspaper reports that the Department of State did not pursue a 1975 Saudi Arabian offer to finance military and economic aid programs to Somalia as a possible means of eliminating the Russian presence there and that the Department of State discouraged a Congressional visit to Saudi Arabia on a trip to Somalia to learn about the Soviet presence there.

A suggestion by Saudi Arabia in May 1975 regarding possible collaboration in assisting Somalia received careful consideration in the Department. Insofar as military assistance was involved, any U.S. decision to ship large quantities of arms to Somalia would have entailed serious complications in our relations with friendly states in Africa bordering on Somalia, some of which were the object of Somali territorial claims. It would have gotten us deeply involved, for the first time, in arming both sides in a conflict in Africa, and would also have presented difficult financial problems. For these principal reasons we concluded that we could not propose to undertake a major arms relationship with Somalia, despite our continuing deep concern over the growing Soviet presence there.

We did, however, decide to offer to restore a modest economic aid program in Somalia, and informed Saudi Arabia—as well as Somalia—of that decision in September 1975.

As for the proposed visit by a Congressional delegation to Saudi Arabia in connection with its trip to Somalia in July 1975, an extensive search of Department records shows that the Department of State did not stand in the way of such a trip. It is possible that a misunderstanding may have grown out of preliminary conversations among officials arranging the logistics of the trip and that a conclusion was drawn that the Department did not favor it. In fact, the Department actually sought to arrange such a visit to Saudi Arabia. In the end the visit did not take place because of factors beyond the Department's control.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT J. McCLOSKEY,  
Assistant Secretary for  
Congressional Relations.

[From the Washington Post, May 5, 1976]

#### SAUDI OFFER OF AID REPORTED

(By Laurence Stern)

Former U.S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia James Akins told a Senate subcommittee yesterday that the State Department turned a deaf ear last year to a Saudi government offer to finance military and economic aid programs to Somalia as a means of eliminating the Russian presence there.

Akins said he was informed by a State Department colleague that the reason he received no answer from Washington to the Saudi offer was that the Defense Department was pressing its case for development of a major U.S. naval base in the Indian Ocean on Diego Garcia Island.

A powerful Pentagon argument to Congress on the Diego Garcia base last year was the growing threat of the Soviet presence in Somalia.

"This is the most dishonest thing I have heard in 30 years in Congress," exclaimed Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.), who opposed the Indian Ocean base in the Senate Armed Services Committee.

"...The argument was used with great persuasion in Congress that since the Russians were in Somalia it was necessary to establish a base in Diego Garcia," he said.

Congress approved \$13.8 million for a permanent naval base on the Indian Ocean island after a stormy battle over costs and increasing military rivalries in the region.

Subcommittee Chairman Frank Church (D-Idaho), after hearing Akins, said, "the circumstantial evidence certainly suggests a relationship between the desire of the Navy for the Diego Garcia base with a continuation of the Russian presence in Somalia to justify the base."

Akins said the Saudi offer was relayed to Washington through him because of the growing concern of the Saudi government over the Russian naval buildup in Somalia.

This concern, the former ambassador said,

was stimulated by U.S. officials who made available to the Saudis photographs of Soviet naval facilities in Somalia. The Saudis, said Akins, "became very frightened."

The terms of the Saudi proposal which he reported to Washington, Akins said, was that the Saudis would provide some \$15 million in economic support and for the supply of U.S. military aid to Somalia.

Akins said he had no idea whether the proposal was acceptable to the Somalis because it was stopped dead in Washington.

After Akins' testimony, Symington confronted Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Navy Secretary William Middendorf about the allegations, Reuters reported.

[Both denied knowledge of the reported Saudi offer. A State Department spokesman declined to comment on the testimony.]

Akins, a 22-year career Foreign Service veteran and specialist in Arab affairs, was dismissed as ambassador to Saudi Arabia last year in the wake of his differences with Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger over dealings with the Saudi government and on oil policy questions. He is no longer in the Foreign Service.

In another revelation, Akins acknowledged in reply to a question that the State Department denied him permission to go to London in late 1974 in an effort to persuade Prince Fahd to agree to a large auction of Saudi oil—a move that would have moderated the steep climb in Persian Gulf oil prices.

Top Saudi government officials, Akins said, had asked him to intercede with Fahd who was under pressure by other oil-producing countries to call off the auction.

Akins testified under oath that his trip to see Fahd was vetoed by superiors in Washington on grounds that the State Department lacked travel funds for the Jidda-to-London journey and that his presence in London would be "too conspicuous."

On another matter, Akins said he was not aware of the use of Saudi Arabian arms agent Adnan Khashoggi as an intermediary in contacts between President Nixon and King Faisal during and after the 1973 Middle East war, as reported yesterday in The Washington Post.

Questioned about The Post article, Akins said: "I was not aware of any such communications and I don't believe they took place." If they had, he told the subcommittee, it would have been "highly irregular and improper."

However, he said that the Saudi defense minister, Prince Sultan, had confided to him that Khashoggi had boasted in Riyadh "that he got me removed (as ambassador) in reprisal for having blocked agent fees."

The former diplomat testified ruefully that "I still think it (Khashoggi's boast) is a joke, but I don't think it's as funny anymore."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, I was absent in Delaware on Tuesday when the House voted on rollcalls Nos. 315 through 320. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

- No. 315—"yes."
- No. 316—"no."
- No. 317—"yes."
- No. 318—"yes."
- No. 319—"yes."
- No. 320—"yes."

WILLIAM DWIGHT, SR.

### HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mark the retirement of one of the giant figures of New England journalism. At the beginning of this year, William Dwight, Sr., ended his long and fruitful reign as publisher and editorial conscience of the Holyoke, Mass., Transcript-Telegram.

Bill Dwight's contributions to journalism and to his community have been enormous. These were best summarized in a special 1965 award to him during 50th anniversary ceremonies at the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. His citation read:

You are that ideal, a publisher with real editorial background and one who has made extraordinary contributions to journalism over the years. Columbia's Graduate School of Journalism honors itself by honoring you today with this 50th Anniversary Medallion.

The Holyoke Transcript-Telegram, one of New England's foremost daily newspapers, was founded in 1883 by Bill Dwight's father, William G. Dwight. For more than 50 years, since he was a high school student, Bill Dwight has worked for this newspaper, where he steadily expanded its coverage and prestige.

Bill Dwight has always had a real reporter's sense of what will interest his readers, and whether it was an anniversary party or the annual Holyoke St. Patrick's Day parade, the Holyoke Transcript has covered it in its columns.

Following graduation from Princeton University, 1925, and the Columbia Graduate School of Journalism, 1926, Bill Dwight joined the staff of the Transcript-Telegram on a full-time basis. In 1930, following the death of his father, Bill Dwight became the paper's managing editor. In 1957, he became publisher.

Born into a newspaper heritage, Bill Dwight has proudly passed his family's legacy to his sons. William Dwight, Jr., has succeeded his father as publisher of the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram. And Donald Dwight, the former Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, was recently appointed the publisher of the Minneapolis Star-Tribune.

Bill Dwight also established a tremendous legacy of community service. He was active in politics as well as business, education, and journalism. As a political leader, Bill Dwight was elected as a member of the Holyoke Board of Aldermen, 1927-29, served as a Hampden county commissioner, 1946-48, and represented the First Congressional District at two Republican National Conventions, 1948 and 1964.

As a businessman, he served as a trustee of Northeast Utilities, the Holyoke Savings Bank, and the Holyoke Hospital. He is a past director of the Franklin County Trust Co. of Greenfield and the Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co.



In 1954-55, he served as chairman of the New England Governor's Textile Committee.

As an educator, he served as a trustee of Mount Holyoke College and Williston Academy.

And as a journalist, Bill Dwight has been a director of the Associated Press, publisher of three newspapers—Holyoke Transcript-Telegram, Greenfield, Mass. Recorder, and Concord, N.H., Monitor, and director of four other newspapers—Raleigh, N.C., News and Observer, Burlington, Vt., Free Press, Haverhill, Mass., Gazette, and Catskill, N.Y., Daily Mail. He has been elected president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, 1956-58, and president of the New England Daily Newspaper Association, 1940-42. He has also served as a jurist for the Pulitzer Prize awards.

For his years of achievement and leadership, Bill Dwight is owed a great debt of gratitude by the people of Holyoke and the Connecticut River Valley.

I want to congratulate Bill and his lovely wife and partner in his endeavors, Dorothy. May they enjoy to the fullest the increased leisure that retirement will bring. At this point in the Record, I submit several articles concerning Bill Dwight:

[From the Holyoke Transcript]

#### WILLIAM DWIGHT RETIRING AS PUBLISHER OF TRANSCRIPT

William Dwight of 60 Lindor Heights, is retiring the end of the year as publisher of the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram.

At the same time he is relinquishing his positions as president and treasurer of the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram Publishing Co. Inc., and as president and treasurer of Holyoke Transcript Inc., parent firm of the Concord, N.H., Monitor.

William Dwight Jr. of 30 Cleveland St., editor of the Transcript-Telegram, succeeds him as publisher and at the same time takes over the two principal corporate positions in Holyoke Transcript-Telegram Publishing Co. Inc.

George W. Wilson of Concord, N.H., who succeeded Dwight as publisher of the Concord Monitor in July, 1974, has been elected president and treasurer of Holyoke Transcript Inc.

Larry D. Lewis of Farmington, Conn., who is a director of Holyoke Transcript Inc., has been elected a director of the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram Publishing Co. Inc.

Dwight is co-publisher of the Greenfield Record and is relinquishing that position.

These changes were effected at meetings of the boards of directors in Holyoke.

William Dwight will continue his association with the two local corporations as director and chairman of the two boards.

He has been with the Transcript-Telegram since his graduation from the Columbia School of Journalism in June, 1926. However, during his school days at Holyoke High and during the summers as an undergraduate at Princeton University he was with the Transcript sports department.

When he became a full time newspaperman in Holyoke 49 and a half years ago, there were two daily newspapers here—the Transcript and the Telegram. On Jan. 1, 1927, the Transcript bought the Telegram and merged it into the Transcript-Telegram.

In 1930, William G. Dwight, founder of the Daily Transcript in 1883 and father of William Dwight, died. At that time the latter became managing editor of the T-T succeeding his uncle, the late Arthur Ryan, who be-

came business manager. The late Minnie R. Dwight, mother of William Dwight, became publisher and held that position until her death in July, 1957. At that time William Dwight was elected publisher.

Dwight has been active in the regional and national newspaper scene. He has served as president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, chairman of the Newspaper Advertising Bureau, a director and vice president of the Associated Press and president of the New England Daily Newspaper Publishers Association.

His other newspaper interests have been as director of the Raleigh, N.C., News and Observer, Burlington, Vt., Free Press, Haverhill Gazette and Catskill, N.Y., Daily Mail. He has retired from the first three newspapers but continues on the board of the Catskill newspaper.

In 1943 he served as assistant administrative officer of the War Shipping Administration.

#### NORTHEAST TRUSTEE

He is a former trustee of Northeast Utilities, and the Holyoke Savings Bank. He is a past director of the Franklin County Trust Co. of Greenfield, and is a past trustee of Mount Holyoke College, Williston Academy and the Holyoke Hospital. He was also a director of Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co.

He represented Ward Five on the Holyoke Board of Aldermen in 1928 and 1929, and served as Hampden County Commissioner by appointment 1946-1948. Dwight was a delegate from the First Congressional District to Republican national conventions in 1948 and 1964.

He was born in Holyoke 72 years ago and feels the time is propitious for his retirement. He stressed to his associates that William Dwight Jr. and George W. Wilson are dedicated newspapermen who are prepared and equipped to assume the responsibilities of their new offices.

His son, William Dwight Jr. is president of the New England Daily Newspaper Publishers Association. This is the fourth father and son team to hold this position.

Mr. and Mrs. William Dwight are leaving for their winter home in Sarasota, Fla., this week. Mrs. Dwight is the former Dorothy Rathbun of Madison, N.J. They plan to spend the winter in Florida but will be in Holyoke for the choice seasons of the year—spring, summer and autumn.

#### THIRD GENERATION

William Dwight Jr., the new publisher and principal corporate officer of Holyoke Transcript-Telegram Publishing Corp., is the third generation of the Dwight family to operate Holyoke's daily newspaper.

He was born in Holyoke 46 years ago, attended the local public schools, Holyoke High School, Deerfield Academy and graduated from Princeton University in 1951. He served as an officer with the Marine Corps during the Korean War and was wounded in action.

He is a past president of the Greater Holyoke Chamber of Commerce and was a co-founder of Holyoke Inc. He is prominently identified with several social service agencies in the city. He served as administrative assistant to Congressman Silvio O. Conte from 1959 to 1961.

George W. Wilson, who assumes the principal corporation offices of Holyoke Transcript Inc., is a native of Scranton, Pa. He grew up in Aiken, S.C., graduated from Harvard College, and has worked as a reporter for the Washington Post and as an administrative aide to United States Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina. Wilson is married to the former Marly Dwight, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Dwight Sr.

The retiring publisher and Mrs. Dwight

have another son, Donald, for many years connected with the Transcript-Telegram, rising to associate publisher and who later became Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts. He is now associate publisher of the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star Tribune.

[From the Holyoke Daily Transcript, Dec. 10, 1975]

#### NEWSPAPER AND COMMUNITY

One of the more difficult tasks is to write an encomium without its sounding like an obituary, or an overly simplistic tribute with words saying less (or more) than intended.

Such is the situation today as the Transcript-Telegram says goodbye to its mentor, its very essence, of the past thirty years.

William Dwight is stepping down from his position as editor and publisher of the newspaper he loves with all his heart and soul, and to which he has dedicated himself so completely as to, in fact, mold the paper to his personality, and his always active pursuit of excellence.

In so doing he has also dedicated himself to the community he loves. The pair—newspaper and community—go hand in hand, and that has been his conviction and philosophy as learned from his mother and father who brought the newspaper into being.

In a time when corporate structures tend to overcome the humanness of the individual it is not easy to see one of the few remaining practitioners of personal leadership give up his role. But that time has now come, and as must happen to all things, we shall be moving under new direction.

The newspaper, without William Dwight will never be the same. It will, however, strive to preserve the fine traditions and high standards he brought, and fought to insure. The Transcript-Telegram will remain, to the greatest extent possible, a monument to his devotion and that of his parents.

To that end his successors pledge themselves.

WILLIAM DWIGHT, Jr.

[From the Holyoke Transcript, Dec. 19, 1975]

#### THE END OF AN ERA

(By Ella Dicarilo)

The biggest change in the scene here at the T-T is, of course, that William Dwight Sr. has retired. Not only will it make a difference here, but in the community at large.

It's not that Bill Dwight, as some people imagine, wrote the Transcript single-handed, or made all the decisions, or even saw what went in until the paper came out. In fact, many a news item is blamed on the Dwigths which really should be placed on other shoulders, despite what some folks, who don't know how a paper is put out, think.

Of course, I knew of Mr. Dwight long before I ever dreamed I'd some day be working for him. His name appeared in the news columns and was praised and castigated in the Safety Valve.

When I came to work at the T-T he welcomed me, but had very little to do with me as a reporter. It was when I became the wire editor that I got to know him very well.

Mr. Dwight, whatever else he might have been, was first and foremost a newspaperman. Naturally, one might say. But, no, there are people in the newspaper business who also have other interests. For Bill Dwight, the news was all. Everyone he met and everything he read turned into a story.

He had a great memory and also could zero in on what was essential in a story. And of course he knew the background of everybody and every business so that, being lazy reporters, we often went to him for the information we should have gotten from the files.

As the wire editor, I determined what went on the front page, and sometimes what I thought was the top news was not what he would think was top news and he'd let me know after the paper came out.

"What made you lead with that?" he'd ask, and I'd explain what led to that decision. Sometimes it would even be, "What the heck made you..." and that would take a bit longer in explaining.

## FRONT PAGE NEWS

One time I decided to lead with the arrest of an army officer in the My Lai case at the same time former Mayor William Taupier announced he would run again. "What the heck..." said the Big Boss. And I said everybody knew Bill would run again, but that that had been the first time an army officer had been charged as in the My Lai case.

He accepted the decision (after all, the paper was already out) but wasn't so sure I knew what I was talking about. Luckily, the next morning, the New York Times, which has got to be the journalists' Bible, saved me by also running the My Lai story on top.

Other times I wasn't so lucky. For instance, when I began running the stock market reports on the jump page daily, all those numbers meant nothing to me. But I soon found out they meant a lot to the Boss.

"Don't you realize the market broke 900 yesterday?" he asked me as he noted I'd run the column with the conventional one-column head. He could have said it broke nine or 9,000 for all it meant to me, but I soon earned. When it broke 1,000, I was ready with a nice, big splashy headline.

Perhaps the most important thing he taught me was to learn to ask myself, "What are people talking about today?" There might have been a war going on across the world, but if we were deluged with rain or snow here, or if the thermometer soared to astronomical heights, that's what area people would be talking about and wanting to read about.

## DISAGREEMENTS

Obviously, no two people think alike and no two editors would put out exactly the same kind of paper. Even editors on the same paper disagree on what is important and what isn't. What was happening out there in the business world was all new to me and so that I wouldn't neglect to provide information, Mr. Dwight busily clipped items from the Times to be put into the Transcript. And I learned to watch for such economic indicators on the wire.

He had other interests which kept us alert. Railroads interested him, world famous hotels, but mostly people. He knew something about everyone and if someone had ever stopped in Holyoke for any reason, he'd remember that and it would have to be inserted in a wire story that the famous John Doe, on his way to Washington, passed through Holyoke, pausing to have his car filled at Yoerg's garage. It gave the news a bit of a local slant.

It was his hand that placed many of the items in the Oracle column and on any trip of his he would meet people who became interesting items in the Oracle.

We're happy to have Bill Jr. at the helm now, but we're going to miss Bill Sr., although we're sure he'll pop in from time to time to straighten us out.

As for me, I'm sorry I missed that story about the Brazilian killer bees, Mr. Dwight, but I'm watching that stock market real closely. If it tops 900 again when I'm on, I'll be ready this time.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Dec. 11, 1975]

WILLIAM DWIGHT STEPPING DOWN AS  
TRANSCRIPT PUBLISHER

William Dwight, 72, publisher of the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram newspaper for the

past 18 years, announced Wednesday he will retire from his post at the end of the year.

He also will relinquish his corporate positions as president and treasurer of the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram Publishing Co., Inc., and president and treasurer of Holyoke Transcript, Inc., parent firm of the Concord, N.H., Monitor newspaper.

Dwight is copublisher of the Greenfield Recorder and is giving up that position also.

Dwight's son, William Dwight Jr., 46, will become publisher of the Transcript-Telegram and assume the two principal corporate positions in the Transcript-Telegram Publishing Co.

Dwight attended Holyoke High School, Princeton University and Columbia School of Journalism. During the last 49 years he has worked as reporter, managing editor and publisher of the Transcript-Telegram.

He served as a Ward 5 alderman in 1928 and 1929 and as Hampden County Commissioner between 1946 and 1948.

THE EMERGENCY 911 TELEPHONE  
NUMBER MAKES PROGRESS

## HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared a listing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of several States and communities which have adopted the "911" emergency telephone number—a common, easily remembered telephone number for citizens to use when requesting help in police, fire or medical emergencies.

Because of the importance of this concept, I first introduced a bill in the 92d Congress to require the Federal Communications Commission, which regulates phone companies, to set regulations to provide for a nationwide 911 emergency number system. I have subsequently reintroduced this bill in each Congress.

In the meantime, my home State of Florida is well on the way to becoming the first large State where 911 will be the statewide emergency telephone number for ambulance, police and fire services.

This accomplishment in Florida has been due—in large measure—to the effort of State Senator Richard J. Deeb, who serves my home county of Pinellas. And, because Senator Deeb has shared my concern, Pinellas County will have the new system in operation by July 1, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of a common number for emergencies is not a new one. As a matter of fact, the concept was introduced in England during the 1930's. Today in Europe, the number 999 is widely used as an emergency number.

It was not until 1957 that the concept of 911 began to gain favor in the United States—with the support of the International Association of Fire Chiefs. However, it was to be a decade later—in 1967—before the President's Commission on Law Enforcement was to make a recommendation for a nationwide

common emergency number. The Federal Communications Commission added its endorsement to the recommendation.

Florida's surge into the forefront in the 911 implementation effort will hopefully be the catalyst to encourage the other larger States—as well as the smaller ones—to adopt the 911 concept because in the event of a serious emergency, time can mean the difference between life and death. Too often now, precious moments are lost when people—under the stress of an emergency situation—stumble through the phone book trying to find the number for the police, or the fire department, or an ambulance service.

## ITALIAN NATIONAL DAY

## HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to pay special tribute to the Italian nation which is celebrating its 30th anniversary as a republic.

Though the past 30 years are a mere instant in the lifetime of this ancient society we know as Italy, they represent an important political transformation. In this, America's Bicentennial Year, we can look with pleasure on the democratic values that have taken hold in Italy. The same ideals of personal freedoms, liberty, and representation that Americans celebrate this year, Italians also proudly hail. It is gratifying to note that in 1976, when many academics and statesmen are speaking with foreboding of the emergence of totalitarian regimes as the only way to meet the demands of the modern state, the comparatively young republic of Italy remains firmly committed to its beliefs in political freedom.

The transformation of Italy in the past 30 years complements the history of a society which constitutes the genesis of Western civilization. After a 3,000 year history, Italy's new republic has retained the traditional Italian concern for human values and the search for knowledge.

The cultural contributions of the Italian people are too numerous to list, but names such as Da Vinci, Michelangelo, Titin, Verdi, and Puccini in the arts, and Galileo, Marconi, and Fermi in the sciences give an indication of the Italian dedication to improving human existence.

I am proud that during the past 200 years many Italians have made America their home, so that the rich Italian culture has become a part of American culture.

With gratitude, I honor the Italian republic and its great people. And in the spirit of friendship, I wish them a prosperous future.



# TO CREATE A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON SOCIAL SECURITY

**HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1975, I introduced a bill, House Joint Resolution 291, to create a National Commission on Social Security. I did so because I had come to the firm conclusion that our approach to the social security program must be thoroughly overhauled. I said at the time that there were too many warning signals which we could no longer afford to ignore.

The warning signals are getting louder and louder, and we still ignore them at our peril.

Unlike private employers, local and State governments can drop their memberships in social security after giving the Federal Government 2 years' notice. In the past 2 years, 138 local governments have relinquished their memberships; another 208 have said they intend to do so.

Now comes the 1976 annual report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds. What does it say?

The trustees of the social security system, heretofore so sanguine about the inherent future strength of the program, have finally admitted that even under the most optimistic assumptions possible the trust funds will be exhausted by the early 1980's. Predicting even further into the future, the report states:

The long-range actuarial cost estimates indicate that for every year in the future, under present law, the estimated expenditures will exceed the estimated income from taxes.

Put bluntly, this means the social security program is on shaky fiscal ground, unless something is done to change the present course.

The final paragraph of the trustee report conveys a sense of urgency to me:

The Board also recommends that the development of additional plans to further strengthen the long-range financing of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program be given high priority.

At last, the official experts are admitting that something is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, House Joint Resolution 291, is an attempt to examine thoroughly our present social security program in all of its aspects and to examine viable alternatives to a system which many actuarial experts—not to say the vast bulk of a concerned public—believe is no longer tolerable, with high costs to the taxpayer and pitifully sparse benefits to the recipients.

Although this bill has received significant cosponsorship, no action has yet been taken by Congress. If the Members of Congress and other Federal employees had a stake in the social security program themselves, I frankly have no doubt that we would have had remedial action long ago.

Does not it seem strange that our social security system is good enough for most American workers to pay for but not good enough for the Members of Congress or other Federal employees to participate in? Because that is exactly the situation that prevails, and the American public is becoming increasingly aware of it.

The retired, disabled and widowed Americans are becoming fearful about the future of social security. We have an unbreakable commitment to them. To honor it, something must be done.

The President has proposed raising the regressive payroll tax. This is wrong. It creates more animosity by already overtaxed citizens and does not deal with the root problems of the social security system, as a National Commission would.

Young people, paying into social security, are cynically aware they will never see their benefits returned to them and they are demanding some new approaches. A National Commission will provide this.

Mr. Speaker, I plead for this Congress to get on with the job.

## THE AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS OF AMERICA

**HON. GUS YATRON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker. On June 2, it was my pleasure to attend a dinner given by the Pennsylvania Joint Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. During the course of the evening, Mr. Peter J. Swoboda, the manager of the Pennsylvania Joint Board, read a letter which he received from one of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' retired members, Mrs. Eleanor M. Fiala.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America have made a continuing effort to help their members; and the following correspondence is a testimony of the tireless efforts of this organization. The text follows:

ELEANOR M. FIALA,  
2456 Market Street, Allentown, Pa.  
18104, May 1, 1976.

PETER J. SWOBODA,  
Pennsylvania Joint Board,  
1720 Market Street,  
Pottsville, Pa.

DEAR SIR: I received word from the New York office of the Amalgamated Retirement Fund that with the approval of the joint board my pension plan has been completed with a coverage of the 44 years of membership in the union and my employment at the Lehigh Valley Shirt Co. of Allentown, Pa.

I want to express my sincere thanks to the Penna. Joint Board officers and my local officers of Local 128 for their efforts on my behalf. A special thanks to my chairlady, Mrs. Anna Onkotz who gives a lot of her time and efforts for the welfare of the members who work at the Lehigh Valley Shirt Co.

The membership has come a long hard route since I was involved in the so called baby strike of the shirtworkers during the depression years beginning in 1931. I have

the privilege of being a charter member of the shirtworkers local 28, Allentown, Pa.

My life was enriched with the honor and pleasure of having known Miss Jule Lesnick who later became Mrs. David Monas. Her efforts were tireless when it came to helping the shirtworkers. We walked the picket lines at 5 o'clock in the morning, rode on the back of trucks from one factory to another in Allentown, Northampton and Emmaus. We even spent some time at police court, and Jule was right at our side not only as our leader and organizer, but most of all as our friend. We owe her a lot.

I of all people should know in those early days, my weekly pays were very small sometimes only a dollar a week or a 1½ cents a doz. to learn. There wasn't any work in the industry so we had to settle for these conditions to learn a trade. We were happy when the union organizers came into our town to help us. They got us strike benefits which were more than we earned in the factory.

I must not forget the daily coffee and donuts they gave us at the union hall, because this was a treat in those days. We didn't have any money to buy them ourselves. Today it is taken for granted, a so-called coffee break.

All this was possible by other members in other places giving their dues and donations to help organize the sweatshops of the Lehigh Valley. These shops had moved out of New York City and took away the work at cheaper wages.

It took almost a year to get all the factories signed up, but I must be fair to my own employer, when the unions came to Allentown, they were one of the first to sign up in 1933.

Now through the growth of our union I will receive the security in my retirement of a substantial pension and life insurance for which I am very grateful.

I have a lot of sad and also happy memories of early days and receiving all these benefits made it all worthwhile.

To whom it may concern my sincere thanks.

The union is only as strong as its members made it. I hope the membership continues to grow and be strong, because without a union there will be nothing again.

I am not a very good letter writer but these words are from my heart.

Sincerely,

ELEANOR M. FIALA.

## EDWARD WILLIAMS TRIBUTE

**HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, Edward Williams will be honored on the occasion of his retirement from the Robert Fulton School in Mount Vernon. I would like to take this time to share with my colleagues a few of Mr. Williams' many accomplishments.

Edward Williams attended Mount Vernon schools, gaining an outstanding reputation in a number of sports. His talents and skills were such that he won a football scholarship to New York University.

Prior to a career in education, Edward Williams chaired the Mount Vernon Recreation Commission Advisory Board, worked with the Children's Aid Society, and served in World War II; out of the service, Mr. Williams gave much of his

time and energy to the rehabilitation of veterans who had been blinded during the war.

He began his teaching career back in Mount Vernon in 1956 at the Washington Junior High School. He later moved to Nichols Junior High School where he was an assistant principal up until the time he began his duties as principal of the Robert Fulton School.

I know the community will miss the leadership and counsel of Edward Williams. His contributions to the lives of countless Mount Vernon children will miss the leadership and counsel of Edward Williams. His contributions to the lives of countless Mount Vernon children will long be remembered. On June 9 it is only fitting, then, that students, parents, and teachers join together with others from the Mount Vernon community to express their appreciation and thanks.

**INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ASSURE APPROPRIATE PARTICIPATION BY PROFESSIONAL REGISTERED NURSES IN PSRO'S**

**HON. MARTHA KEYS**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mrs. KEYS. Mr. Speaker, it is most important that we support the basic principle of accountability of all health care practitioners to provide care which is of a high standard and which is available and accessible to all at a reasonable cost. The participation of the Federal Government in health care matters brings with it an increasing governmental concern about standards of practice and their implementation.

I support the concept that the government at all levels should provide mechanisms whereby professions can increase the effectiveness of their self-regulatory activities. The bill I am introducing today is one such mechanism. It simply provides professional registered nurses appropriate participation in the professional standards review organizations at all levels of government.

Physicians are already intimately involved in all levels of PSRO activities and also have been given authority for all decisionmaking relative to medical care. The same type of self-regulatory mechanism for other health professions is not clearly stated within the current provisions of the law. Attempts to rectify this lack of clarity within the law through regulations and policy manuals is not a satisfactory solution.

The law which provides for the structure and authority of PSRO has failed to clearly provide for an appropriate involvement and decisionmaking on the part of health professionals other than physicians. It is necessary to support the efforts of these health professionals to gain appropriate identification and involvement in PSRO and the regulations that govern its implementation.

As the largest professional group within the health field, with over 900,000 professional registered nurses engaged in

active practice, nursing must be acknowledged as a vital component of the health care team and be accorded the appropriate rights and responsibilities as professional practitioners within this law.

Inasmuch as providers educated and practicing in professions other than nursing do not have the experience or educational background to effectively evaluate the necessity, appropriateness, and quality of nursing care, it follows that members of the nursing profession should be involved in decisions as to the quality of professional care/service, rendered by nurses.

My bill to amend the Social Security Act provides for the minimal changes in Public Law 92-603 to effect the rightful role of professional registered nurses in PSRO.

**RESOLUTION OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE ON ICELAND**

**HON. EDWARD I. KOCH**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I have received the statement of the Liberal Party of New York State concerning the so-called cod war between Iceland and Great Britain which recently entered the cease-fire stage but has not yet been resolved.

I believe that the proposal of the Liberal Party of New York State to resolve this issue is well done and should be pursued by the parties involved. I urge that our colleagues read the statement that is appended:

**LIBERAL PARTY STATEMENT CONCERNING ICELAND**

It is an ugly sight to see a small, democratic, progressive nation relentlessly pushed to the edge of catastrophe by the intransigence of a larger neighbor.

The world is witnessing the spectacle of the might of the British Navy thrown against a country of some 200,000 population with no army, air force, or navy. If British force prevails, the small but historic nation of Iceland will be economically destroyed. Much as Great Britain deserves considerable sympathy regarding her current economic plight, Britain's arbitrary policy toward Iceland is unjust and unjustifiable.

Iceland, whose export economy is almost 80% dependent upon fish, has extended her fisheries water limits to 200 miles as an essential economic and conservation measure. Great Britain, refusing to recognize Iceland's action, has continued to send British fishing boats accompanied by British military craft into Icelandic fishing waters, precipitating what the international press condescendingly characterizes as "the cod war."

Consequently, Iceland has broken diplomatic relations with Great Britain, thus bringing into question the future of strategic NATO and American defense facilities in Iceland.

That such an extreme situation could come about highlights the urgent need for fair, practical, binding international agreement and regulation concerning both legal and commercial limits of offshore waters throughout the world. Such agreement and regulation must give appropriate priority to worldwide needs for, and conservation of,

such vital commodities as oil, minerals, and fish. Such agreement and regulation likewise must protect the interests of nations such as Iceland that are dependent upon offshore resources.

Ironically, Great Britain, which has asserted her own 200-mile commercial water limits in order to claim newly discovered North Sea oil reserves, also may be dependent upon offshore resources in the near future.

The Liberal Party of New York State earnestly hopes that the current International Conference on the Law of the Sea, sponsored by the United Nations, will reach equitable agreement on the proper conservation and use of offshore resources throughout the world.

Meanwhile, until equitable international agreement is concluded and implemented, the Liberal Party of New York State calls upon the United States Department of State, as a matter of humanitarian justice, to take all possible action through established diplomatic channels to persuade Great Britain and all other nations to respect Iceland's 200-mile fisheries water limits.

**BICENTENNIAL ESSAY BY MARC RESZEL**

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding young man in my district, Marc Reszel, age 13, has written a Bicentennial essay which has already won him first prize in two levels of competition sponsored by the American Legion. He is now competing for the statewide award. I take pleasure in inserting his essay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend him for his patriotism and scholarship. Marc is also the valedictorian of his graduating class at Highlands Junior High School in La Grange, Ill.

**AMERICAN LEGION BICENTENNIAL THEME  
(By Marc W. Reszel)**

(Theme question: Group B—"What contributions have been made by whom, to make the United States of America the best country in which to live, since it declared independence July 4th, 1776?")

The greatest contribution in the last two hundred years is by far the Constitution. This document not only set up our unique form of Government but it gave the people their rights as American Citizens.

The major job of the Constitution was to create a new Government and that it did. Not only this, but it also stated the qualifications to hold a government office.

The three Government Branches set up by the Constitution are the Legislative, Executive and Judicial. The idea of a Legislative Branch was not new, but to have one house based on population and another based on equality to all States, was and is an excellent idea. The Executive Branch is headed by the President. In the late 1700's a President was a new idea, to prevent the government from being dominated by a king. The third is known as the Judicial Branch. This is the Court of Law system in America. This was not exactly a new idea but the Constitution assures all Citizens of a fair trial.

The other part of the question asks who made this contribution. Although it was written by our Forefathers the Constitution belongs to and protects each and every American.



# H.R. 50: THE PRESS SPEAKS OUT AGAINST HUMPHREY-HAWKINS

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months, the Nation's leading newspapers have begun to speak out on their concern over the potentially damaging impact of H.R. 50 on the American people, not only in terms of the possibility that H.R. 50 would bust the economy through ruinous inflation, but in the potential intrusion of an expanding government into all aspects of our lives. In addition, columnists and professionals have also cast serious doubts on the efficacy of H.R. 50. Some have even gone so far as to suggest that the bill was drafted by the editorial board of the National Lampoon.

These members of the fourth estate are quick to point out a sham when they see one. Such is the case of H.R. 50.

I am inserting for the Record a sampling of this commentary. Included is an editorial from the Washington Post which asked the rhetorical question as to whether it is possible to reach full employment simply by legislating it; an editorial from the Washington Star and a recent editorial from the Wall Street Journal.

In the event the Members of the House have not had an opportunity to review these editorials, I urge that they review what the leaders of the national press think about the so-called Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act.

The articles follow:

## LEGISLATING JOBS

The question is whether the country can establish full employment, permanently and with stability, by enacting a law that requires it. The answer, as you probably suspected, is that it cannot—not without either a dangerous inflation or iron-clad wage controls. But that answer is mere economics, and economics is an offensively reasonable discipline with which the country periodically loses patience. This year is the thirtieth anniversary of the great Employment Act, passed partly in fear that the United States might slide back into the Depression, but partly in confidence that a better life was genuinely within reach. That Act set a goal and pointed the country toward it. But now, with the unemployment rate at 7.6 per cent, Congress is beginning to think about more drastic legislation. Support is gathering for the full employment bill drafted by Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.) and Rep. Augustus F. Hawkins (D-Calif.).

The Humphrey-Hawkins bill would require the administration to get the unemployment rate for adults down to 3 per cent within four years. It does not define "adult," but the authors are inclined to include everyone over 18. Since unemployment is heaviest among the youngest workers, that would make the target much more difficult to meet. Even if the teen-agers are excluded from the rate, the bill would mandate unemployment at a level that, in the past 30 years, it has reached only during the wars in Korea and Vietnam.

This bill would take the extraordinary step of conferring on all adult Americans the right to "useful paid employment at fair rates of compensation." It would require the President to prepare federal programs to keep the rate down—programs of public service jobs, public works grants, state and local aid, manpower training, youth employment and

community development. Federal ventures of this sort have existed for years, of course, but the bill envisions an expansion on a scale that cannot be easily predicted. How much would it cost? Mr. Humphrey hazarded a guess that creating 2 million jobs would require an outlay of about \$25 million a year, although nearly half of it would be offset by higher taxes, and lower unemployment benefits.

But the inflationary pressure does not come mainly from the direct costs of public jobs. It comes from the effect of a tightening labor market on wage rates. Long before the adult unemployment rate fell as low as 3 per cent, wages would have started to creep upward at the dismaying pace as employers bid against each other for manpower. Even without the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, inflationary wage settlements may well turn into the most difficult economic issue with which the next President will have to deal. The most obvious defect of the bill is that it contains no recognition that this danger exists, let alone providing any safeguards. And yet, as the country has seen over the past two years, a high inflation rate itself contributes to unemployment.

The bill shows Sen. Humphrey at his best and worst. Not many men of his warmth and generosity of spirit have ever arrived in the top ranks of American politics. But part of that generosity is his inability to say no to his friends, and some of his best friends are the labor unions. Their opposition to any degree of wage control or even guidelines is adamant, and the senator cannot bring himself to disagree with them. President Ford can be counted upon to make the most of this defect. It would be ludicrous if this Republican administration, having led the country through the most severe price increases in its modern history, should now manage to persuade the voters that the Democrats are the party of inflation. But it is possible.

The point needs to be noted, not only because Mr. Humphrey may be a future candidate for the presidency, but because most of the current Democratic candidates have specifically endorsed the Humphrey-Hawkins bill. Rep. Morris Udall (D-Ariz.) has been citing it for some time in reply to economic questions. Sen. Henry Jackson (D-Wash.) endorsed it last week in New York. Former Gov. Jimmy Carter is studying it, his staff say, and he plans to take a stand on it within a few days.

Employment as a guaranteed and enforceable civil right is a noble concept. But if it doesn't look as though it can be made to work in practice, then what? Bishop James S. Rausch of the U.S. Catholic Conference described the responsibility accurately the other day before the Joint Economic Committee. "Behind the jumble of statistics and the rise and fall of economic indicators lie human lives and individual tragedies," he observed. "... What happens to a nation that begins to accept the notion that it cannot use the talents and labor of all its people?"

Working the unemployment rate back down to a tolerable figure will take time, unfortunately, and it may never be possible to hold it there as rigidly as the Humphrey-Hawkins bill envisions. But there are ways to speed up the very cautious progress that President Ford offers. The congressional budget committees are now at work revising the federal budget, for example, to increase growth without any significant penalty in inflation. The time has also come for the country to undertake wider experiments in public employment and training particularly for young people.

While the country cannot accomplish everything that it wants immediately, it has the capacity to do a great deal. Good policy does not get trapped in false choices between everything and nothing. Full employment remains the goal. If it cannot be achieved simply by passing a bill, it can be approached

more rapidly and surely than the country now seems to be doing. This, surely, deserves to be a central issue of the presidential campaign.

## HUMPHREY-HAWKINS

The House Education and Labor Committee's favorable party-line report on the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act, better known as the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, may not carry us closer to the magic goal of "full employment." But it's well worth talking about.

Even Rep. Augustus Hawkins, a co-sponsor, concedes that it's unlikely to clear Congress before November. Even if it got lucky, President Ford has targeted the bill for a veto almost surely sustainable.

So even those who profess to believe in it see this ultimate Santa Claus bill as a pretext for debate over the federal role in securing what the 1946 Employment Act calls "maximum" employment. Maximum employment, with price stability, is what everyone favors. But we're far from agreeing what it is or how to achieve it.

The novelty of the Humphrey-Hawkins approach is several-fold. The act would "require"—though that verb is open to all sorts of quibbles arising from the separation of powers—the President to key his budget policies to a goal of 3 per cent unemployment by 1980.

It would establish within the Department of Labor a "Full Employment Office" to backstop private employment with public jobs if the private sector failed to bring unemployment to 3 per cent. And finally, the bill would necessitate an undetermined but considerable amount of political manipulation of the monetary and interest-rate policies of the Federal Reserve Board. "Some fellow in the (White House) basement," as Chairman Arthur Burns warned a couple of months ago, "might be making monetary policy." If that happens, we might be well advised to swap our wallets for wheelbarrows.

In some ways, Humphrey-Hawkins is a natural Democratic reflex to the somewhat fatalistic views of the President and his economists about the future of unemployment. It stands now at over 7 per cent and by their and other reckonings won't fall below 6 per cent in the near future. The bleak realism in the President's economic circle is catnip for opposition rhetoric.

Behind the rhetoric about 3 per cent unemployment, however, there are familiar philosophical, economic and institutional quandaries. Philosophically, one quandary is the scope of the federal government's role in the economy. Should it use tax incentives and other devices and rely on the dynamics of the private sector to supply new jobs? Or should it go into comprehensive economic planning?

Economically and institutionally, the question is how full employment can be without rekindling the double-digit inflation of the recent unhappy past, and without reducing independent policy-making agencies like the Fed to political puppets.

In Britain, where nearly every vital lever of the economy is under government control, the economy has been thoroughly botched. On the subject of Humphrey-Hawkins, then, British politicians who have recently proclaimed their disillusionment with an overweening public sector could presumably offer good advice.

Perhaps the chief practical problem with the Humphrey-Hawkins approach to "full employment" is that it takes slight account of what Dr. Seymour Wolfbein, formerly of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, calls the "fine print" of employment statistics.

We really need to understand unemployment's component parts. One striking example of its complexity, cited by Dr. Wolfbein in a recent interview with *Nation's Business*, is that "during the first 10 months of 1975 . . . the number of people out of

work rose by 765,000 and the unemployment rate went up from 7.9 per cent of the labor force to 8.6 per cent. (But) in those same months employment rose by 485,000. What happened was that the size of the nation's labor force—people available for work—went up by 1.3 million in this period."

It follows from these interesting figures that projections of the increases in the size of the potential work force over the coming years are helpful; and in that sense, some "planning" would be in order. But we don't need an enormous "full employment" bureaucracy to do that simple job.

Perhaps the most telling fact Dr. Wolfbein cites is that between the end of World War II and 1975 some 30 million non-farm jobs were added to the economy—"the overwhelming proportion of them in the private sector despite the growth of public employment." And there were nine years in that quarter-century when average unemployment stood below 4 per cent.

These facts suggest several conclusions: That the current level of unemployment is abnormal, but given intelligent fiscal management will subside as the economy strengthens; that the private sector, properly stimulated by government policy, is sufficiently dynamic to provide the new jobs we need to keep unemployment within acceptable bounds, without ruinous inflation; and finally, that if public employment is to be used as a backstop for the private sector it can probably be arranged for without the elaborate bureaucratic apparatus contemplated in the Humphrey-Hawkins bill.

What we need from government, in short, is not a grandiose and single-minded four-year plan to reach an arbitrary low figure of unemployment at all costs, but selective programs tuned to the relief of special problems (e.g., teenage unemployment).

The Humphrey-Hawkins bill takes a one-dimensional, Johnny-one-note approach to economic planning, and seems geared to subordinate other important economic and institutional values to a magic figure of unemployment that may not be attainable. The best one can say of the legislation is that it's out of date, and that it seems likely to over-promise and under-deliver simplistic answers to complex problems.

#### THE NEW HUMPHREY-HAWKINS BILL

The new, revised version of the Humphrey-Hawkins bill that is now before Congress has only one virtue. It is not as bad as the old, unrevised version. Because political liberals have come to use "Humphrey-Hawkins" as a saliva test, congressional Democrats had to write a bill with that title that Jimmy Carter could swallow hard and support.

The old bill would have more or less made it illegal for the United States to have more than 3% adult unemployment in 18 months after the bill's enactment. An unemployed person could sue the government if he or she were not offered a satisfactory job and the federal courts would order one up. Senator Humphrey didn't drop this provision because he suddenly realized some people would find it mind-boggling, but because it "seemed to be putting the cart before the horse—providing a legal guarantee before we set up the job-creation mechanisms necessary to provide the jobs."

The new bill would set 3% as the adult unemployment goal within four years of enactment, and if the government could not attain that goal through the wise use of monetary and fiscal policy, it would have to hire the unemployed until it got to 3%. The "mechanism" that the bill embodies is essentially nothing more than a solemn directive to the President and the Federal Reserve to be wise and conduct the correct policies, even if they would rather be incorrect. If in this way the goal is attained on schedule, the cost of Humphrey-Hawkins

would be a mere \$50 million, the cost of hiring people to make sure wise policies are followed.

Except that we don't like to see \$50 million wasted, it might be interesting to observe an experiment in legislated wisdom. Unfortunately, the bill doesn't explicitly state what constitutes wise policy. Presumably the President would be permitted to conform to its provisions by stating that drastic tax and spending cuts will produce economic expansion. Or the Fed could insist that monetary expansion produces higher interest rates and rates of inflation. This isn't what Senator Humphrey has in mind, for it isn't his brand of wisdom.

Because these ideological tensions remain the same, the bill would change nothing except that in the end the government would have to hire a lot of unemployed people, paying them by taxing those who are employed. This is the theoretical flaw in Humphrey-Hawkins, the erroneous assumption that if the government hires the unemployed, the unemployment rate will fall.

As the privately employed are taxed to finance public jobs for the unemployed, they themselves become unemployed. The more producers are taxed the less they will produce. Following Humphrey-Hawkins logic, New York City over a dozen years added nearly 150,000 public jobs. All along the way taxes rose, productivity fell and the unemployment rate climbed. In the same period federal spending went from \$100 billion to \$400 billion, and what has happened to the unemployment rate?

Elsewhere on this page, Senator Taft of Ohio offers further critical commentary in this vein. If jobs are destroyed when taxes go up, isn't it reasonable to suppose that jobs are created when taxes go down? Perhaps a third version of Humphrey-Hawkins would incorporate and legislate this wisdom.

#### ECONOMIC STOCKPILES REVIEW

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, next week on Tuesday and Wednesday the 8th and 9th of June, the Joint Committee on Defense Production will hold hearings on the purpose and organization of economic stockpiles.

Recent and anticipated shortages of vital materials and commodities both in this country and abroad have led to proposals for economic stockpiles. Such stockpiles would be distinct from military or mobilization stockpiles in that they would serve the needs of the civilian economy in peacetime. It is hoped that they would help to smooth out supply and demand fluctuations and thus aid manufacturers and consumers.

Economic stockpiles could also play an important role in our international trade policy, providing reserves as a hedge against cartelization or forced price increases.

Before the Government embarks on a policy of economic stockpiling, however, it is important that we understand fully the potential advantages and disadvantages of such a course. We need to have an unambiguous understanding of the purpose or purposes of civilian materials reserves. And we must be sure that any such stockpiles or reserves are fully pro-

tected from possible abuses. Consistency of purpose and safeguards against self-serving pressures will be necessary for any economic stockpiling program to be credible with the American public.

It is to these questions which the Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Materials Availability hearings are addressed. We will be examining the variety of roles or objectives which have been suggested for economic or consumer stockpiles. And we will look at alternative ways of structuring stockpiles, so that we can be assured that they could fulfill these roles and objectives.

On Tuesday, June 8, the Joint Committee will hear testimony from: Mr. C. Fred Bergsten, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution; Mr. Jacob Clayman, secretary-treasurer, Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO; Mr. Simon D. Strauss, chairman of the Minerals Availability Committee, American Mining Congress; and Mr. Timothy Stanley, president of the International Economic Policy Association.

On Wednesday, June 9, witnesses will include: Mr. Joseph Greenwald, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs; Mr. Gerald L. Parsky, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs; Gen. Leslie W. Bray, Jr., Director, Federal Preparedness Agency; and Mr. William N. Lawrence, formerly Chief, Stockpile Policy Division, Office of Emergency Preparedness.

Both days of hearings will be held in room 2222 of the Rayburn House Office Building and will begin at 10 a.m. each day.

#### HAVE YOU HAD YOUR SWINE FLU SHOT?

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include my Washington report entitled, "Have you had your Swine Flu Shot?" The article follows:

#### HAVE YOU HAD YOUR SWINE FLU SHOT?

Have you had your swine flu shot? That question may become a part of your routine greeting to friends in the next six months.

The largest vaccination program ever attempted in American history has now been launched to vaccinate most of the people in the country against swine influenza to protect them against a public health threat that is potentially grave, but far from certain. The aim is to give as many Americans as will accept it a vaccination against swine influenza before the start of the flu season next winter.

The problem is that flu viruses seem to change from year to year and when a big change comes, as it does about once every decade, most people are unprotected against it. Many older citizens remember the epidemic of 1918-1919, which disrupted normal life in many parts of the United States, and during which 20 million people died in the world, more than 500,000 of them in the United States.

In February of this year the outbreak of a new type of flu, similar to one found in swine, was spotted among the recruits at Fort Dix, New Jersey by public health of-



ficials, an signalled to them that a new flu virus might be at hand. It quickly spread to 500 persons, and proved fatal to one of them. Soon thereafter, there began a dramatic race to produce a new flu vaccine to protect Americans from a virus against which they had no immunity. Working at top speed, the nation's virus specialists and the manufacturers of flu vaccine discovered and produced a new vaccine. After a series of meetings by our top public health officials, a recommendation was made to President Ford for an all-out nationwide effort to urge the American people to get flu shots to head off an outbreak of the new swine flu.

On the basis of the advice of these experts, the President recommended, and the Congress quickly approved, \$135 million in emergency funding for the campaign. Most of the money will be spent to produce the vaccine. Another large part of it will go to the states to help them carry out programs of mass immunization.

Exactly how many people can be reached by the immunization campaign is unknown. One expert suggests that to be effective a campaign should reach 70% of the 215 million Americans. The only similar mass immunization campaign, conducted against polio in the 1960s, reached about 100 million people.

Immunization of those persons considered most vulnerable to influenza—the elderly, those with chronic health problems, and young children—may begin in July. In general, the operation of the immunization efforts will be left to the states under guidelines from the U.S. Center for Disease Control. No one will be required to receive a flu shot, but community immunization centers will be set up in schools and places of work. At such centers it is proposed that the vaccination be given free of charge. If one chooses, however, to have his private doctor administer the vaccination, he may have to pay a small fee for his doctor's time and service although no charge will be made for the vaccine itself.

Not everyone agrees with the immunization program. The critics ask these questions: Is it necessary? Is it safe? Will the drug companies make a huge profit? Is there enough money to do the job? Will the efforts be successful in preventing an epidemic?

The critics have raised the question of the safety of the vaccine, pointing out that any mass vaccination program is bound to have some ill effects on some Americans and that mass producing so quickly a new vaccine will create hazards. The public health experts who testified before the Congress countered this by saying that the vaccine is a conventional flu vaccine, backed by many years of experience, and that they expect no serious problems.

One concern of the Congress is that no one make windfall profits from the program. The legislation requires a tenfold increase in production of the vaccine and only a few firms in the country make it. The question of costs controls are not totally resolved, and the Congress will have to monitor the program carefully.

Some of the critics suggested keeping the vaccine in storage until there was evidence that the flu was spreading, but the experts said that the flu moves so fast that this storage approach would inevitably fail and the epidemic would outrun the program.

The decision to go ahead with the program of immunization was made quickly because the public health experts advised the President and the Congress that there was no time to waste. No one can be absolutely sure that the new flu virus would have produced an epidemic in the absence of the immunization campaign, and we may never know if this effort and expense were really necessary. Next winter the nation is bound to have the usual quota of sniffles, colds, sore throats and fevers. If that is all we have, perhaps we can claim success.

So the whole program is a gamble, but the Congress reasons that it is better to gamble with money than lives. Any major flu epidemic would cost thousands of lives and billions of dollars.

## BIRMINGHAM NEWS CONCERNED ABOUT DEFENSE

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the Congress have been concerned that the United States maintain an adequate defense posture. The strength of our great Nation is basic to the future of the entire free world.

Our strength is the world's best hope for peace and, through the NATO and other alliances, we are helping to maintain the basic security of the free world. We must be first in strength in the world if the world itself is to be safe from war or tyranny.

There has been much debate in recent years concerning our actual military position as compared to that of the Soviet Union.

In this vein, I would call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial of the Birmingham News, which is the leading newspaper in my congressional district and State. This newspaper has long been concerned with the problems of maintaining an adequate defense.

The editorial is based on a recent Birmingham speech by Dr. Leon Goure, director of Soviet Studies Center for Advanced International Studies at the University of Miami in Florida:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, May 30, 1976]

WE ARE NO. 2 MILITARILY

Doubts this newspaper has had about President Ford's claim that the U.S. is "second to none" in its military capability were reinforced this week when the editorial board of The News discussed the issue with Dr. Leon Goure, director of Soviet Studies Center for Advanced International Studies, University of Miami, Fla.

Goure was born in Russia and lived in Germany and France before coming to the U.S. at the age of 18. He is fluent in Russian, French, German and English. He served in the U.S. Army Counterintelligence Corps in Europe during World War II, received his doctorate from Georgetown University and has served in a number of scholarly positions including being a senior staff member of the RAND Corp.

While in Birmingham this week, Goure addressed the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Rotary Club of Birmingham.

The message he brought was not particularly reassuring, but it represents a reality which should be faced.

"Concerning numbers," he said, "the present situation can be described quite simply: In terms of men in the armed forces, ready reserves and most major weapon categories, the Soviet Union is unquestionably ahead of the U.S."

The categories in which the Soviets lead the U.S. are:

Troops: 4.4 million vs. 2.1 million, plus superior Soviet combat ready reserves; ICBMs: 549 more than U.S.; SLBMs: 240 more by agreement; ballistic missile submarines: 73 vs. 41; army divisions: 168 vs. 16; armored divisions: 47 vs. 4; mechanized divisions: 113 vs. 4; airborne divisions: 8 vs. 1; tanks: 40,000 vs. 10,100; artillery: 17,000 vs.

2,100; anti-tank missiles: 6,000 vs. 2,400; cruisers: 33, 20 with surface to surface missiles, vs. 27, none with SSM; destroyers: 85, 20 with SSM, vs. 70, none with SSM; attack submarines: 253 vs. 73; submarine-carried cruise missiles: 300 vs. none; surface to surface missiles: 853 vs. 180; tactical aircraft: 350 more for Soviets; missile throw-weight and warhead size: range of submarine launched ballistic missiles (4,200 miles for Soviet Delta submarine vs. 2,000 miles for Polaris); strategic air defense: 10,000 surface to air missiles and 2,700 fighter aircraft vs. 330 SAMs and 396 fighters.

We are ahead in other categories:

Aircraft carriers: 21 vs. 3; the U.S. has a much larger naval aviation force, but the Soviet Navy has 480 long-range bombers vs. none for the U.S.; the U.S. has more heavy bombers (463 U.S. vs. 135 Soviet) but the U.S. has 434 fewer medium bombers; more tankers: 615 vs. 50; more nuclear warheads: 6,794 vs. 3,442, but U.S. warheads are small compared to Soviet warheads and the Soviets have 603 heavy ICBMs vs. 54 for the U.S.; more MIRVed warheads: 5,810 vs. 640; and more helicopters. We also believe we hold a qualitative advantage in aircraft, missile accuracy, submarines and long-range cruise missiles.

However, Goure pointed out, numbers do not tell the whole story.

"In assessing the balance," he said, "consideration must also be given to such factors as national will and social-political cohesion, psychological readiness of the troops and the people to face the threat of a nuclear war, the strength and effectiveness of alliances, differences in strategic doctrine, availability of overseas bases, the capability of industry rapidly to switch to war production and to survive nuclear strikes, the quality and level of investments in research and development, etc."

Perhaps an indication of the Soviet Union's commitment to building military power is the relative percentage of its GNP spent on defense, 11 to 13 per cent, vs. 5.7 per cent for the U.S.

Moreover, according to Goure, the Soviet Union has a completely different approach to its military posture than does the U.S. The U.S. bases its strategy on threatening the Soviet Union with "assured destruction" in retaliation for a Soviet first strike.

By contrast, Goure said, the aim of the Soviet Union "has been and remains to develop a war-fighting, war-survival and war-winning capability."

The Soviets intend not only to deter a U.S. attack but also to develop the capability of striking first at the U.S., destroying as much of the U.S. strategic force as possible, and then being able to survive whatever retaliation the U.S. could muster.

Goure pointed out that the Soviets have a large air defense system and that the country has been investing \$1 billion a year in civil defense programs since 1955. By hardening industrial plants and dispersing them, plus protecting the civilian population with shelters and evacuations, the Soviets say their casualties may be kept to 4-7 per cent of the urban population or about 15 million people. That is less than they lost in World War II.

Thus, the Soviet policy is to nullify our strategy of "assured destruction."

If the Soviet Union perceives our nuclear threat as empty, then it is free to carry out its plans to extend its domination.

Goure said, "On the political side, the basic Soviet objective is to achieve such a power position that, to quote Brezhnev, 'no question of any importance in the world can be solved without our (Soviet) participation, without taking into account our economic and military might.'"

The Soviets equate military power with success in foreign policy and believe the more powerful they are the more successful they will be.

The Soviets today, Goure said, believe they hold the military advantage and hope they will be able to increase that superiority.

While the U.S. is able to deter an attack on itself by the Soviet Union, that does not mean that it has a credible capability to carry out U.S. foreign policy and prevent the Soviets from pursuing an expansionist policy.

"Detente" to the Soviets does not rule out their participation in what they call "national wars of liberation." Their concept of peaceful coexistence between the U.S. and the Soviet Union is when the U.S. stops trying to prevent the Soviets from carrying out their territorial ambitions.

As long as the military position of the U.S. continues to decline relative to that of the Soviet Union, we can only expect to see Russia pursue aggressive policies designed to achieve world domination.

We are No. 2—and we're not trying harder.

#### THE LITTLE RED SCHOOLHOUSE

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to my colleagues attention a lasting tribute to our American Bicentennial and an important reminder of our proud past.

In the town of Newburgh in my 26th Congressional District of New York State, parents, students, teachers, the Lions Club, and other interested citizens banded together to recreate and retain a bit of our past. Thanks to hundreds of people and students a "Little Red Schoolhouse" was constructed on the grounds of the Meadow Hill School in the historic town of Newburgh.

It is a fitting reminder of our great past—a bit of Early Americana has been preserved.

On Friday, May 28, the Little Red Schoolhouse, which will be an impressive history lesson on for the students at the modern school just a few yards away, was dedicated.

It was a memorable afternoon for everyone involved in this colorful Bicentennial event. As Acting Principal Ronald Shapiro stated:

Our satisfaction and personal gratification is knowing that we have involved a community; its citizens, its school and, most important, its children in a totally worthwhile project. We have taken a piece of our nation's past and built for the future.

I had the good fortune of taking part in the dedication ceremony and to tour this one-room schoolhouse. For a moment I had left the 20th century far behind and was back in the days when our fledgling Nation was just blossoming.

Here is a colorful, meaningful reminder of our history. The people of Newburgh, N.Y., have not lost sight of the true meaning of our Bicentennial.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to include the text of an article which appeared in our local newspaper, the Evening News, which describes the dedication of Meadow Hill's Little Red Schoolhouse:

SCHOOLHOUSE A SYMBOL

(By Ward Poche)

TOWN OF NEWBURGH.—In a profound sense, Friday's dedication of the Little Red School-

house of the Meadow Hill School was a dedication to a symbol of American education which Dr. Murray Cohen, board president, called the greatest good democracy has given to the world.

And in spite of the profoundness, it had to be defined as a fun day.

On 11-year-old Billy Vittorini, the poet, John Milton, might have written: "He also serves who only stands and waits."

Billy, a fifth grade pupil at the school, was the unsung hero of the ceremonies. He was the bell ringer.

While everyone was outside for the ceremonies Billy was inside (in the shade) waiting for his moment of glory which came at the end of the program. And he had another advantage—he could blow his bubble gum because he was out of sight.

It was an impressive day—the dedication of the structure built to commemorate the nation's 200th Birthday and dedicated on this Memorial Day weekend.

It was the day of which the school was—and could be—proud. They had come up with a sterling idea for the bicentennial and they had seen it through to completion.

For all speakers it was a time when "cooperation" could be cited and they did.

Town of Newburgh Supervisor Malone Bannan, mindful of the age of most of his audience, reminded the "boys and girls" to take advantage of the modern facilities they have because they will be the leaders of tomorrow. And he reminded them that the leaders of the past came from little red schoolhouses such as the one they had built.

School Superintendent Charles F. Disare got the biggest hand as former principal of the Meadow Hill School.

And Edward Schlissel, member of the school's guidance department, who has taken over the roll of school master of the Little Red Schoolhouse was also well received by the audience.

In the signing of the deed for the schoolhouse, with quills, he noted it was presented with several exceptions: it cannot be used for off-track betting, as the superintendent's greenhouse, as the new site for the City Club nor a lunchtime detention center.

James Patsalos, member of the board of education in signing, said it was accepted in the spirit in which it was given and praised Auden Reilly of the Stewart Citizen who stepped out of her role as a reporter in an article to express her personal view of how great the project, the administration, the faculty, the students and the volunteers had been. He called it a positive approach at a time when the media is negative.

State Senator Richard Schermerhorn presented a state flag which had flown over Albany to the school and spoke as did Rep. Benjamin A. Gilman and Assemblyman Lawrence Herbst of the past and future.

Ronald F. Shapiro, acting principal of the school, and Ralph A. Pizzo, assistant principal, were praised for their dedication to the project and presented with unexpected plaques by the Parent-Teacher Organization. Shapiro said he was shocked and Pizzo, who had apparently been in on the Shapiro award, was not only shocked but "double crossed" because he hadn't wanted any fanfare.

The Town of Newburgh Lions Club made a \$1,000 donation, in two \$500 payments, toward the project with some apparent hard-sell by President Donald Van Buren who dipped into his own pocket for another \$100 because he thought so much of the idea.

The school band was outstanding and they had their new blue blazers because of contributions of others to their special project.

That was the way it was under blue skies on Friday as Barbara Bernstein, president of the school's PTO suggested it is the time to "uproot the deep seated apathy which infects the nation because of war, political assassination and economic problems."

And while it was all going on Adam David,

5, and his friend ("We don't know how old he is!) somersaulted behind the bleachers without a care in the world."

#### EXPANDING FORT MACARTHUR

**HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in April, the Defense Department announced their intention to study the possibility of closing down several military bases throughout the Nation as part of an "economy" move. It has been my contention that such actions must be considered very carefully, because they may have a serious effect on the communities that depend, at least partially, on those bases for support. In addition, they may well end up costing the military more money than they would if allowed to continue operations.

An example of this type of situation exists in southern California. Fort MacArthur, the last active Army base in an area with a population in excess of 11 million, has been in existence for over 80 years. Two years ago, the Army undertook a drastic reduction in fort operations, leaving only a small portion of the reservation still active, and declaring the rest of the base—over 310 acres—as surplus to Government needs.

San Pedro is still trying to adjust to the effect of that move. The community has responded well to the challenge, and a committee of citizens has worked long and hard to insure that the uses of the surplus land will be in the best interests of the people. Now, the Army—after assuring San Pedro residents that the fort would remain active—has announced the study that may very well conclude with the complete elimination of historic Fort MacArthur.

It is my strong belief that the closing of Fort MacArthur would be a serious mistake. In the long run, many dollars of taxpayers' money could be saved by consolidating many Los Angeles area Army activities onto the fort. Rent money in the millions of dollars could be saved annually by such a move.

In addition, the hardships imposed on employees of a military base must be considered in the total cost of a base shutdown. Many are forced to relocate long distances to resume their careers; the unlucky ones must seek new employment.

Recently, I received the following letter from Mr. Harold E. MacLeod, national vice president of the American Federation of Government Employees. As a representative of the civilian employees of Fort MacArthur, he is also vitally concerned about the future of the base. The letter details his position quite eloquently:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF  
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES,

Washington, D.C., May 11, 1976.

HON. CONGRESSMAN GLENN M. ANDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: May I take this opportunity to express to you, our deep gratitude here in the 12th District of the



American Federation of Government Employees (California-Nevada) and to thank you for your undying efforts to assist us in saving Fort MacArthur.

Your May 3, 1976 letter to the Secretary of the Army has given me renewed hope that through many efforts such as yours, we may be able to bring an end to this most unsatisfactory problem.

It is beyond my comprehension to ever understand the reasoning behind such a move to close this most important base of operation on the West Coast.

We have attempted to point out the savings to the Army as well, and to think they continue to talk "close" rather than expand, is utterly ridiculous.

It is our prayer that somewhere a positive attitude will strike in the hearts and minds of those in power to make changes, and that proper evaluation shall be given prior to giving us the "ax".

Thank you again for your continued interest and for all you have done in our behalf.

Sincerely,

H. E. "Mac" McLEON,  
National Vice President, 12th District  
AFGE.

# REMARKS BY JAMES A. BURKE ON "THE PASSING OF CARL R. JOHNSON"

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the town of Braintree, Mass., which I represent, has lost an outstanding public servant. Carl R. Johnson, Jr. was a man who cared about his community. For over two decades he provided the citizens of Braintree with a quality of leadership that will be sadly missed. As a town clerk, State representative, selectman, and moderator he was surpassed by no man and equaled by few.

Carl Johnson's numerous contributions to the people he served were widespread. Residents from every walk of life seemed to benefit from the funds Carl secured for Swift's Beach as well as his continuous improvements in the clerks office. Perhaps his greatest donation was that of himself when he presided over the town meetings in a manner of fairness and impartiality that could only be exemplified by a man of Carl's stature and character.

He could call no man his enemy and his popularity amongst his peers was a direct result of the hard work and style that made him a leader. My admiration and respect for Carl had come through a close and personal friendship that had grown over the years. He was a giant among men and we shall all miss him.

The article follows:

[From the Braintree (Mass.) Star]

IN MEMORIAM

The Town of Braintree has lost a good and faithful friend. For over twenty years Carl Johnson dedicated his life to public service, to caring about his town and the people in it. His public career saw him hold office as Town Clerk, State Representative, Selectman, and Moderator.

His many contributions to helping people are too numerous to recount in detail but a small sample of his public service would in-

clude: Improvements in the Clerks Office, the construction of a vault to house the many priceless town documents, re-writing the election laws to bring greater participation in the election process, helping the unemployed find work, securing funds for Swift's Beach, appointing outstanding individuals to Town Boards and Committees, presiding at Town meeting with a fair and impartial hand and above all always acting on every issue before him with straightforward and simple integrity born of wisdom and experience.

In the late fifties and early sixties, this country experienced the height of excellence in public life personified by President Kennedy and his brothers. Carl Johnson was very much a part of this now sadly lost era. He was not only a friend and ally of the Kennedys, he was a man who in his own right served in the style of excellence and self-sacrifice so characteristic of those years.

It has been said that "Politics is a profession; a serious one complicated and in its true sense, a noble one." We can accept this definition for Carl Johnson of politics.

We hope that his many achievements and the high regard in which he was held by all is a source of consolation to his family.

We shall all miss him.

[From the Patriot Ledger, May 3, 1976]

CARL JOHNSON JR. DIES; BRAINTREE, STATE OFFICIAL

BRAINTREE.—Carl R. Johnson Jr., 49, longtime public official for Braintree and Massachusetts, died Saturday at University Hospital in Boston after a long illness.

He was born in Weymouth and had lived in Braintree for many years. His home at 766 Washington St. is the oldest house in Braintree.

Mr. Johnson was presently the administrative assistant to the president of the Massachusetts Senate.

He had served for eight years as a state representative, for six years on the Braintree Board of Selectmen, for 13 years as town clerk, and formerly as a clerk for the state senate. He was also a former special assistant director of engineering and facilities for the Post Office Department.

Since 1969, he had served as town moderator. The town meeting scheduled for tonight will be adjourned in deference to Mr. Johnson.

An active member of the Democratic party, Mr. Johnson was a former member of the Democratic State Committee and former chairman of the Braintree Town Democratic Committee. He was a delegate in 1960 and 1964 to the Democratic National Convention, and secretary to the state conventions in 1962, 1964, 1966 and 1970.

He conducted Sen. Edward M. Kennedy's voter registration drive in 1962. In the same year, he was chairman of the credentials committee at the state Democratic Convention.

Sen. Kennedy offered his respects to Mr. Johnson's family yesterday at their home.

During World War II, Mr. Johnson served in the Navy on the USS Eversole in the South Pacific.

He was a member of the Braintree American Legion, the VFW, the Disabled American Veterans, the Braintree Knights of Columbus and the Massachusetts Legislative Association, the Braintree Housing Authority and a former member of the Braintree Fire department.

Members of the Knights of Columbus Council No. 1462 will assemble in the council chamber tomorrow at 7:30 p.m. before paying respects at the funeral home.

He was honored in 1972 in a tribute attended by 400 at the Sons of Italy Hall.

Son of the late Carl R. Johnson and Mrs. M. Leone (Beauregard) Johnson, he is survived by his wife, Mrs. Beatrice T. (Woodford) Johnson; three sons, Braintree Selectman Carl R. Johnson III, C. Mark Johnson

and Kevin M. Johnson, all of Braintree; three daughters, Mrs. Christine A. Shea of Randolph, Mrs. Karin T. Leao of Long Island, N.Y. and Miss Katherine M. Johnson of Braintree; a brother, Raymond A. Johnson of Norwell; a sister, Mrs. Anita L. Coleman of Wilbraham; and four grandchildren.

A funeral Mass will be celebrated Wednesday at 10 a.m. at St. Francis of Assisi Church. Burial will be in Blue Hill Cemetery. Visiting hours are tonight from 7 to 9 and tomorrow from 2 to 4 and 7 to 9 p.m. at Leo J. McMaster and Son Funeral Home, 86 Franklin St.

Donations in his memory may be made to the Boston University School of Medicine, Amyloid (Arthritis) Foundation, care of Dr. Martha Skinner, University Hospital, East Newton St., Boston, Mass.

[From the Boston Globe]

CARL JOHNSON, JR., 49; BRAINTREE POLITICAL FIGURE

Carl R. Johnson, Jr., 49, of 766 Washington St., Braintree, long active in Democratic politics and campaigns for President John F. Kennedy and Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, died late Saturday at University Hospital in Boston. He had suffered from arthritis for many years.

He was born in Weymouth and lived most of his life in Braintree. He attended Braintree High School and Boston University.

Mr. Johnson had been Braintree town moderator since 1969 and had been state representative from Braintree for eight years. He also had been the Braintree town clerk for 13 years and a selectman for six years.

He was a delegate to the national Democratic Convention in 1960 and 1964 and to the state Democratic Convention in 1962, 1964, 1966 and 1970.

Mr. Johnson had previously been special assistant to the director of engineering and special facilities in the Post Office department.

He conducted Sen. Edward M. Kennedy's voter registration drive in 1962 and afterward performed similar chores for the Democratic State Committee.

In 1962, he was chairman of the credentials committee at the state Democratic Convention.

Mr. Johnson served in the Navy during World War II in the South Pacific. He earlier was with the Braintree Fire Department. He once was a member of the Braintree Housing Authority.

He was a member of the VFW, American Legion, Knights of Columbus, and Massachusetts Legislators Assn.

He leaves his wife, Beatrice T. (Woodford); three sons, Carl R. 3d of Braintree, C. Mark and Kevin M. Johnson, all of Braintree; three daughters, Mrs. Christine A. Shea of Randolph, Mrs. Karin T. Leao of New York and Katherine M. Johnson of Braintree; a brother, Raymond A. of Norwell; a sister, Mrs. Anita L. Coleman of Wilbraham and four grandchildren.

A Mass will be said at 10 a.m. Wednesday in St. Francis of Assisi Church, Braintree. Burial will be in Blue Hill Cemetery.

Johnson—Carl R., Jr., former State Representative, Administrative Assistant to the President of the Senate and Braintree Town Moderator, May 1, husband of Beatrice T. (Woodford) Johnson, father of Carl R., III of Braintree, Mrs. James F. (Christine A.) Shea of Randolph, Mrs. Nelson (Karin T.) Leao of Long Island, N.Y., Katherine M., C. Mark and Kevin M. Johnson, all of home address. Also survived by 4 grandchildren. Brother of Mrs. Thomas H. (Anita L.) Coleman of Wilbraham and Raymond A. Johnson of Norwell. Funeral from the Leo J. McMaster and Son Funeral Home, 86 Franklin St., Braintree (Route 37), Wednesday, May 5 at 9 a.m. Followed by a funeral Mass in St. Francis of Assisi Church at 10 a.m. Relatives and friends are respectfully

invited to visit the Funeral Home Monday evening 7-9 p.m. and Tuesday afternoon and evening 2-4 and 7-9 p.m. Rather than flowers, the family sincerely wishes that remembrances be sent to Boston University School of Medicine, Amyloid (Arthritis) Research Foundation, care of Dr. Martha Skinner, University Hospital, East Newton St., Boston, Mass.

## INJUSTICE IN THE SOVIET UNION

## HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on May 27, the British Broadcasting Co. presented a documentary entitled "KGB—The Soviet Secret Police." This excellent show was produced by Mischa Scorer, who traveled throughout the world talking to people with firsthand experience of the KGB, both victims and defectors. He traces in fascinating detail the history of the KGB and the way it operates inside the Soviet Union.

An interesting part of this production deals with the Soviet legal system. It points out the complete lack of justice in political cases. According to the show's commentary:

All cases of a "special" or political nature are prepared by the KGB in conjunction with the State Prosecutor. Virtually all judges are Party members, defense counsel must have special clearance for such cases and the trials are rarely heard in public. It is not surprising that acquittals in political cases are almost unknown.

The show continues with an interview of Zigmus Butkus, a judge in the Soviet Union before he defected to the West in 1972. Following is the text of his experience of judges' relationships with the KGB:

ZIGMUS BUTKUS. Officially, they are not considered members of the KGB. But the KGB has its own representatives as in all organizations. They have direct links with the courts and I remember when I was a Judge we had personal contacts with the KGB people. And in certain cases they would drop in to my office and say: "In such and such a case the following had better be done". And you have to do it because you can't do anything else.

MISCHA SCORER. Can you give me a specific instance of this?

ZIGMUS BUTKUS. Well, for example, last year a case was under investigation in Kaunas. The case of a Catholic priest called Zdebskis. I was in charge of the Kaunas Juridical Consultancy at the time, I was summoned to Party headquarters of one of the District Committees of the city of Kaunas and the First Secretary who knew me personally, said: "On my orders, and on those of the KGB, you must dismiss the barrister who has been retained to defend the priest. You will put our own man, a Party man, in his place, who will conduct the defence the way we want". I said that this would be difficult, that they had already paid the money but he said: "These are orders. That's all there is to it". Of course, I spoke to the barrister and explained it to him and told him he had better to drop the case of his own accord, and he left. And I appointed another barrister who just went through the motions.

MISCHA SCORER. What if a judge has a conscience?

ZIGMUS BUTKUS. Well then he has to go against his conscience because if he wants to go on working, he can't do anything else.

We might legitimately ask ourselves why the British Broadcasting Co. is the one investigating and reporting on KGB abuses in the Soviet Union. Where are the liberal American networks when it comes to such matters: Out selling détente?

## MORE FUNDS FOR LEGAL SERVICES TO THE POOR

## HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the appropriations bill for the Legal Services Corporation, which provides legal assistance for the poor, is scheduled for House action sometime in the middle of June. The amount approved by the Appropriations Committee—\$110 million—is \$30 million less than the request of the Corporation.

It should be noted that the funding level of the Federal legal services program has remained at the same level for the past several years. In part that is attributable to the attempts by the Nixon administration to dismantle the entire program. The battle to keep the program alive left little time to fight for increased funding.

The time has now arrived when the severe problem of underfunding must be addressed. "Equal justice under law," a fundamental precept of our society, has little meaning if persons cannot afford adequate legal services. An editorial in the June 2, 1976, issue of the New York Times speaks to these questions, which I am having reprinted here:

## FUNDING LEGAL SERVICES

The nation's commitment to law and order is to be tested soon in a Senate appropriations subcommittee as it considers what might otherwise appear to be a routine money bill. The measure is the appropriation bill for the new Legal Services Corporation, which is attempting to rescue the program from its present stagnation.

The concept of a public corporation that dispenses legal services was initially advanced by the Nixon Administration in 1971. For the next five years, the program received no funding increase at all. The practical effect was an inflation-induced 30 percent shrinkage of the program.

Under the leadership of its new president, Thomas Ehrlich, former dean of the Stanford University law school, the corporation is seeking sufficient funds to provide services throughout the country to people who, as the act specifies, "are otherwise unable to afford adequate legal counsel."

The corporation's budget request of \$140 million is based on the fact that of the nation's 29 million poor people, only 17 million have any access to legal counsel at all and 10.5 million of those people have access at a ratio of less than one lawyer per 10,000 people. The ratio in the general population is 11.2 lawyers per every 10,000 people. The requested sum (\$30 million more than the House voted) would enable the corporation to begin a program designed to achieve after four years a minimally adequate representational level of two lawyers for every 10,000 people throughout the poverty population.

No society can properly claim that it is governed by a system of law when millions

of its citizens are denied access to the legal system because they are poor. Congress understood this principle when it enacted the program. It should now provide sufficient funds to make it a reality.

## AGRICULTURAL/SMALL TOWN/SMALL BUSINESS POLICY

## HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, in response to a letter that I have written to the Presidential candidates regarding their agricultural/small town/small business policy, I have received the attached response from Ronald Reagan. I inserted it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to give others an opportunity to read the response. I shall be inserting farm policy statements from other candidates as I receive them. I shall also supply the replies to farm publications.

The articles follow:

[Excerpts From Remarks by Ronald Reagan at Bell Farm, Bloomington, Ill., Jan. 22, 1976]

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—America's farmers and ranchers demonstrate the genius of American productivity every day. Ten years ago, a single farm worker supplied enough food and fiber for 29 people. That's impressive, but today he supplies 56 people—nearly twice as many. Our farmers constitute one-tenth of one percent of the world's population but feed 25 percent.

Our food producing system is the envy—and the supplier—of the world. It has made it possible for the consumer—who paid more than 22 percent of his takehome pay for food 25 years ago—to pay only about 17½ percent this year. Yet only five percent of our population remains on our farms and ranches.

In the Soviet Union, by contrast, more than one-third of the people must work to produce food for themselves and the other two-thirds, and still they can't produce enough.

A hungry world looks to us for leadership in agricultural technology and production, and this will be the case for years to come, until the newer nations can increase their own output and, at the same time, curb their exploding population growth.

In recent years our government's policy has been to tell the farmers to plant fence to fence and go into the open market to meet the world's demand. As a result, our agricultural exports this fiscal year should equal or surpass last year's \$12.6 billion record. Our earnings from agricultural exports last year were nearly large enough to pay for all the foreign oil we imported in that period and were one of the few favorable items in our balance of trade.

Our level of exports is nearly four times what it was in the late Sixties. Without it, there would be a need for astronomical subsidies, and prices of all imports would have risen sharply.

Government policy should be to encourage full production without undue interference in the free-market process. But this hasn't been the case. By placing a sudden embargo on grain sales to the Soviet Union last September, Washington changed the rules in the middle of the game. That is no more fair in a government-to-farmer commitment than it would be in a business commitment or a football game.

Farmers tell me they believe the family farm can survive without any help or interference from Washington, and the great ma-



majority of farmers would rather rely on a free market. They know that this spirit of independence carries both risks and opportunities, but they are willing to take their chances. And isn't that the American way?

A famous citizen of Bloomington, the late Adlai Stevenson, said more than two decades ago, "Let us strive for big men, not big government." Those words are true today—truer than ever before.

Let Washington play by the rules it agreed to. If at some time in the future it decides that our long-range national interests dictate reduced trade with the Soviet Union—and not just agricultural trade—then the government should give our producers ample warning so they can find alternative markets without hardship.

I am skeptical though of proposals for a world grain reserve or a national grain reserve. These could too easily become mechanisms through which government could dump grain on the market and depress prices when they are high.

Two recent studies, one by the General Accounting Office and another by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, show that those countries which have imposed price controls, export embargoes and other restrictions on their farmers' and ranchers' profit opportunities, continually experience productivity problems.

Of course the Soviet Union and other communist nations provide the best examples of how not to go about agriculture, or much of anything else, for that matter.

Now the Soviet Union has a land mass larger than ours, with 250 million capable people. For nearly 60 years it has been free to implement—without interference—the principles of Karl Marx' socialism. We could be just like them, but it would take a little doing on our part.

We'd have to start by cutting our paychecks by 80 percent, move 33 million workers back to the farm, destroy 59 million television sets; tear up 14 out of 15 miles of highway; junk 19 out of 20 automobiles; tear up two-thirds of our railroad tracks; knock down 70 percent of our houses; rip out nine-tenths of our telephones; and then all we'd have to do is find a capitalist country that would sell us grain so we wouldn't starve!

Practically speaking, when it comes to agriculture, our free enterprise system can continue to play the key role in feeding the world, provided we keep its energy unleashed and we get maximum use of our known resources, our imagination and our common sense.

There are those in the United States who think we should feel guilt for having been inventive, productive and powerful. Some of them try to make us feel guilty or "sinful" for using animal-produced forms of protein, namely meat and dairy products. But misinformation, fads or emotionalism have no place in rational discussions of food policy.

The Guilt Lobby argues that the grain fed to livestock could be used more efficiently to alleviate worldwide starvation and malnutrition if it were consumed directly by humans.

What these critics overlook is the fact that cattle obtain most of their food from sources humans cannot use. Their forage must be converted by them to have food value for us. They are, in fact, four-legged protein factories. They are one of the most promising weapons in man's battle against hunger and one of man's most completely used products, both in food and essential nutrients and in a variety of byproducts.

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above text. He will, however, stand by the above quotes.)

RONALD REAGAN ON AGRICULTURE

Government policy should encourage full production without undue influence in the

free market process. We cannot afford to use food as a weapon. It is not a finite commodity, like oil. New crops are produced each year and new technology continues to increase production levels. Our government policy in recent years has been to tell the farmer to plant from fence-to-fence and sell on the open market. But, it changed the rules in the middle of the game last September by putting a sudden embargo on further grain sales to the Soviet Union. By doing so, Washington simply encouraged the Russians to go elsewhere to buy 15 million tons of grain. Washington was not living up to its commitment to the nation's farmers. By not playing according to the rules that it had agreed to, it caused the farmers to lose sales of an estimated \$2.2 billion or more.

Sales of agricultural products to the Soviet Union in recent years have been an important factor in making U.S. agriculture one of the most fully-employed and productive areas in the nation's economy. Our agricultural exports have shot up from \$7.6 billion in 1971 to \$22.6 in 1975, enhancing our balance of trade. Yet, only five percent of our population is engaged in agriculture. By comparison, more than one-third the population of the U.S.S.R. works on its farms. Several poor harvests in a row have made them increasingly dependent on grain from elsewhere. In buying grain from us, they are paying in U.S. dollars and they are getting them by selling large amounts of their gold on world markets. The sales have definitely been to our advantage.

George Meany went too far when he ordered longshoremen not to load vessels bound for the U.S.S.R. with grain last fall. I don't think Mr. Meany should be determining foreign policy for the United States, and I don't think most union members think so either. A recent national poll revealed that 65 percent of rank-and-file union members feel that their leaders have too much power, and that they should not use that power for political purposes.

Our government should encourage export sales, not only to the Soviet Union, but also to nations around the world willing and able to buy. A hungry world looks to us for leadership and technology in agricultural production, and will continue to do so for many years to come. Washington must not penalize the farmer for becoming more efficient and productive.

We must enable farmers and small businessmen to pass their estates on to their families without necessitating the liquidation of the enterprise.

The present estate tax schedule is far out of date. A person's spouse has only a \$60,000 federal exemption. This figure has been used since 1942, when farm land and equipment was worth a fraction of its current value. Today, a farmer invests \$20,000 in a single tractor, \$45,000 in a combine, \$5,000 to \$10,000 in a plow and disc, plus the price of ground which can cost from \$1,000 to \$3,000 per acre. A new schedule is needed that will increase the inheritance tax exemption not only for farmers, but also small business in general, to more accurately reflect the current value of estates.

#### ADDITIONAL MATERIAL RELATING TO DEBATE ON SECURITY ASSISTANCE AMENDMENT FUNDS FOR REPUBLIC OF KOREA

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just today received a telegram from the organization of Evangelist Billy Graham regarding his cru-

sade throughout Korea, during which over 3.2 million people attended his religious meetings, including over 1.1 million at just a single meeting.

I believe this information adds substantially to the point which I have been making over the past few weeks regarding the fact that religious freedoms and social freedoms in South Korea are relatively unrestricted, contrary to allegations of a handful of our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the telegram in the RECORD to lend additional support to my arguments regarding aid to Korea—an argument which was substantially supported by the majority of the Congress in yesterday's vote.

The telegram follows:

Congressman JOHN M. MURPHY,  
Washington, D.C.

Evangelist Billy Graham conducted an evangelistic crusade in Seoul, Korea, May 30 to June 3, 1973. There were 3,210,000 people in attendance during the five-day crusade with nearly 100,000 commitments to Christ. The closing Sunday meeting was unprecedented with one million, one hundred thousand in attendance.

GEORGE M. WILSON,  
Executive Vice President, Billy Graham  
Evangelistic Association.

ANTHONY J. BRENNAN: CHAIRMAN  
OF THE MILFORD REVOLUTION-  
ARY BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION  
AND THE MAN BEHIND THE  
WORLD'S LARGEST BIRTHDAY  
CAKE

HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anthony J. Brennan, chairman of the Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission in Milford, Mass., has earned the admiration of his coworkers and of the people of Milford for his tireless and diligent efforts on behalf of the town in all of the Bicentennial programs headed up by the commission.

Mr. Brennan's latest—and probably most fattening—project was the "First In the Nation Childrens Bicentennial Party," featuring a 5 ton, 30 feet high, 215.6 square foot birthday cake. Needless to say, the party guests, numbering over 1,000, thoroughly enjoyed themselves.

Mr. Brennan deserves a large amount of the credit for this possibly world record-breaking event for his imagination, his determination and his patience—not to mention his faith—and, it certainly paid off.

Anthony Brennan and the commission's next project: the "Largest Bicentennial Parade in the Commonwealth" is to take place on June 15, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to place in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Milford Daily News entitled "The World's Tallest Cake." And, my personal thanks go out to Mr. Brennan for his hard work and his creative talents on behalf of Milford and the Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission.

The article follows:

## THE WORLD'S TALLEST CAKE

The town of Milford has "Bicentennial cake fever."

It was a circus atmosphere this morning when the Bicentennial Commission unveiled its 30-foot, six-tier cake, which is supposed to break the Guinness Book of World Records mark.

After it took nearly two hours to assemble the three-section cake, a Boston television film crew began video taping a seven-minute segment to be shown on Channel 5 tomorrow morning.

With a crowd of about 1,000 jamming around the confectionery skyscraper, you had to wonder "who's working?"

The long morning began shortly after 6 a.m. when the Highway Department headed for Fino Field annex from the town barn on Central Street. It took three trips to move the 10,000 pound monster.

While the trucks crawled up East Main Street commuter traffic was slowed to a snail's pace. For early morning drivers it was an unusual way to wake up.

By 7:45 a.m. the first two sections of the cake were in place at the annex, between Fino Field and the Municipal pool. Slowly, a crane donated by the Consigli Construction Co. lifted the second two sections into place while the crowd gasped.

Sabatino Scafuto, the key man behind the creation, worked from the Fire Department's "cherry picker" as he guided the two-by-four frame into place.

A minor problem developed when the crew attempted to lower on the top two layers—the crane was slightly out of position and Scafuto was unable to complete the job. After moving the crane ahead (with the layers still suspended) the crisis passed. Shortly after 8:30 a.m. the world's tallest cake was in one piece.

The next scene was a bit hectic for Milford District Court Judge Francis J. Larkin.

Judge Larkin, who was dressed in a three-piece suit, was hoisted to the top of the cake with a tape to make the official measurement. Not counting the eagle, the cake measured exactly 30 feet, breaking the Guinness record by seven feet.

A number of town officials were in attendance to authenticate the height. Among them were Selectmen Emilio E. Diotalevi, John V. Fernandes, and Mrs. Marie J. Parente.

Other groups participating for the TV performance were the Milford Youth Militia and Milford High School Band. The taping was still going on late this morning.

## FRAME EXPENSIVE

The Commission had hoped to make the frame in a home carpentry shop, but when the size of the cake became apparent the task was carried out at the highway barn.

Used to make the wooden frame was 1,000 feet of two-by-fours. Also 50 sheets of plywood, two-by-twos and two-by-eights. In order to support the weight, the frame had to be carefully built.

The only major concern was a 25-mile per hour wind blowing from the northwest. The construction of the frame allowed most of the air to pass through the cake, averting any disaster. When the crew began assembling the cake it was only 35 degrees.

A number of figures are being tossed around, but one seems certain about the actual cost. The lumber cost about \$800. Anthony J. Brenna, chairman of the Bicentennial Commission, said the cake would cost the town under \$1,000.

Scafuto said if he were to sell the cake retail, it would be worth as much as \$12,000. It was estimated that about 500 man hours were need to complete the project. It took about three working days to piece the cake together and frost it.

Basically, the cake is red, white and blue, with flag decorations and jimmies. Red and white crepe paper is stretched around the entire cake with red, white and blue paper

around the wooden beams. The cake is resting on flat bed trucks donated by the highway department National Guard.

Once the television taping is finished, the crew is expected to take the cake apart and transport it back to the highway dept. garage. Scafuto said the cake would be fresh for Sunday afternoon's party. "You won't even realize when it's been baked," said Scafuto. "We have used special ingredients."

The five other bakers are Norman Martell, Rick Auger, Nicholas Oliva, Bruce Blair, and Mario Scafuto.

Sunday's party will be held in downtown Milford from 1 to 4 p.m. In addition to the cake, children will receive free ice cream and lollipops. Eight booths will also be set up on Main Street.

## PRIVY SQUAD FOR OSHA?

## HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, many of us pooh-poohed George Orwell's "1984" when it was written some years ago, but as that date draws nearer the specter of Big Brother hovering over every decision and act looms more and more into reality. Call it Big Brother, EPA, OSHA, or whatever, it cannot be denied that freedom of individual citizens to make everyday decisions concerning their livelihood and working conditions is being steadily eroded.

One of the most recent incursions is the ridiculous decision of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration in proposed standards for field sanitary facilities. The standards they hope to mandate across the land were published in the Federal Register on April 27, 1976. The public has been invited to comment on them until July 6, 1976.

Regulations for toilet facilities "within a 5-minute walk of each employee's place of work in the field," are prescribed and they are detailed right down to the toilet paper holder and the inside lock on the door "to insure privacy." Handwashing facilities are also required with signs, and the quality of water, towels, and soap specified.

Also included are provisions requiring availability of drinking water which "shall be dispensed either through the use of a drinking fountain equipped with an angled jet outlet, or a gravity water tap." Cooling of the water, drinking cups, and construction and maintenance of containers are specified together with a requirement "all containers, fountains, or other devices used for the storage or dispensing of drinking water shall be conspicuously marked 'drinking water.'"

As far as I can see this is another case of Government trying to apply blanket regulations to situations where they can not possibly work. It was just a few years ago that OSHA tried to regulate the number, size, and shape of toilets for all business firms including the smallest shop, and they finally had to back off to concentrate on industries with high safety hazards.

Now they are at it again, and this time they have decided to make a proposal designed for the fruit and vegetable fields of California apply to the vast

grainfields and rangeland across the country—regardless of whether it is needed, practical or even feasible.

It takes little imagination to figure out how tough it will be to try and comply with regulations like these in areas where wheatfields are a quarter section or larger. The facilities would have to be placed either in the middle of nearly every field or have a mobile capability, neither of which makes any sense at all.

I am encouraging every farmer and rancher in South Dakota as well as farm organizations to join me in protesting this unnecessary bureaucratic nonsense. And even protesting is not going to be easy: OSHA has specifications on how this is to be done, too.

Ridiculous? That is an understatement. If California wants or needs such rules, that should be California's decision. For the rest of the Nation, the entire proposal: "Subpart I—General Environmental Controls, Section 1928.110 Field Sanitary Facilities," should be scrapped. Farmers have enough problems without the Government meddling in their toilets.

## TRIBUTE TO GERRI AND MANNY ROHATINER

## HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join the Los Angeles community in paying tribute to Gerri and Manny Rohatiner at a concert to be held at the Scottish Rite Auditorium on Sunday, June 12, 1976.

This event is being sponsored by the National Conference of Synagogue Youth—NCSY—in honor of Mr. and Mrs. Rohatiner, who by their leadership in chairing a citywide banquet, the first major fundraising event for NCSY, helped establish a base of support for the organization's continued good work. Since that time, Manny has chaired the NCSY West Coast Youth Commission, and was recently elected to the vice presidency of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America on the west coast, the official organization for the orthodox movement.

The NCSY is the youth arm of the orthodox movement. Manny and Gerri have dedicated many years of their lives with endless devotion, warmth and love, and a deep spiritual commitment to its growth on the west coast.

The Rohatiners have been actively engaged in various philanthropic endeavors within the Los Angeles Jewish community for the past 25 years. The United Jewish Appeal, the Guardians, B'nai B'rith, American Mizrahi Women, Young Musicians Foundation, City of Hope, Hillel Hebrew Academy, and Yavneh Hebrew Academy are just a few of the organizations that they have supported through the years.

Manny has also had an active political career for many years. He served as deputy for Supervisor Debs and found great satisfaction in helping people with their problems. He has actively supported



many worthy candidates for public office.

Gerri and Manny Rohatiner are two very fine human beings and it is my pleasure to express to them and to my colleagues my commendation of them.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S CONCERN ABOUT CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE CLEAN AIR ACT

**HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, in a matter of days this body will begin consideration of legislation which will have far-reaching effects on virtually every segment of our economy. I am speaking of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1976.

Many of the Nation's policymakers—both in and out of Congress—have voiced concern about two particular sections of this bill: that which sets auto emission standards and that which prohibits significant deterioration of air quality. It has been a great help to us here that they have made their views known before we must make a final decision on this very complex bill. Their arguments have enabled all of us to know more thoroughly the many different aspects of the issues involved.

To that end, President Ford has expressed his reservations about the committee amendments dealing with auto emissions standards and significant deterioration.

In a letter to Chairman STAGGERS, Mr. Ford endorsed the Dingell-Broyhill amendment on auto emissions as striking the proper balance between energy, environmental, and economic needs. The President also stated that, because of potentially disastrous effects on unemployment and on energy development, he could not endorse the committee recommendations on significant deterioration. While applauding the committee's attempt to clarify this complex issue, he called for the Congress to amend the act to preclude application of all significant deterioration provisions until sufficient information concerning its final impact can be gathered.

Mr. Speaker, because some of my colleagues may not have seen the President's letter, I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, May 28, 1976.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,  
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce  
Committee, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Both Houses of the Congress will soon consider amendments to the Clean Air Act of 1970. There are several sections of both the Senate and House amendments, as reported out of the respective committees, that I find disturbing. Specifically, I have serious reservations concerning the amendments dealing with auto emissions standards and prevention of significant deterioration.

In January 1975, I recommended that the Congress modify provisions of the Clean Air Act of 1970 related to automobile emissions. This position in part reflected the fact that

auto emissions for 1976 model autos have been reduced by 83% compared to uncontrolled pre-1968 emission levels (with the exception of nitrogen oxides). Further reductions would be increasingly costly to the consumer and would involve decreases in fuel efficiency.

The Senate and House amendments, as presently written, fail to strike the proper balance between energy, environmental and economic needs. Therefore, I am announcing my support for an amendment to be co-sponsored by Congressman John Dingell and Congressman James Broyhill, which reflects the position recommended by Russell Train, Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. This amendment would provide for stability of emissions standards over the next three years, imposing stricter standards for two years thereafter. Furthermore, a recent study by the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Transportation and the Federal Energy Administration indicates that the Dingell-Broyhill Amendment, relative to the Senate and House positions, would result in consumer cost savings of billions of dollars and fuel savings of billions of gallons. Resulting air quality differences would be negligible. I believe the Dingell-Broyhill Amendment at this point best balances the critical considerations of energy, economics and environment.

I am also concerned about the potential impact of the sections of the Senate and House Committee Amendments that deal with the prevention of significant deterioration of air quality. In January 1975, I asked the Congress to clarify their intent by eliminating significant deterioration provisions. As the respective Amendments are now written, greater economic uncertainties concerning job creation and capital formation would be created. Additionally, the impact on future energy resource development might well be negative. While I applaud the efforts of your committee in attempting to clarify this difficult issue, the uncertainties of the suggested changes are disturbing. I have asked the Environmental Protection Agency to supply me with the results of impact studies showing the effect of such changes on various industries. I am not satisfied that the very preliminary work of that Agency is sufficient evidence on which to decide this critical issue. We do not have the facts necessary to make proper decisions.

In view of the potentially disastrous effects on unemployment and on energy development, I cannot endorse the changes recommended by the respective House and Senate Committees. Accordingly, I believe the most appropriate course of action would be to amend the Act to preclude application of all significant deterioration provisions until sufficient information concerning final impact can be gathered.

The Nation is making progress towards reaching its environmental goals. As we continue to clean up our air and water, we must be careful not to retard our efforts at energy independence and economic recovery. Given the uncertainties created by the Clean Air Amendments, I will ask the Congress to review these considerations.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD.

#### LEGISLATIVE STATUS REPORT

**HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, periodically I enter into the RECORD a status report on legislation I have sponsored. Following is such a report covering all

legislation I have sponsored so far during the 94th Congress:

#### LEGISLATIVE STATUS REPORT: JUNE 1976

##### AGRICULTURE

H.R. 6737 (Seiberling). Research funds for improved fertilizer and food production methods.

H.R. 9890 (Burke of Mass.). Distribution of seeds and plants for use in home gardens.

##### ARTS AND HUMANITIES

H.R. 2898 (Krueger). Establish folklife center in the Library of Congress. (Enacted as Public Law 94-201.)

H.R. 4030 (Whitehurst). Assistance to zoos and aquariums.

H.R. 11137 (Gude). Amends Dwight Eisenhower Bicentennial Civic Center Act.

H.C. Res. 97 (Bingham). Authorize bust or statue of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to be placed in the Capitol. (Passed House; pending in Senate.)

H.R. 13522 (Brown). Establish a National Museum of Afro-American History.

##### ASIAN-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

H.R. 5548 (Anderson of Calif.). Cabinet Committee for Asian-American Affairs.

##### BUDGET

H.R. 7449 (Moorhead of Pa.). Intergovernmental Countercyclical Assistance Act. (Enacted as Title II, H.R. 5247; vetoed by President.)

H.R. 12007 (Metcalf). Revenue Sharing Reform Act.

##### CHILD WELFARE

H.R. 2967 (Brademas). Comprehensive child care bill.

H.R. 3408 (Daniels). Youth Camp Safety Act. (Passed the House; pending in Senate.)

H.R. 5702 (Mitchell of Md.). Grants for pre-school education programs.

##### CIVIL LIBERTIES

H.R. 353 (Dellums). Amnesty. (Judiciary Subcommittee hearings held.)

H.R. 354 (Dellums). Gun control. (Judiciary Committee markup pending.)

H.R. 3235 (Goldwater). Comprehensive protection of constitutional rights of privacy.

H.R. 3337 (DuPont). Allows women in military academies. (Passed House as amendment to 1976 DOD authorization bill.)

H.R. 4134 (Drinan). Abolishes capital punishment.

H.R. 5129 (Abzug). Amends the Privacy Act of 1974 to allow individuals to correct personal files.

H.R. 5452 (Abzug). Gay Rights.

H.R. 8964 (Metcalf). Permits suits against governments for civil rights violations.

H.R. 9451 (Spellman). Prevents housing discrimination on grounds of marital status.

H.R. 9666 (Harrington). Protects constitutional rights and liberties for disclosure of private communications.

H.R. 10093 (Bingham). Prohibits prior restraint.

H.R. 12504 (Kastenmeier). Criminal code reforms.

##### COMMERCE

H.R. 3229 (Frenzel). Accelerates capital formation through employee stock ownership.

H.R. 3352 (Seiberling). Mandatory interest on bank accounts. (Passed House; pending in Senate.)

H.R. 3823 (Addabbo). Aids small businesses affected by relocation.

H.R. 4318 (Patman of Texas). Audit of Federal Reserve Board.

H.R. 5524 (McFall). Price controls for concentrated industries.

H.R. 6833 (Mitchell of Md.). Places a moratorium on certain SBA loan repayments.

H.R. 10220 (Hughes). Removes oil import tariffs; establishes a maximum tariff for domestically produced crude oil.

H.R. 10329 (Mikva). Corrects franchise practice inequities. (Judiciary subcommittee hearings held.)

H.R. 13785 (Mitchell). Minority Enterprise Act.

## CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

H.R. 1268 (Dellums): Congressional review of Executive agreements. (International Relations Committee hearings held.)

H.R. 3045 (Rallsback): Public disclosure of lobbying. (Committee on Standards of Official Conduct hearings held.)

H.R. 9102 (Phillip Burton): Provides public financing of Congressional campaigns. (Defeated on floor as amendment to Federal Election Commission Reform bill.)

H.R. 11708 (Kastenmeier): Requires all candidates and federal officers to file financial statements.

H. Res. 442 (Stark): Additional staff for certain House members.

## CONSUMER AFFAIRS

H.R. 352 (Dellums): Bans war toys.

H.R. 4149 (Ford of Tenn.): Requires all packages to have individual prices.

H.R. 10881 (St Germain): Aid and technical assistance to specialized credit sources.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

H.J. Res. 432 (Fauntroy): Full District of Columbia representation in Congress. (House vote pending.)

H.R. 13467: (Rees): D.C. Pension reforms.

## DRUGS

H.R. 5170 (Koch): Recall of unsafe drugs.

H.R. 6108 (Koch): Decriminalization of marijuana.

## EDUCATION

H.R. 349 (Dellums): Grants to the Degana-widah-Quetzalcoatl University.

H.R. 2600 (Meeds): Comprehensive school health programs.

H.R. 8584 (Miller of Calif.): Authorizes nutrition education projects and programs.

## EMPLOYMENT

H.R. 345 (Dellums): Eliminates employment discrimination on the basis of military discharge status.

H.R. 346 (Dellums): Extends Age Discrimination Act to states.

H.R. 1609 (Hawkins): Full Employment Act.

H.R. 2394 (Riegle): Puts price stability as the goal of 1946 Employment Act.

H.R. 6730 (Riegle): Unemployment compensation program extension.

H.R. 8567 (Burke of Calif.): Establishes service programs for displaced homemakers.

H.R. 11503 (Sullivan): Provides for loans to finance urgently needed state and local public facilities.

H.R. 12437 (Perkins): Opportunities and Industrialization centers job creation and training act.

## ENERGY

H.R. 1768 (Green): Suspends power of the President to raise oil tariffs. (Passed Congress; vetoed.)

H.R. 6870 (Fish): Halts nuclear power plant license grants.

H.R. 8943 (Harrington): Prohibits oil company control of alternative energy sources.

H.R. 9181 (McCormack): Promotes electric vehicle studies.

H.R. 10824 (Drinan): Oil import fee preservation and consumer distribution.

H.R. 11768 (Allen): Permits electric utility lifeline rates. (Commerce Subcommittee hearings held.)

H.R. 12090 (Fraser): Divestiture of oil interests in pipeline transportation.

H. Res. 1057 (Scheuer): Investigation of Transportation Secretary Coleman's Concorde decision.

## ENVIRONMENT

H.R. 3246 (Jeffords): Returnable Beverage Container Act. (Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee hearings held.)

H.R. 4328 (Rogers): Ozone Protection Act.

H.R. 4386 (Brown of Calif.): Strengthening of Clean Air Act. (House vote pending.)

H.R. 8778 (Foley): Humane treatment of certain animals. (Passed House.)

H.R. 9218 (Fraser): Environmental Health Act.

H.R. 10586 (Anderson of Calif.): Discourages trap use on animals and birds. (Fisheries and Wildlife Subcommittee hearings held.)

H.R. 10756 (Studds): Compensation for oil pollution damages and cleanup costs. (Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation hearings conducted.)

H.R. 11520 (Koch): Establishes Commission on the Humane Treatment of Animals.

H.R. 12087 (Fisher): Prohibits landing rights at Dulles International and Washington National Airports for supersonic aircraft.

H.R. 12475 (Melcher): Revised strip mining control bill.

H.R. 12661 (Taylor): Land and Water Conservation Act amendments.

H.R. 14027 (Mineta): Calls for establishment of jet noise standards.

H.J. Res. 539 (Bell): Imposes an embargo on the products of all foreign enterprises engaged in commercial whaling.

## FOOD STAMPS

H.R. 6417 (Richmond): Food Stamp Program improvements.

H.R. 7695 (Harrington): Prohibits cuts in food stamps because of increases in monthly Social Security payments.

H.R. 12044 (Cornell): Reforms welfare, food stamp programs.

H.R. 12105 (Richmond): Prohibits new food stamp regulations from taking effect until Congress enacts new legislation.

H. Res. 45 (Peyser): Rescinds Administration's Food Stamp regulations. (Enacted as P.L. 94-4.)

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS

H.R. 350 (Dellums): Indochina Peace Pledge Legislation.

H.R. 1845 (Fraser): Rhodesian chrome import ban. (Failed in House.)

H.R. 2438 (Findley): Development of land-grant type universities in developing nations.

H.R. 5162 (Drinan): Requires submission of reports to Congress on exports of arms and ammunition.

H.R. 6632 (Drinan): Increases Congressional oversight of foreign military arms sales.

H.R. 6937 (Fauntroy): U.S. participation in African Development Fund. (Banking, Currency and Housing Subcommittee hearings held.)

H.R. 7223 (Diggs): Bans transfer of nuclear materials to countries which have not ratified nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

H.R. 9462 (DeLugo): Virgin Islands Constitution. (Passed the House; pending in Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.)

H.R. 10236 (Bingham): Repeals embargo on U.S. trade with North and South Vietnam.

H.R. 11012 (Fish): Provides for refusal of nonimmigrant visas in some instances.

H.C. Res. 191 (John Burton): Cuts off military aid to South Vietnam and Cambodia.

H.C. Res. 356 (Bingham): Disapproval of proposed sales to Jordan of Hawk missile and Vulcan anti-aircraft systems.

H.C. Res. 414 (Zablocki): Proposes international treaty to ban lethal chemical weapons.

H.J. Res. 535 (Ottinger): Renounces the first use of nuclear weapons. (Subcommittee hearings held.)

H. Res. 28 (Gude): Seeks agreement with U.N. members on prohibition of weather modification activity as a weapon of war. (International Organizations Subcommittee hearings held.)

H. Res. 536 (Harrington): Directs the Secretary of State to furnish information to the House of Representatives concerning the Mayaguez incident. (Full International Relations Committee hearings held.)

H. Con Res. 356 (Bingham): Disapproves proposed sale of Hawk missiles and Vulcan anti-aircraft systems to Jordan.

## GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

H.R. 343 (Dellums): CIA Control Act.

H.R. 351 (Dellums): Continuing Congressional Oversight Act.

H.R. 355 (Dellums): Provides for receipt of testimony and information from Executive agencies and bodies.

H.R. 1267 (Dellums): CIA Disclosure Act.

H.R. 3000 (Clay): Hatch Act amendments. (Passed House; Senate vote pending.)

H.R. 3050 (Rosenthal): Conflict of interest of public servants.

H.R. 5007 (Drinan): Controls on impoundment.

H.R. 5300 (Mitchell of Md.): Establishes Federal Protective Service Police force within the General Services Administration.

H.R. 6026 (Fascell): Opens meetings of government agencies to the public.

H.R. 6939 (Gude): Procedures for location of post offices.

H.R. 8201 (Dellums): Bureaucratic Accountability Act.

H.R. 8388 (Kastenmeier): Code of accountability and liability for Government officials engaged in making and implementing national security policy. (Courts, Civil Liberties and Administrative Justice Subcommittee hearings held.)

H.R. 9201 (Carr): Prohibits Secretary of State from holding position of Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

H.R. 10853 (Cornell): Prohibits Congressional appointments to service academies.

H.R. 11338 (Simon): Requires arms control impact reports for international nuclear materials transfers.

H.R. 11786 (James V. Stanton): Establishes position of Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

H.R. 12292 (Rosenthal): Establishes an independent visa and naturalization agency.

H.R. 12315 (Ketchum): Benefits for state meat and poultry inspectors.

H. Con. Res. 138 (Mitchell of Md.): Appreciation to Frank Wills.

H. Res. 106 (Holtzman): Directs the President to provide information on CIA activities to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 959 (Badillo): Establish Office of Hispanic Affairs in various executive agencies.

## HEALTH

H.R. 4155 (Fraser): Establishes emergency health benefits program for the unemployed. (Health and Environment Subcommittee hearings held; markup completed.)

H.R. 5265 (Mitchell of Md.): Establishes controls on the use of vitiligo.

H.R. 7345 (Pepper): Aid for graduate programs in geriatrics and gerontology.

H.R. 7364 (Koch): Assistance for geriatrics schools and departments.

H.R. 7367 (Koch): Continuing educational grants for geriatrics programs.

H.R. 7375 (Koch): Paramedical education assistance.

H.R. 12132 (Fauntroy): Extends for one year the District of Columbia Medical and Dental Manpower Act. (Awaiting presidential signature.)

H. Con. Res. 449 (Fraser): Calls for self-help aid increase to persons receiving inadequate nutrition.

## HOLIDAYS

H.R. 1810 (Conyers): Designates the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr. as a legal public holiday.

H.J. Res. 636 (Byron): Designated Sept. 14, 1975 as "National Saint Elizabeth Seton Day." (Enacted as Public Law 94-95.)

H.R. 692 (Myers of Ind.): Designates week of Thanksgiving "National Family Week."

## HOUSING

H.R. 344 (Dellums): Defrays mortgage payments for the temporarily unemployed. (Enacted as Public Law 94-50.)

H.R. 6240 (Mitchell of Md.): Building of three million low income homes.



H.R. 8095 (Ashley): Provides emergency housing assistance.

H.R. 9526 (Badillo): Establishes pilot homestead programs in selected cities.

H.R. 12658 (Stokes): Repair program for urban dwellings.

H.R. 12699 (Stokes): V.A. program of aid for repair of urban dwellings.

#### LABOR

H.R. 5023 (Mitchell of Md.): Collective bargaining for postal employees. (Subcommittee hearings started.)

H.R. 5042 (Phillip Burton): Strikes on construction sites.

H.R. 7348 (Pepper): Prevents fining of employees for giving Congressional testimony.

H.R. 7552 (Clay): Equal treatment of craft and industrial workers. (Passed Congress; vetoed by President.)

H.R. 8612 (Charles H. Wilson of Calif.): Establishes postal arbitration board.

H.R. 10490 (Harris): Eliminates Presidential authority to offer alternative comparability pay plans for federal employees.

H.R. 13743 (Ryan): Prohibition of contractors firing strikers.

H.R. 13744 (Ryan): Establishes fact-finding panels in strikes involving government contractors.

#### LEGAL SERVICES/COURT REFORM

H.R. 2986 (Conyers): Grand Jury reform.

H.R. 8742 (Drinan): Provides reasonable attorney fees in civil and constitutional rights litigation. (Courts, Civil Liberties and Administrative Justice Subcommittee hearings held.)

H.R. 8743 (Drinan): Provides recovery of attorney fees as part of costs in certain civil action. (Courts, Civil Liberties and Administrative Justice Subcommittee hearings held.)

H.R. 10303 (Koch): Government payment of attorney fees to accused when not convicted.

H.R. 13658 (Dellums): Bi-lingual court proceedings in U.S. District Courts.

#### MILITARY AFFAIRS

H.R. 1820 (Dellums): Establishes the Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Equal Opportunity.

H.R. 2964 (Bennett): Regulate discharge certificate issuance.

H.R. 4220 (Moss): Jerry L. Pettis Memorial Veterans' Hospital.

H.R. 5413 (Ottinger): Prohibits production of binary nerve gas.

H.R. 5894 (Fraser): Increase in veterans' educational assistance. (Subcommittee hearings completed, bill reported to committee.)

H.R. 6261 (Holt): Assistance to states for veterans cemeteries.

H.R. 6890 (Schroeder): Alternative Defense Authorization Bill.

H.R. 7225 (Drinan): Repeals Selective Service Act.

H.R. 7848 (Hicks): Military Health Care Program amendments.

H.R. 14020 (Dellums): Requires Defense Department to retain civilian employment whenever possible.

#### PENAL REFORM

H.R. 2803 (Dellums): Omnibus Penal Reform Act.

H.R. 3603 (Mitchell of Md.): Limits use of prison inmates for medical research. (Courts, Civil Liberties and Administrative Justice Subcommittee hearings held.)

H.R. 1689 (Badillo): Prisoners' rights.

#### PUBLIC LANDS

H.R. 2241 (Pettis): Establishes conservation area in California desert.

H.R. 2620 (Stark): Feasibility of Ridge-lands Park area.

H.R. 3510 (Udall): Land use planning. (Tabled by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.)

H.R. 6637 (O'Neill): Disposal of surplus government property. (Government Activities and Transportation Subcommittee hearings held.)

H.R. 6883 (Miller of Calif.): Enlarges Sequoia National Park.

H.R. 6898 (Bell): Santa Monica Mountains and Seashore National Park.

H.R. 7631 (Phillip Burton): Enlarges Redwood National Park.

H.R. 7819 (Krebs): Land use study of Kaiser Ridge in the Sierra National Forest. (Subcommittee on Public Lands hearings held.)

H.R. 10753 (Seiberling): Prohibits incompatible activities within any area of the national park system. (Similar S. 2371 reported from Interior Committee.)

H.R. 13280 (Krebs): Adding Mineral King to Sequoia Nat. Park.

H.J. Res. 154 (Dingell): Establishment of the Tule Elk National Wildlife Refuge. (Full Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee hearings.)

#### SENIOR CITIZENS

H.R. 2396 (Riegle): Food Allowance for Older Americans Act.

H.R. 3601 (Mitchell of Md.): Provides for monthly consumer price indexing for older Americans.

H.R. 7255 (Pepper): Tax changes for nursing home expenses.

H.R. 7258 (Pepper): Assistance for provision of long-term care in rural areas.

H.R. 7261 (Pepper): Social Security funds for nursing homes.

H.R. 7264 (Pepper): Required MD visits to nursing homes.

H.R. 7267 (Pepper): Twenty-four hour professional care in nursing homes.

H.R. 7270 (Pepper): Handling of medication in nursing homes.

H.R. 7273 (Pepper): Medical directors for nursing homes.

H.R. 7276 (Pepper): Staff ratios in nursing homes.

H.R. 7279 (Pepper): Social services in nursing homes.

H.R. 7282 (Pepper): Admissions contracts for nursing homes.

H.R. 7285 (Pepper): Safety provisions in nursing homes.

H.R. 7288 (Pepper): Requirements for nursing homes.

H.R. 7291 (Pepper): Reporting of diseases in nursing homes.

H.R. 7294 (Pepper): Procedures for nursing home state plans.

H.R. 7297 (Pepper): Ratings of nursing homes.

H.R. 7300 (Pepper): Nursing home ombudsman program.

H.R. 7303 (Pepper): Inspector General for Health Administration.

H.R. 7306 (Pepper): No fees for referrals to nursing homes.

H.R. 7309 (Pepper): Controls for safety of nursing homes.

H.R. 7312 (Pepper): Outlaws bribe as means of getting in nursing homes.

H.R. 7315 (Pepper): Standards for long-term care facility personnel.

H.R. 7318 (Pepper): Nursing home payment form changes.

H.R. 7321 (Pepper): Increased federal inspection of nursing homes.

H.R. 7324 (Pepper): Increased federal funding of nursing home audits.

H.R. 7327 (Pepper): Inspections of nursing homes.

H.R. 7330 (Pepper): Class action suit for nursing home patients.

H.R. 7333 (Pepper): Financial incentives for nursing homes.

H.R. 7336 (Pepper): Construction loans for non-profit nursing homes.

H.R. 7339 (Pepper): Nursing homes in minority areas.

H.R. 7342 (Pepper): Aid to repair and renovate nursing homes.

H.R. 7357 (Koch): National Home Health Care Act.

H.R. 7361 (Koch): In-service training of nursing home personnel.

H.R. 7372 (Koch): Veteran training for paramedical programs in nursing homes.

H.R. 7378 (Koch): In-home care for elderly individuals.

H.R. 7384 (Koch): Training grants for nurse practitioners to provide primary health care in nursing homes.

H.R. 7385 (Koch): Demonstration projects for elderly care.

H.R. 7388 (Koch): Full disclosure of ownership interests of nursing homes.

H.R. 7391 (Koch): Improved audits of nursing homes.

H.J. Res. 970 (Downey): White House conference on aging.

H. Res. 493 (Koch): Action plan on nursing homes.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

H.R. 3149 (Burke of Mass.): Social Security rate changes.

H.R. 3765 (Collins of Ill.): Provides cancer tests under Medicare.

H.R. 6333 (Koch): Cost-of-living increases in Social Security benefits.

H.R. 6769 (Holtzman): Cost-of-living and other benefit increases.

H.R. 6934 (Burke of Mass.): Allows blind to receive disability benefits.

H.R. 7138 (Ottinger): Special housing allowance for Social Security insurance.

H.R. 7252 (Pepper): Intermediate care services under Medicare.

H.R. 7696 (Harrington): No cut in Social Security insurance because of Social Security increases.

H.R. 11148 (Abzug): Increases Social Security reimbursements to states.

H.R. 11862 (Bedell): Increases Social Security base rate to \$28,500.

#### SPORTS

H.R. 347 (Dellums): Athletic Safety Act.

H.R. 348 (Dellums): Athletic Care Act.

H.R. 2355 (Seiberling): Protects the civil and constitutional rights of professional athletes. (Commerce, Consumer and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee hearings held.)

#### TAXES

H.R. 1040 (Corman): Tax Equity Act.

H.R. 3447 (Mitchell of Md.): Tax exemption for the handicapped.

H.R. 4195 (Litton): Restricts use of income tax returns.

H.R. 4897 (Dellums): World Peace Tax Fund.

H.R. 6229 (Drinan): Denies tax deductions for oil company ads.

H.R. 9061 (Whitehurst): Allows deduction for public utility taxes.

H.R. 10086 (Moakley): Tax Justice Act.

#### TRANSPORTATION

H.R. 2149 (Karth): Terminates airlines mutual aid agreement.

#### WOMEN'S RIGHTS

H.R. 9013 (Wolff): Permits women admission to the Coast Guard Academy. (Subcommittee hearings started.)

H.R. 9061 (Adams): Credits women's service in telephone operating unit of U.S. Signal Corps.

H. Con. Res. 301 (Fraser): International Women's Year. (Passed the House.)

H.J. Res. 212 (Burke of Calif.): Study of the local, state and federal criminal justice systems as they affect women.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY DAUGHTERS OF THE BARONS OF RUNNYMEDE

#### HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the United States certainly must express its gratitude to the British people for their generous Bicentennial gifts. The golden

replica and the loan of the time-honored copy of the Magna Carta form a magnificent tribute to the American Bicentennial celebration. In expressing our gratitude it is important that we not overlook an American organization of women, whose ancestors played a large role in the history of the original document.

Historians still dispute over the exact location of the original location of the signing of the Magna Carta. Some maintain that the signing occurred on a grassy bank overlooking the Thames River, called Runnymede. Others contend that the actual signing took place on an island out in the Thames River. There is little debate however, over the date and the circumstances involved in this document.

In 1215, King John of England was faced with the rebellion of many of the English barons. When these barons marched on London, King John was forced to compromise with these feudal lords. King John met the barons on the outskirts of London and attempted a compromise. This compromise became the Magna Carta, or Great Charter.

The Magna Carta was an attempt to outline the specific powers granted to the King of England in feudalistic society. This document forced the King to consult the Great Council about any increases in taxation, authorized the right of all free men to have a trial by a jury of their peers, and made King John responsible to the laws of the land. The Magna Carta represents one of the first attempts to limit a monarchy in European history.

Included in the Magna Carta, in what has come to be known as section IX, this document called for the naming of 25 Sureties. These Sureties were to be chosen from the Barons of England and were to see to the enforcement of the charter. Anything done by the King or his administrators in violation of the charter, the Sureties would meet and decide on a suitable recourse. These Sureties were: William d'Albini—Lord of Belvoir Castle; Roger Bigod—Earl of Norfolk and Suffolk; Hugh Bigod—the Earl of Norfolk's heir; Henry de Bohun—Earl of Hertford; Richard de Clare—Earl of Hertford; Gilbert de Clare—Earl of Hertford's heir; John Fitz Robert—Lord of Warkworth Castle; William De Fortibus—Earl of Albemarle; Robert Fitz Walter—Lord of Dunmow Castle; William de Hardell—Mayor of London; William de Huntingfield—a feudal baron; John de Lacie—Lord of Halton Castle; William de Lanvalli—Lord of Stanway Castle; William Malet—sheriff of Somerset; Geoffrey de Mandeville—Earl of Essex; William Marshall—the Earl of Pembroke's heir; Roger de Montbegon—Lord of Horneby Castle; Richard de Montfichet—a feudal baron; William de Mowbray—Lord of Axholme Castle; Richard de Percy—a feudal baron; Saire de Quincey—Earl of Winchester; Robert de Roos—Lord of Hamlake Castle; Geoffrey de Say—a feudal baron; Robert de Vere—the Earl of Oxford's heir; Eustace de Vesci—Lord of Alnwick Castle. These men were responsible for the enforcement of the great charter.

Today in the United States, there is a

group that remembers these individuals who had the courage to stand up to King John. This group, known as the National Society of the Daughters of the Barons of Runnymede, traces its ancestry back to those gallant men. The National Society of the Daughters of the Barons of Runnymede helps maintain the rich heritage of Anglo-American relations. In extending our thanks to the British people for their generosity in extending these precious gifts, we also recognize the descendants of the original 25 Sureties, or the National Society of the Daughters of the Barons of Runnymede, for the role that their ancestors played in the history of the Magna Carta.

#### POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

#### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 2, 1976, I was privileged to attend the Polish Constitution Day gathering held at Independence Mall in Philadelphia. The occasion of this festive meeting was the 185th Anniversary Commemorative Exercise and Polish-American Youth Day. The program was sponsored by the Polish American Congress and the main speaker was Brig. Gen. Felix J. Zaniewski. General Zaniewski spoke eloquently of both his personal and the general experience of being a Polish-American and in serving the causes of liberty throughout the world. His remarks are most appropriate during this year of our Bicentennial and at this time I enter them into the RECORD:

SPEECH BY BRIG. GEN. FELIX J. ZANIEWSKI

Mr. Chairman, Councilman Zazyczny, members of the Polish-American Congress, friends, guests, Polish-American youth, and fellow Polish Americans:

Czuje Sie Wielce Zaszczycony Zaproszeniem by W. Okresle Dwuch-Setlecia Naszego kraju, wyrazic uczucia w Tej Dorocznej Uroczystosci Obchodu Konstytucji Trzeciego Maja.

It's a great privilege and honor for me to speak to you today at this hallowed place... hallowed by its location in Independence Hall—the symbol of liberty and freedom... hallowed by the day we celebrate—the 185th anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the third of May, 1791... hallowed by the presence and participation of our Polish-American youth of greater Philadelphia, and hallowed most of all by your presence.

Patriots, citizens... representing two heroic nations with a tradition of freedom—the United States and Poland. I might add that, as a lawyer, this particular weekend means something additional to me, since yesterday was designated "Law Day, USA" by the President and Congress—to remind us of the importance that law has played in our lives as free citizens as we celebrate our Nation's Bicentennial.

As I tried to weave these separate threads—constitution and law day—Poland and the United States—the Bicentennial Year and Polish American patriotism—into some coherent pattern, it struck me that there was one... and that the common thread was liberty. A topic that we are all concerned with and one which I, as a member of the armed forces with a special obligation to protect that liberty, might be able to discuss with some degree of competency.

200 years ago, when Benjamin Franklin arrived in France to become our ambassador there, he wrote to a friend in America and noted, "This is a common observation here that our cause is the cause of all mankind, and that we are fighting for their liberty in defending ours."

200 years later, our cause is still the cause of all mankind—or at least of all free men—and we are still fighting for their liberty in defending ours. If we were to let fall the banner of freedom and liberty, who would pick it up?—No other nation is capable.

So, on our shoulders rests the weight and honor of leadership in the defense of liberty. The burden is great—as it always has been—but if we fall or falter, then the cause of freedom would soon be in jeopardy.

The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil—and the loss of liberty—is for good men to do nothing. I think that many of you in the audience today remember what happened less than 30 years ago when the good men of the west were unable to do anything in the defense of Poland. In this nation today, there are far too many good men doing nothing. There is a mood of complacency; a feeling that we no longer have to work and fight to maintain what we have and what we are.

It is well that we recall now—on the commemoration of the 185th anniversary of the formation and adoption of the Polish constitution of May 3rd, 1791—some of the history and tradition that underscores Poland's and the Polish people's contribution to the cause of liberty.

In earlier centuries and up to about 1700, Poland was a leading country on the continent of Europe. But its fortunes gradually declined—the other surrounding countries were monarchies—they were imperialistic—so these external forces aided the gradual decline of Poland.

Despite this gradual and continual decline, the constitution of May 3 was adopted to stem the tide to decline and to attempt to rebuild the fortunes of the country. This constitution played a significant role in Poland's history from that day on. As an example, at the time, General Thaddeus Kosciuszko gave the peasants full civil rights, which included owning their own land. And, some 40 and 70 years later, in 1830 and 1860, the patriots who fought against Poland's enemies and in the uprisings, were fighting for a new Poland—the constitution of 1791 was their symbol—their banner. After the First World War, Poland regained its independence and that constitution of 1791 was the foundation of the new political order.

Two important factors played significant roles in the 1791 constitution. First, it was influenced by the American Revolution and the Declaration of Independence. Second, it was inspired and partially authored by Poles whose desire was to improve the position of the peasant and to unify the country from within. This unity has been revived from time to time, especially during the period between World War I and World War II—and the unity is seen today.

And, so, we commemorate again the adoption of the constitution of 1791—as Polish-Americans do each year around the country, and the world, to commemorate that hopeful time in Poland's history when all eyes and hearts looked to freedom and democracy—a time of hope, desire and enlightenment. The constitution of 1791 was to be the guiding light, and even today, it keeps alive that fire of unity which has burned for 185 years.

I am proud to share this day and time with you. There are those who try to hide or deny their ethnic background. They object to references to the fact that they are Poles, or Germans, or Italians, and such. But this country of ours was formed and molded and developed by people such as these. All of us here have either come from other countries or our parents or grandparents have.



We are all Americans, but we all have come from varied ethnic backgrounds. Personally, I feel a sense of pride when people say to me: "Your name indicates that you are a Pole." Or, when people ask, "What kind of name is that?" I say: "It's Polish." It doesn't occur to me to object to being described as a Pole. I feel quite proud when people recognize that I am a Pole because the Poles in this country of ours enjoy an excellent reputation as citizens and individuals.

Politically, Poles have been deeply concerned with our democratic process. They have been involved in politics since the early days of this country—Captain Marcin Krygier was elected co-burgomaster of New Amsterdam in 1653. He served a second term in 1655, and was elected again in 1661. In 1662, Olbracht Zaborowski was the first justice of the peace for upper Bergen County, New Jersey. And, today, we have many elected officials in Federal, State and city offices around the country. Poles have also been deeply involved as voters. To us, the democratic process is a way of life—Poles truly understand the meaning and value of liberty.

Socially, Poles are examples of sound and close knit families. The father is respected. The mother is revered and the children are taught honor, loyalty, dignity and integrity.

In economics, the Poles have contributed much to industry, commerce and agriculture in this country. One of the best recognized characteristics of a Pole is his ability and willingness to work hard.

Morally, Poles are honest and God-fearing. Polish-Americans seldom appear in the divorce columns or in crime and juvenile delinquency statistics. For us and our families, it is considered a disgrace to be involved in anything illegal or immoral or unethical.

We Poles are a close knit people, we gather together—we like to retain the old Polish customs and traditions, we like to speak our native language. And, those famous old Polish recipes and cooking will never be forgotten because they are handed down from mother to daughter.

We are deeply religious. We consider education an absolute necessity and have a high regard for talent.

We like to sing and dance. We love our native polka music and dance to it with light hearts and light feet. And, we shed a tear when we sing "Boze Cos Polske."

And, so, I'm proud of my own Polish background because of the kind of people we are. And I'm proud that you asked me to be here with you today.

But, there is another reason why I am proud of my Polish background—and we all should be proud—this is because we Polish-Americans can point with pride to the accomplishments of Polish-Americans in the history of our nation. The part they played in the development and the progress of this great country of ours. It surprises me somewhat that many of us are not aware of the contributions that Polish-Americans have made in all facets of American life and experience.

For instance, there is some basis for the belief that one of Columbus' crew was a Pole. It has been written that the name of this sailor was Francis Warnodowicz.

Authenticated history reveals that Polish settlers came to Virginia and settled in 1608. This was twelve years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. By the time the Pilgrims arrived, Poles had cleared land, built cabins and had dug wells.

Captain John Smith, who settled Jamestown, reported in his writings that his life was saved on one occasion by two Poles when he was ambushed by Indians.

Polish settlers drifted to New Amsterdam at the tip of Manhattan Island. One was Daniel Litscho, who participated in Governor Stuyvesant's expedition against the Swedes on the Delaware River. He was an influential burger and also the fire inspector in New Amsterdam. There were Polish

teachers in New Amsterdam, John Rutkowski and Casimir Butkiewicz. Wojciech Adamkiewicz was a successful builder, and, as I mentioned, Marcin Krygier was elected co-burgomaster of New Amsterdam.

Polish pioneers participated in the French and Indian wars. Their names are on record. Charles Blaszkowicz, a surveyor, surveyed the coast of New England and drew the first map of this territory. Two of his maps are in the British Museum in London.

A number of Poles assisted in our fight for freedom in the Revolution. At least a thousand names of unmistakably Polish origin are listed in the muster roles of the Continental Army. The contributions of two especially have been recorded indelibly in the history of this great Nation.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko, born February 12, 1746. It is impossible to evaluate his share in the brilliant victory of the American forces near Saratoga, on the upper Hudson River on October 17, 1777. Kosciuszko's choice of battlefields and his fortifications made a noteworthy contribution to this victory. Woodrow Wilson, in his "History of the American People," said:

"It was the gallant Polish patriot, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who had shown General Gates how to entrench himself upon Bemis Heights."

The Battle of Saratoga is considered the turning point of the American Revolution.

Kosciuszko undertook the building of fortifications at West Point—the location today of the United States Military Academy. While there, he planted a flower garden in a secluded spot where he spent his spare moments. To this day it is known as "Kosciuszko's garden"—it is a part of the lore of the corps of cadets.

He is considered the founder of West Point. When it was first resolved to found a training school for young men, Kosciuszko urged that it should be placed at West Point. For his record with our forces, Congress awarded him the privilege of American citizenship, an annual pension and the rank of brigadier general, which he retained in the Polish service.

Casimir Pulaski, too, is recorded in history. Count Casimir Pulaski, a Polish patriot and revolutionary soldier, was the most romantic and professionally the most prominent. He came to the United States under the auspices of Dr. Franklin from Paris. Recognized for his brilliance with the cavalry, he gave John Hancock plans for the organization of a corps of volunteers. Pulaski was the first cavalry officer of the Republic and had been called "father of the American cavalry."

In September 1777, because of his prior heroic and outstanding service, particularly his actions at Brandywine, the Congress awarded Count Pulaski the rank of Brigadier General and command of all the American Cavalry forces. In 1779, rushing to the aid of American forces near Savannah, he was mortally wounded. He is remembered till this day by impressive parades each year in our larger cities, monuments erected to his memory, counties and cities named after him.

The contribution of the Poles is legion. During the Civil War, they served in the Union and Confederate armies. According to official records, Captain Thaddeus Strawinski was the first Confederate casualty. The first Union officer to die was Capt. Constantine Blandowski. Vladimir Krzyzanowski, first cousin of Frederick Chopin, recruited a regiment among all Poles of the Union. His regiment fought many battles and he was honorably discharged in Nashville, Tennessee. On October 1, 1885, at the time of the Civil War, there were 30,000 Polish-Americans. Seven thousand of them were in the military service.

Polish peasant pioneers established a great reputation also. The New Englanders of the Connecticut Valley speak in terms of highest praise of the industry—efficiency, thrift

and prosperity of the Poles. Even Calvin Coolidge admitted once that it took the Polish immigrants to show the Yankees how to till the soil.

The reaction of the Polish-Americans in World War I was truly remarkable. Of the first 100,000 men to volunteer, about 40,000 were Poles. In the Nation at that time four percent of the population were Poles, but twelve percent of those who died for their country were of Polish descent.

Many, many, in fact over 900,000, Polish-Americans were involved in World War II. Five of them rose to the rank of General and the list of those who were recognized and decorated for bravery and valor is long indeed.

In Korea and Vietnam, Polish-Americans have done their share. As history has recorded, the love of democracy and freedom, pride in their country and strong sense of duty has made Polish-Americans always willing to contribute their share, even to laying down their lives for our country.

No recitation of the great Poles or Polish-Americans would be complete in this audience of "Lotnikow Polskich" (Polish Air Force pilots) without reference to the memory of Second Lieutenant Joseph Raymond Sarnoski, a Congressional Medal of Honor winner, who was killed in action in the Solomon Islands on June 16, 1943. Although not regularly scheduled to fly on that day, Lieutenant Sarnoski volunteered for the mission. His citation reads in part as follows—"When the mission was nearly completed, about twenty enemy fighters intercepted. At the nose guns, Lieutenant Sarnoski fought off the first attackers, making it possible for the pilot to finish the plotted course. When a coordinated frontal attack by the enemy extensively damaged his bomber, and seriously injured five of the crew, Lieutenant Sarnoski, though wounded, continued firing and shot down two enemy planes. A 20-mm. shell which burst in the nose of the bomber knocked him into the catwalk under the cockpit. With indomitable fighting spirit, he crawled back to his post and kept on firing until he collapsed on his guns. Lieutenant Sarnoski, by resolute defense of his aircraft at the price of his life, made possible the completion of a vitally important mission."

A contemporary Polish-American aviator is the top ranking living ace of all wars—Colonel Francis Stanley Gabreski, of Oil City, Pennsylvania. He knocked out 31 enemy planes in Europe before he was shot down on July 20, 1944, and held prisoner of war until May 1945. During the Korean action, he brought down another six and a half for a total of thirty-seven and a half. Some of you recall him as the liaison officer to the Polish Air Force in England from November 1942 to February 1943.

Parenthetically, three of us Polish-Americans serve as general officers within the Air Force today: Major General Edmund Rafalko of Stoughton, Mass., the Commander of the Oklahoma Air Logistics Center; Brigadier General Selectee John L. Piotrowski, of Detroit, Mich., Vice Commander of the Keesler Technical Training Center, Mississippi, and I. Two years ago, I succeeded Brigadier General Joseph E. Kryszakowski of Bridgeport, Connecticut, as Staff Judge Advocate of Strategic Air Command when he retired. It could well be that major John Grablewski of Philadelphia might be an eventual successor to my job.

Poles have played important roles in other areas besides the military. Polish-Americans have become prominent in the professions, as physicians and lawyers, surgeons, etc.

There are educators, publishers, authors, engineers, composers, diplomats, poets and historians.

Casimir Funk, a Polish-American, discovered vitamins.

Stanislaw Vlam and Emil Konopinski were atomic scientists. They worked with Edward

Teller on the development of the atomic and hydrogen bombs.

Ignace Paderewski was not only a world famous pianist, but a great diplomat. He gave 167 recitals in his first American tour of six months. In March, 1902, he filled Carnegie Hall and the Metropolitan Opera House. His fame reached every land. He gave a benefit performance to raise money for a reminder of George Washington's inauguration in New York. The white marble arch that spans the entrance to Washington Square Park at the foot of Fifth Avenue is the result. His charity was known all over—unemployed musicians, veterans, American Legion fund and disabled veterans. He is buried in Arlington, along with Vladimir Krzyzanowski. Both of these men were related to Frederick Chopin.

Leopold Stokowski and Artur Rodzenski are well-known symphony conductors.

John Gronowski distinguished himself as postmaster general and U.S. Ambassador to Poland.

I could go on and on. In sports, there are too many to mention. Carl Yastremski, Stan Musial are only two of hundreds.

In college football, "all American honors" have been pinned on one or more Americans of Polish descent almost every year since 1927. Americans of Polish origin began to climb up the ladder of sports, to such an extent that at one point the "Fighting Irish" of Notre Dame had so many players with Polish names that Knute Rockne was asked how he picked his players. "It's a cinch," he answered with a grin, "when I can't pronounce 'em, they're good."

All these people gained fame in all fields of endeavor. They have brought tremendous credit to all of us Polish-Americans. But there are many whose names are not inscribed on the face of history. Those who came to this country as immigrants—who had to adjust to new situations—far different from their previous patterns. They were lonely, and separated and sometimes they despaired. But with their tenacity, moral and physical strength, they overcame many obstacles.

I speak of the Poles who furnished the manpower of this country—in the mines, the foundries—my own father was an iron and brass-molder—on the farms. They are the carpenters, mechanics, those who worked in the stockyards. They also made great contributions to this country. Polish-Americans such as you who sit here.

These are the backbone of the country—the doers. These Polish-Americans deserve our utmost respect.

So, I am proud of my heritage, my ethnic background, my predecessors. And we should all be. With this background and our traditions, we can contribute to this great country of ours—towards its future. We can contribute greatly to freedom and liberty for all nations and nationalities. We have a potential for greater achievement. We Polish-Americans, as with our ethnic groups, share the ability to hold tightly to good human principles and to overcome the great problems which must be faced.

Today, as we commemorate the Bicentennial and the Constitution of May 3, 1791, let our constitutions be the guiding light to help us keep alive that fire of unity and liberty that has burned for 200 and 185 years.

#### "BUY NATIONAL" OCS AMENDMENT WOULD BACKFIRE

**HON. SAM GIBBONS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, a rigid "buy only American-made products" floor amendment will be offered to the

Outer Continental Shelf bill (H.R. 6218), which we are scheduled to take up tomorrow.

The facts show that such an amendment is completely unneeded and would result in far more harm than good for American workers and companies. I urge my colleagues to take a very critical look at this amendment. When this is done, I feel sure that Members will not want to give the approval of the House to such a proposal.

As I see it, the issue for the future of the oil rig industry in this country is not whether we can guarantee that every single OCS oil rig is American-made, but rather whether we can maintain for ourselves a healthy share of the strong future market for offshore oil rigs around the world. Much of this market will lie in foreign offshore areas.

Because of our technological superiority in this field and the productivity of American firms and workers, all forecasts indicate that we will be able to do this and that there may be more rather than fewer American jobs involved.

However, it is certain that we will not be able to achieve this goal if we provoke foreign countries into their own "buy national" legislation for offshore drilling. The oil rig industry and its workers have far more to lose than gain by an OCS "buy national" amendment.

Further, since trade restrictions have a tendency to spill over from one area of trade to another, retaliation against other U.S. exports and escalating trade restrictions in the world economy could well result from creation of this kind of trade restriction by the world's richest country. The victims here would be those workers and companies connected with our \$108 billion in annual export business.

As we have learned the hard way, good and patriotic sounding proposals are not always what they seem to be. It is a little hard to judge the actual merits of a "buy national" OCS amendment, since the amendment has not been given any consideration at all by the ad hoc Select OCS Committee or by any other committee of the House. For this reason alone, it should not be approved by the House. Further, it exceeds the jurisdiction of the ad hoc committee, infringing on the jurisdiction of other committees.

Beyond this, all the information I have come across indicates that this amendment is worse than a pig in a poke—it is a real bombshell.

I would like to share with other Members what information I have been able to dig up on this issue. I think it brings the amendment into serious question and should make us very concerned about adopting such a proposal, especially in the absence of hard facts and full consideration of the very serious effects which are likely to result.

Included in this information is:

A Business Week article on the growing boom in offshore oil drilling.

A refutation of some of the arguments being used by supporters of a "buy national" amendment.

A "Dear Colleague" letter from several of us, which gives further reasons for opposing this amendment.

Letters from the Office of our Special Representative for Trade Negotiations

and the Department of State which attest to the health of our domestic oil rig industry and point out the dangers for this industry and other export industries and workers if a "buy national" amendment for the OCS is adopted.

As the ad hoc committee has pointed out to us, there has been a good deal of "slippage" in the expected pace of oil drilling on the OCS and around the world. One result has been something of a surplus of completed offshore drilling rigs. However, the surplus is expected to end soon, as offshore drilling on the OCS, in the North Sea, and elsewhere around the world picks up. See Business Week article below, "The Oil Business Bubbles Again."

Supporters of a "buy national" OCS amendment are arguing that other countries have already taken steps to insure that offshore development on their coasts is carried out by their own nation's rigs and crews. Quite the contrary is true.

Although the United Kingdom intended to require the use of domestically produced equipment in offshore oil and gas development, those provisions of the United Kingdom's submarine pipelines bill which would have given such a requirement the force of law were rewritten before the bill was passed by Parliament. Currently the only inducement to "Buy British" is in the Offshore Operators Agreement, which calls on firms operating in British offshore areas to insure that British firms have a "full and fair" opportunity to compete for business in the offshore equipment market.

In other areas around the world, opposition to foreign involvement—U.S. involvement—in oil and gas production is easing. In the face of the prevailing high oil prices, Brazil, Argentina, Norway—north of 62 degree latitude, which was to be developed solely by Statoil, the Norwegian national oil company—Australia and others including the Democratic Republic of Vietnam have or are expected to ease restrictions on foreign involvement in their respective offshore areas.

Supporters of a "buy national" amendment have also circulated some figures which purport to show that oil rig orders at U.S. shipyards have declined drastically over the past several years. Since there is no source given for the figures and no further information on them, it is somewhat difficult to judge their validity. However, they do not seem to jibe with facts and figures which I have received from industry and Government energy experts about U.S. dominance of the industry here and abroad, including these figures:

U.S.-made products today account for about 90 percent of oil drilling equipment worldwide, with a value of \$1.5 billion in sales in 1975.

U.S. services provided in connection with this equipment amounted to another \$1.5 billion last year.

Forty-four percent of U.S.-produced oil drilling equipment is exported, and these exports have been growing rapidly in recent years. Of 339 U.S.-made oil rigs operating, 113 are in U.S. waters and 226 are in foreign waters.

Employment in the industry reached record levels in 1975, as reported in the Commerce Department's U.S. Industrial Outlook—1976.



According to the same Commerce Department estimates, this is the outlook for 1985 for the industry:

The expected growth in foreign exploratory activity during the next 10 years should assure a strong export market for U.S.-made equipment. U.S. exports of oilfield machinery are projected to reach \$3.1 billion, increasing at a compound annual rate of 9.0 percent from the 1975 level. U.S. imports of this machinery are relatively insignificant and are expected to remain so.

Industry spokesmen estimate that by 1985 \$8 billion of new capital oil drilling equipment will be needed in foreign countries; they expect that at least \$5 billion of this amount will be produced in U.S. shipyards. This is true even though the economics of offshore petroleum equipment production dictate that some of the equipment, notably rigs and hulls, be built near the prospective drilling sites. Giant offshore oil rigs are clumsy and expensive to transport long distances. Transporting such a rig over long distances could cost from \$1 million to \$3 million. Although there may have been some decline in the percentage of U.S. sales of rigs because of this and because of shortages of steel tubing and pipes during 1974, there has been no decline in the absolute amount of U.S. sales. Also, the United States has a virtual monopoly on sales of highly sophisticated oil production equipment, including drilling bits.

Virtually all oil rigs on the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf today are American-made, owned and manned, and this is not expected to change much in the future. Some foreign-owned oil rigs are being made in U.S. shipyards. Finally, there has been talk of bringing at least some rigs made in the Far East to the OCS. However, this is not expected to be done to any extent as offshore drilling picks up in the area of Vietnam, Malaysia, Thailand, Australia, Indonesia, and the Philippines, and so forth.

Some further information on the proposed "buy national" OCS amendment follows:

FROM THE OFFICE OF HONORABLE SAM GIBBONS  
(Reasons to oppose any "buy national" Floor amendment to Outer Continental Shelf bill (H.R. 6218 scheduled for Friday) (May be offered by Congressman MURPHY of New York).)

DEAR COLLEAGUE: A "buy national" Floor amendment may be offered to H.R. 6218. Such an amendment is needless, counterproductive and potentially very harmful to U.S. companies and workers. We ask you to join us in opposing this amendment, which would exclude from OCS oil drilling and production any oil rig, vessel or structure which was not wholly built in the United States, owned by U.S. citizens and operated by U.S. citizens. Here are some of our reasons for opposing it.

1. The United States dominates the oil drilling equipment industry here and abroad. OCS equipment and personnel are American. The amendment is unneeded, unwarranted and has not been justified. It was not discussed at all during the Ad Hoc Select OCS Committee's hearings and markup of H.R. 6218. Further, it exceeds the jurisdiction of the Committee, infringing on the jurisdiction of those committees which handle trade and investment matters.

In short, U.S. industry dominates this field already. As our Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations puts it: "The United States enjoys a substantial competi-

tive advantage over other producers of similar equipment, as to price, quality and technology. In fact, we look to U.S. sales of this type of equipment, to other countries seeking to develop offshore sources of oil, to provide a major export market for U.S. manufacturers in the months and years ahead." Some foreign-made oil rigs may come to be used on the OCS, but it is also true that some U.S. companies are building oil rigs for foreign companies here in the U.S. 90% of oil drilling equipment used world-wide today is U.S. made.

2. Such a "buy national" requirement on private industry would put us in clear violation of our obligations under the GATT international trading laws. This would allow every other nation of the world to retaliate against our exports—not just U.S. oil rig exports, but also aerospace products, manufactured goods, farm products and the other exports which now account for more than \$108 billion of income and jobs to us each year.

Ironically, with such a strong export market for U.S.-produced oil rigs, it is exactly those U.S. producers of oil rigs and their workers that could be hurt most if a "buy national" OCS amendment is adopted and similar "buy only national products" restrictions are implemented for North Sea offshore drilling and elsewhere. Thus far, vigorous U.S. diplomatic efforts have helped us to avoid such restrictions in, for instance, the North Sea.

Also, such a "buy national" amendment would needlessly violate our pledge in the International Energy Agency to avoid trade restrictions on energy and energy-producing equipment. The purpose of this pledge by the major oil consuming nations is to avoid delays and problems for IEA countries in making themselves more independent of OPEC oil.

To our credit, the United States has fewer unnecessary government restrictions on private companies than most countries do. At a time when we're trying to get rid of the needless restrictions we do have, it seems especially unwise to adopt new ones which are not justified by economic facts. A "buy national" OCS amendment would be such a restriction. Even worse, it invites retaliation against our profitable, job-producing export industries. It is not needed and almost certainly would result in much more harm than good for us. We ask you to join us in opposing this amendment.

Sincerely,

SAM GIBBONS,  
BILL FRENZEL,  
BARBER CONABLE,  
ABNER MIKVA.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1976.  
HON. AL ULLMAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of State understands that a restrictive procurement amendment to H.R. 6218, The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act amendments of 1976 bill, may be introduced shortly. The amendment provides that vessels, rigs, platforms and other contingencies involved in U.S. Outer Continental Shelf operations must be built, or rebuilt, in the United States; must be documented under the laws of the United States; and must be crewed by United States citizens. The Department of State submits the following comments in opposition to such an amendment for your consideration.

#### TRADE POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The Department of State questions the need for this type of restrictive procurement amendment. According to information from the Petroleum Equipment Suppliers Association in Houston, U.S. manufacturers produce roughly 90% of the world's oil and

gas production equipment (Standard Industrial Code (SIC) 3533). The Department of Commerce in U.S. Industrial Outlook—1976 forecasts that "the expected growth in foreign exploratory activity during the next 10 years should assure a strong export market for U.S.-made equipment. U.S. exports of oilfield machinery are projected to reach \$3.1 billion, increasing at a compound annual rate of 9.0 percent from the 1975 level. U.S. imports of this machinery are relatively insignificant and are expected to remain so."

It is estimated by the Bureau of Domestic Commerce that in 1975 U.S. exports of these types of products represented 44% of total value of product shipments (\$1.3 billion of \$2.95 billion). Imports, however, have been negligible. These statistics indicate that the amendment cannot be justified on the basis of the needs of the industry.

The amendment conflicts with U.S. policy to seek elimination of non-tariff barriers to international trade, and could invite emulation at a considerable cost to U.S. exports. Other countries, particularly the U.K., Norway and Canada, may be induced to adopt similar policies at least with respect to like projects carried out in their territories. This would be serious, for example, in the case of U.S. sales of North Sea offshore equipment. There has been strong pressure in the U.K. for the U.K. offshore Operations Association (UKOOA) and the British government to develop purchasing procedures for oil companies operating in the U.K. sector of the North Sea, favorable to U.K. industry. The U.S. objected to this possibility and the UKOOA is now committed to provide British firms with only a "full and fair" opportunity to compete for business in the U.K. offshore market. British government estimates put British industry's share of the market at between 40-45%, but British analysts believe that an insistent "buy British" policy could increase this share to 70%. Thus, the U.S., as a major supplier of offshore extractive equipment and technology would stand to lose far more than it would gain by passage of this amendment.

The reaction could be much broader, affecting a whole range of trade issues, since it would be received by other countries as strong evidence of a shift by the U.S. towards increased protectionism as a general policy. There could be repercussions in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations (MTN) currently being held in Geneva, and certainly in the OECD where the U.S. and other industrialized countries have been engaged in an effort to develop an international government procurement code, with a view towards opening government markets to competitive international trade to the greatest extent possible.

Thus, the restrictive procurement amendment can only be damaging to the U.S. position in the development of a Code in the OECD as well as forthcoming work in the MTN to secure a fair and uniform approach to procurement which would benefit American exporters by opening up new markets.

The amendment is also contrary to the intention of Article III, Paragraph 4 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which states in part:

"The products of the territory of any contracting party imported into the territory of any other contracting party shall be accorded treatment no less favorable than that accorded to like products of natural origin in respect of all laws, regulations and requirements affecting their internal sale, offering for sale, purchase, transportation, distribution or use."

Restrictive procurement requirements have been interpreted by courts in the U.S. to be a violation of GATT obligations.

#### ENERGY POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Introduction of restrictive procurement provisions in the development of our Outer Continental Shelf mineral resources would

seriously prejudice major elements of U.S. international energy policy. Since the emergence of the energy crisis in 1973, the U.S. has taken the lead among the industrialized countries in establishing an overall framework for energy cooperation. This has resulted in:

The formation of the 18 nation International Energy Agency (IEA);

The establishment in the IEA of an emergency program to counter the threat of another embargo; and

The adoption by the IEA of a program of long-term cooperation in conservation and the development of new energy resources to reduce our dependence on OPEC oil.

The long-term program recognizes that the national energy policies and reduced dependence efforts of the U.S. and other IEA countries can be significantly reinforced by multilateral cooperation in the development of new energy resources. Moreover, it represents a firm political commitment to energy cooperation as an essential part of our overall political, economic, and security cooperation. An integral part of this long-term program is a best efforts commitment by each country to avoid the introduction of new legislation which would prevent other IEA countries from receiving national treatment in the energy area. The introduction of the proposed procurement amendment would clearly be contrary to the spirit of this commitment. Its enactment as legislation would significantly reduce the credibility of the long-term program as part of our overall response to the energy crisis and erode the ability of the U.S. to continue to exercise leadership among the consuming countries.

In addition, if introduction of discriminatory provisions such as the proposed restrictive procurement amendment to this Act causes adoption of similar provisions by other IEA countries, it could slow significantly the development of new energy in IEA countries, thus prejudicing our basic interest in the accelerated development of all energy alternatives to OPEC oil.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Department of State opposes the proposed restrictive procurement amendment to H.R. 6218 and hopes that, should it be introduced, it will be defeated.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT J. MCCLOSKEY,  
Assistant Secretary  
for Congressional Relations.

[From the Business Week, May 24, 1976]

#### THE OIL BUSINESS BUBBLES AGAIN

James P. Murphy, president of Houston-based Vaquero Petroleum Co., is unequivocal about the state of the oil business these days. "We've never had it so good," he declares.

Few oil company executives would interrupt their ever-ready tirades about the evils of government interference in their business to make such a glowing assessment. But there are clear signs that Murphy may be right. First-quarter profits were up across the board. According to Investors Management Sciences in Englewood, Colo., not one integrated oil company in the U.S. reported a profit downturn and only a few nonintegrated companies did. After two years of pitching and rolling in the wake of the Arab oil embargo, the price runups that followed, and the backwash that resulted, the oil industry seems headed once again into a period of stability.

Business has unquestionably been bolstered by the revival in demand for oil products that started earlier this year and shows no sign of abating. Moreover, the Energy Policy & Conservation Act of 1975—better known as the omnibus energy bill—has eliminated much of the uncertainty about crude oil prices that had been paralyzing oil operations. Even the political climate is brightening for oilmen, who do not consider the three

Presidential frontrunners, Gerald Ford, Ronald Reagan, and Jimmy Carter, antagonists of the industry.

#### THE NUMBERS

Profits dropped precipitously last year following the big gains in 1973 and 1974 caused by the sudden jump in crude-oil prices. According to a survey by the American Petroleum Institute, earnings of the 25 largest domestic oil companies plummeted 23.6% in 1975. But some of the first-quarter 1976 comebacks were spectacular. Sun's profits leaped 160%, Atlantic Richfield's 98%, Shell's 94%, Cities Service's 82%. Ashland registered a return on common equity of 18.5%, Exxon 16.1%, Standard of Indiana 16%.

Most of the companies note that the big first-quarter gains will not be followed by comparable advances during the rest of the year. Nevertheless, oil experts are optimistic, if somewhat cautious about 1976 profits. One analyst, Geoffrey Hertel of Rotan Mosle Inc., forecasts that industry earnings for the year will rise 15% to 25%. He suggests that oil company stocks may be a "haven for portfolio profits from other areas."

The optimism should linger as long as demand for oil products remains strong. Crimped by higher prices, the recession, and the nationwide campaign for conservation, demand fell 4% in the U.S. in 1974 and an additional 2% last year. But when the economy started picking up early this year, demand for oil grew quickly. It wound up 3.2% higher in the first quarter than in the first quarter of 1975. And Exxon has predicted that demand for the year will soar an impressive 9%.

The revival is being led by gasoline, which spurted ahead 6.3% in the first quarter and has accelerated even more in recent weeks. Prior to the embargo, increases of 7% a year were common. The big oil companies, however, are hesitant to voice much enthusiasm about a possible return to the gas-guzzling days of the 1960s. While runaway demand obviously boosts profitability in the short run, it raises the politically sensitive issue of conservation. And in the long run, it could leave the companies with virtually no leverage at all as they grow more dependent on increasingly nationalistic governments for crude supplies. At Shell's annual meeting last month, retiring President Harry Bridges told shareholders that he was disappointed in the sharp increase in gasoline demand. His personal solution: a 40¢ per gal. federal tax.

#### SPENDING PLANS

Further evidence that oil companies are expecting better times is an API report that indicates that 22 majors plan to spend a total of \$25.3 billion in exploration and other new capital projects this year. That would work out to an increase of about 10% over 1975 and 16% over 1974. Exxon U.S.A. just revealed that it is planning to spend \$2.5 billion in the U.S. this year, 25% more than it did in 1975. "We view the long-term outlook as optimistic," explains Randall Meyer, president of the company's domestic operation. Hughes Tool Co. is forecasting a surge in drilling activity during the last half of the year even though fewer rigs are now at work than at this time last year. "The issuance by the Federal Energy Administration of proposed price schedules for the next 36 months removes some uncertainty and provides a basis for planning," explains Hughes President James R. Lesch.

The price schedules came as a result of the new energy law. Although the law initially rolled back the average price of domestic crude oil and slapped controls on so-called new oil for the first time, it provided a mechanism by which the President could increase prices by as much as 10% a year. The FEA can also recommend that Congress approve an increase of higher than 10%, and the agency will hold hearings in June to examine this possibility.

Thus oilmen believe they have nowhere to go but up. Gulf Oil Corp. Chairman Jerry McAfee, for example, reckons that the new energy law will reduce his company's earnings by \$10 million this year. But, he says, "as bad as these programs are for us, for our customers, and for the country as a whole, we at least now have the framework within which to plan our future." He points out that U.S. exploration budgets are essentially geared to the price of domestic crude that is expected to prevail when the new fields start producing, not to the current price. "Under the most recent FEA proposals, new oil will be in the range of \$13 to \$14 a bbl. by the time controls are scheduled to end in May, 1979," adds McAfee. "It will take at least that long to bring most new offshore discoveries into production."

#### ON CONTROLS

The new law also opens the possibility of ending controls on all refined products this year. Price controls and allocations for residual fuel oil will end on June 1. The FEA has now proposed that controls be lifted on middle distillates, which include home heating oil and diesel fuel, and it will consider decontrol of aviation fuel and gasoline later this year.

"The climate is beginning to stabilize," admits Leland W. Carter, president of Mitchell Energy & Development Corp., an independent producer. "The biggest problem now is natural gas." Like other producers, Carter was unhappy when proposed legislation to deregulate interstate gas prices failed to get through Congress earlier this year. But "next year I think we have an excellent chance—better than 50-50—of getting a phase-out of controls," he says.

Even though gas producers did not get deregulation this year, they did get somewhat higher prices. Rotan Mosle's Hertel thinks producers will realize an average of 55¢ per 1,000 cu. ft. for their gas this year, vs. 44.5¢ in 1975, and just 30.4¢ in 1974. "Even with the expected decline in production this year," he says, "the industry will wind up with \$1.7 billion in additional revenues." And his estimate does not include the possibility that the Federal Power Commission may hike the price allowed for new gas, which is now set at 52¢ per 1,000 cu. ft. "We expect the FPC to review this price and come out with a new ceiling of at least 80¢ per 1,000 cu. ft.," Hertel says.

#### SOME DAMPERS

One factor that is still dampening enthusiasm among oilmen, however, is loss of the depletion allowance, which reduced the industry's cash flow last year by some \$2 billion, according to Citibank's petroleum department. A sampling of companies that reported the impact of that loss showed an average 13% reduction in net income last year, the bank notes.

But a far bigger concern among oilmen is the lingering threat of divestiture. "While the trend in the Presidential race is encouraging," says the president of a major domestic company, "we see no indication that the bent of Congress will be changing."

As for the independents, they seem unfazed. "Divestiture would hurt consumers because it would raise prices," contends one. "But," he adds, "the only people really worried about it are the managements of the big companies."

DEPUTY SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE  
FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS,  
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1976.

HON. AL ULLMAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been brought to Ambassador Dent's and my attention that the Rules Committee is now considering an amended version of H.R. 6218, The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, reported by an



ad hoc committee made up of Members of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries. As amended, it would provide for a "Buy American" requirement on all U.S. purchases of off-shore oil rigging and drilling equipment.

I am writing to give you our personal views as trade negotiators of the serious adverse foreign trade consequences of enacting such a requirement.

In the first place, such a requirement is unnecessary. The United States enjoys a substantial competitive advantage over other producers of similar equipment, as to price, quality and technology. In fact, we look to U.S. sales of this type of equipment, to other countries seeking to develop off-shore sources of oil, to provide a major export market for U.S. manufacturers in the months and years ahead.

More important, to restrict our market to U.S. equipment would invite and surely result in our competing supplier nations following suit with "Buy National" restrictions on their markets. This could cost the United States many millions of dollars of potential export sales and thousands of U.S. jobs.

Further, we are engaged in a major effort in the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva, over which your Committee has jurisdiction, to persuade other countries to open up their government procurement markets to U.S. competition. This hopefully will be done through negotiation of an international government procurement code which calls for open bids and awards on government purchase contracts.

For us to adopt the same kind of restriction that we are asking our trading partners to abandon would compromise and severely jeopardize our efforts at opening up markets for other U.S. goods and equipment.

When the detrimental effects of this amendment are fully considered, it becomes apparent that the proposed action is unwarranted and would be counterproductive to our own interests.

We would, of course, be pleased to discuss this matter further, and to answer any questions you or your colleagues may have.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

CLAYTON K. YEUTTER.

ALEXANDER LERNER

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1976

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible for us to comprehend the harsh realities of Soviet life to which Russian applicants for emigration are subjected.

I submit for our colleagues the following brief résumé on Prof. Alexander Lerner and two letters, written by him, that need no comment:

ALEXANDER LERNER

Alexander Yakovlevich Lerner was born in 1913 in the city of Vinnitsa, Ukraine. Since 1931 he has lived in Moscow where, in 1936, he finished the Moscow Energy Institute. In 1939 he was awarded the academic degree of Candidate; in 1954 that of Doctor of Science, and in 1955 the academic title of Professor. His wife, Judith Abramovna Pearlman

was born in 1916, and is a housewife. Two of their daughters together with many of their relatives were murdered by the Germans in 1941 when Vinnitsa was occupied by the Germans.

Until 1971 Prof. Lerner occupied a prominent position in Soviet society. He supervised a large department (more than 100 scientist colleagues) in the Institute of Problem Management of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., which developed theories for managing large systems; worked as a regular professor at the Moscow physics-technical university; served as a member of the editorial staff of the Soviet Encyclopedia; was a member of the editorial collegium of the Journal "Automation and Telemekhanics" and of the Cybernetics Council of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. He was also Deputy Chairman of one of the committees of the International Federation of Automation Administrators (IF.A.C.)

Prof. Lerner is the author of 168 scientific works; among them 12 books, many of which have been translated into English, German, French, Chinese, Japanese and other languages. He has presented scientific papers at Science Congresses, conferences and symposia in the U.S.A., Japan and almost all the countries of Europe.

Prof. Lerner's scientific accomplishments were concentrated in the following (areas): theory of automatic administration, theory of optimum administration, theory of administration of large systems, theory of method identification, the adaptation of mathematical formulae for solving medical problems, problems dealing with the construction of artificial hearts.

After he submitted a petition concerning his decision to leave for Israel, Prof. Lerner was dismissed from all his duties and removed from all the elected bodies. His 26 year old daughter Sophia was discharged from her position as mathematics researcher. She now lives in Israel with her husband and two daughters. His 31 year old son Vladimir an engineer in system analysis, has been discharged from his research activities; has not as yet been able to find employment in his specialty, and is compelled to work at unskilled, odd jobs.

[Translated from Russian]

AN OPEN LETTER TO ACADEMICIAN TRAPEZNIKOV, THE DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF CONTROL PROBLEMS OF THE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF USSR

"It is not important in what country a scientific finding is made. It is important that it should be made and that it should be of benefit to the mankind."

Thus you stated publicly while staying in the USA as a head of a Soviet scientific delegation. The hypocrisy of this statement had shocked me so deeply that I can not leave it unanswered.

How dare you make such pompous statements and pose as a humanist and a scientist standing above egotistic state interests after everything you had done to me and to a number of other scientific workers.

Was not it you who demanded to dismiss me from the reading of lectures at the Physical-Technical Institute because I had handed in the application to go to Israel? Was not it you who dismissed from the Institute of Control Problems my sons and my daughter for the same "crime"?

Was not it you who dismissed Yulia Shmukler and Grigory Pinus from the same institute because they received invitations from Israel?

If you really think that it is important to contribute to the conditions for scientific progress wherever it is happening—why did

you write in the letter to the members of the Executive Committee of the International Federation of Automatic Control (IFAC) that my son and daughter should be thrown out from the post-graduate course as you do not want to train specialists in science for the State of Israel.

I would like to remind you of your statement saying you will do everything in your power to prevent me from leaving the USSR. And you fulfilled this promise supplying the KGB false data about my alleged knowledge of secret materials at the time when you knew better than anybody else that I have not been taking part in any secret works for many years. You know very well that for many years I am engaging in such open fields of cybernetics as the theory of discernment of shapes, the theory of large systems' control and mainly the solution of medical problems by using mathematical methods.

You are, in fact, showing solidarity with General Vereln of the Ministry of Interior who had officially told me that the authorities prefer to let me rot in the Soviet Union rather than to let me work overseas.

Prof. ALEKSANDER LERNER.

#### THE MYTH OF MY POSSESSION OF SECRETS— ALEXANDER LERNER

It is now four and a half years that my wife Judith Perlman, my son Vladimir Lerner and I, Alexander Lerner, are being held in the USSR against our will, on the excuse of my, so-called, being privy to State secrets. This myth is based on false information received by the KGB from the academician VADIM TRAPEZNIK. Out of a feeling of vengeance, like that of a slave holder who is about to lose a useful slave, he deliberately submitted a distorted account of my being privy to secret experiments and the danger to the State of my being allowed to travel abroad. That this pretext for detaining our family is totally unjustified is sustained by the following uncontradictible facts:

1. In the last 12 years I have not participated in any secret projects and confined myself to theoretical work in the area of economic administration and adaptation of mathematical methods to the solution of medical problems. My single work in the last few years, which has any practical relationship, dealt with metal supply. But my participation in this work was not only of a most exclusively theoretical nature, but also was actually a more detailed restatement of propositions formulated by tens of British specialists. Furthermore, everything which I knew in this field, I reported in detail at an international conference in Cleveland (USA) in July, 1968, and it was published in the journal "-----" No. 5, 1969.

2. My participation in one confidential project was discontinued 12 years ago. It has to do with optimum systems of administration. This work was declassified in 1963, was submitted to the I.G.A.S. Congress in London, and published in the U.S.S.R. in the Journal of Automatics and Telemekhanics, No. 6, 1964, and in releases of the Congress abroad.

3. In the last decade of my activity in the Institute of Problem Management, I have many times been sent on missions abroad. And on each such occasion, the academician Trapeznikov reported to the KGB that I was not privy to any State secrets.

And so, the pretext of secrecy, on which is based the refusal to release me, is patently absurd. Even more absurd is this excuse for detaining my son who in his entire life has not had the slightest glimpse of secret documents or participation in secret activities.

Alexander Lerner, Professor. Moscow, March 30, 1976.