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EXTRADITION STATEMENT FOR GATEWAYS CITIES ASSISTANCE BILL OF 1975

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT
OF GUAM
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which will be known as the Gateway Cities Assistance Act of 1975. This measure has been specifically drafted to authorize Federal assistance to those areas of our country who have high concentrations of foreign-born residents and is especially pertinent in light of the recent influx of over 150,000 refugees from Southeast Asia.

Under the provisions of this measure, any city in the United States or its territories who has 3 percent or more of its total population comprised of non-U.S. citizens who have resided in that locality for 6 months or more can qualify for Federal aid in the amount of $1,000 per person. The funding may be used by these communities to offset the additional expenditures often required to help permanent resident aliens assimilate in the local population.

Since immigration and refugee policy
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Mr. Speaker, as this Nation increasingly relies on television and radio as prime methods of communication, it is essential that we work to insure that the media contain mechanical and electronic interference. Today I am introducing important consumer legislation that will eliminate 90 percent of all radio frequency interference to all audio and visual equipment. A somewhat similar piece of legislation was introduced in the last Congress by the late Congressman Teague. That bill was defeated in only radio and television receivers. I feel strongly, however, that more encompassing legislation is long overdue to insure trouble-free broadcasting in all audio and visual electronic devices.

The most frequent complaints about RFI come from people who live near amateur radio operators and citizen band radio operators. However, radio-frequency energy is generated by many different sources. Microwave ovens, automatic garage door openers, industrial heating equipment, video recording equipment, and millions of amateurs, citizens band, marine, and other radio users, are all potential sources of radio-frequency interference. In most of these different items, including ham and CB radio, is operating in accordance with FCC regulations. These units are all operating within their licensed, assigned frequencies. They are not at fault in almost all incidences of RFI.

In fact, televisions, radios, and other devices are not manufactured well enough to block out unwanted interference from properly broadcast radio signals. In 90 percent of the incidents of RFI, according to the FCC, the receiver, not the sender, is at fault. Our atmosphere is flooded by millions of different radio signals, all being emitted at legally prescribed frequencies. For example, AM radio stations broadcast at different frequencies from amateur operators. Each different source of radio-frequency energy, including microwave ovens and automatic garage door devices, sends out a unique, federally regulated signal. It is then up to the receiving unit, such as the television or radio, to differentiate among the many different signals and the one it intended to receive. All too often, the television or radio receiver does not pick out only its intended signal. A strong, nearby signal from an amateur radio operator or other source is picked up and broadcast over the sound system on top of the regular program. The by-product of 10 cases of this problem could be eliminated by the installation of shielding or filters. The television or radio would then filter out all unwanted transmissions.

In phonographs, stereos, and electric musical instruments, speaker leads and solid state components act as miniature antennas that pick up unwanted signals. Those signals are amplified through the instrument's own amplifier, and broadcast over the speaker, causing radio-frequency interference. In effect, RFI can be corrected in most cases by the installation of filtering and shielding components.

Radio frequency interference is indeed a growing problem. In 1974 the Federal Communications Commission received 4,600 complaints. Of these, in the first 3 months of this year, 76 complaints were referred to the FCC by congressional offices alone. In 9 out of 10 of these complaints, with the exception of ham radio, the fault lies with the sender. Overall, the number of complaints is up 20 percent since 1970. This number should continue to grow as more and more amateur radio operators and citizen band operators increase. The FCC has only 400 people in its enforcement force, 5 less than in 1948. The Commission is clearly overburdened by the problem of RFI. In 1974 the FCC was over 119 million television sets in use in the U.S. with so many complaints to contend with, the Commission can do no more today than send out a flier to complaining citizens that explains what corrective steps may be taken in the individual's case. It takes an expensive service call, however, to install the necessary corrective filters.

It would seem only natural that a new television set or other electronic device should work properly. If a ham radio moves nearby and installs his multiwatt broadcasting equipment, chances are good that interference will develop in the new television. The interference extends as the ham operated moved in. Therefore, it is only logical to assume that the fault lies with the ham operator's broadcasting equipment. In fact, however, the fault lies with the television. It is not properly shielded and filtered and thus picks up the ham operator's stronger signal next door as well as the area television station broadcast.

Stories of radio frequency interference are frightening. The uninform ed consumer is often resort to violence in order to restore his television reception. There have been numerous tales of irate neighbors attacking ham radio transmitting stations with axes. In one case, a shotgun was used to properly install and operating antenna with his shotgun. The list goes on and on.

The electronics industry is very reluctant to try to correct the RFI problem themselves. The industry reasons that RFI effects less than 1 percent of television owners. This is sheer folly. A look at a map of the locations of amateur and citi-
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THE UNIFORM EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER: 911

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. ROUSH: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the new Members of the House, I would like to take this opportunity to tell them briefly something about a very important emergency telephone number, known as the 911 emergency number.

Mr. Speaker, in 1967, I introduced legislation in Congress that has since become law. The legislation was aimed at providing a single, nationwide emergency telephone number for the United States. The number is 911, and it is designed to provide immediate assistance in times of emergency.

As of December 31, 1974, the latest date for which such figures are available, A.T. & T. had 375 systems in operation serving a population of more than 31,000,000, where the person in need of emergency telephone assistance dialed "911." This figure represents an increase during 1974 of 94 systems and an increase in population served of more than 4,250,000.

In addition, some 505 systems were in operation, as of December 31, 1974, in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, serving populations of more than 2,000,000.

In other words, as of last December, there were in operation 505 systems covering a total population well in excess of 6 million people.

It is interesting to note too, that the companies, both independent and A.T. & T., as of December 31, 1974 had scheduled more than 100 systems — with a population in excess of 10,000,000 — for adoption of the 911 emergency number for the most part in 1975 and 1976.

You may wonder why the use of such a number, with its great potential for providing better service, speed, and protection and above all for saving human lives, is not more widespread.

The simple answer is that in some communities it is costly, initially, and while we continue to make progress in spreading the program, we must face the reality that many communities are unable to finance these initial costs.

The simple answer is that in some communities it is costly, initially, and while we continue to make progress in spreading the program, we must face the reality that many communities are unable to finance these initial costs.

With these problems in mind I have introduced legislation, H.R. 3692, to assist local communities financially with the costs incident to the establishment of the 911 emergency number. I think this is a worthwhile investment and I urge you to give it your support.
CARDINAL MINDSZENTY IS DEAD

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, anti-Communists around the world were deeply saddened by the recent passing of a spiritual and philosophical leader of many nations—Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty. Few men born into this world endure the persecution and personal suffering experienced by this brave and principled Christian. He was driven into painful exile by the merciless Communists who overran his native Hungary, never to return to the once-free land he loved. The merits of his steadfast courage and conviction will surely inspire future generations to come those, who like Cardinal Mindszenty, will be called upon to stand against regimes which persecute religion and deny freedom.

When the Vatican relieved him of his duties as Prince Primate of Hungary in early 1945, the Cardinal made it clear that he had not abdicated his office, saying that he could not do so while the Catholic Church in Hungary was not free and the hands of the Church administrators were completely controlled by the Communist regime.

Cardinal Mindszenty published his critically acclaimed autobiography, Memoirs, last Fall and millions of world readers have come to visit his “scattered flock” of Hungarian refugees. During his pastoral tour of the United States in 1974, he was met by huge, cheering crowds from coast to coast. Up until his death, the Cardinal warned of the dangers of detente with Communism, saying that world leaders must take a strong stand against regimes which persecute religion and deny freedom.

The Cardinal was born in the town of Midsest in 1892, a village where his ancestors had immigrated four centuries before. When Pope Pius XI named him Bishop of Veszprem in 1944 he changed his name from the German-sounding Flem to Mindszenty in order to identify himself as much as possible with Hungary.

He was appointed Primate of Hungary and given the name of Cardinal by Pope Pius XII as the shadow of Stalinist terrorism was spreading over the countries of Eastern Europe.

Having suffered imprisonment in 1944 for his opposition to the policies of Nazi-occupation Hungary, he was again imprisoned again in 1948, this time by the Communists. His mock show-trial for alleged espionage and treason caused cries of indignation from leaders around the free world.

The Cardinal, who died in the town of Midsest in 1974, a village where his ancestors had immigrated four centuries before, caused cries of indignation from leaders around the free world.

The next eight years of torture and persecution in Communist prison, as well described in his Memoirs, Monetary freedom came in late 1956 when he was released by the Hungarian Freedom Fighters. After exhaustingly visiting all over the United Nations and the free world in 1956, the Cardinal was granted asylum in the U.S. mission in Budapest. The young Freedom Fighters who had released him from prison on Oct 30th, 1956, were later killed by the Communists, who held them prisoners until they reached the age for legal execution.

During his 1974 pastoral tour of the United States, the Cardinal met with leaders of the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation, named in his honor to uphold his principles of combating atheistic Communism. “Continue fighting,” he said. “If you ask me what I expected you to do today in this world, in which we all live, I would like to tell you to keep the Faith.”

“Don’t be discouraged,” he said, “don’t be disheartened, keep strong to the principles and God will be with you in the Spirit.”

The Cardinal’s Foundation “has to be and has to act and has to continue fighting.”

The Foundation’s Executive Director, Eleanor Schlaffy, issued a statement shortly after announcement of the Cardinal’s death. “We are grateful to learn of our beloved patriarch’s death. He was a great and noble soldier for Christ and a defender of liberty and democracy for mankind everywhere. Certainly Cardinal Mindszenty was one of the great men of the twentieth century. His devotion to the principles of freedom, religion inspired the world; his courage in facing persecution and imprisonment made him stronger when it should have weakened him. He was indomitable in facing tyranny. He left an indelible mark on history.

“We of the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation will fervently continue the work that Cardinal Mindszenty wanted us to do.”

FARMERS NEED RELIEF FROM FEDERAL ESTATE TAXES

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, during this session of Congress I have introduced two bills that would amend the current Federal estate tax law. These bills are very important to the farmers of our Nation.

H.R. 5332 would raise the estate tax exemption from $80,000 to $120,000. This exemption has not been changed for more than 25 years.

Economic conditions have certainly changed, however. During this period inflation and urban development have caused a sharp increase in land values. Inflation has eroded the value of the exemption. It has pushed farm estates into higher tax brackets.

As recently as 1972, the $80,000 exemption is no longer adequate. When a farmer dies, many families are unable to pay the high estate taxes. They are forced to sell the farm despite their desire to keep it in the family.

This is wrong. It is time that the Congress acted to relieve this increasingly heavy burden on farm families.

I have also introduced H.R. 3131. It would, at the election of the executor, allow a farm estate to be assessed at its fair market value. 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.

I urge the Congress to move on these two important bills. We should help keep the family farm within the family.

“MEANS TEST” CREATES HARDSHIPS FOR ELDERLY RECEIVING SOCIAL SERVICES

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress resolved a continuing controversy over the proper provision of social service programs to the aged, blind and disabled when it passed Public Law 93-647, creating a new title XX of the Social Security Act.

Unfortunately, our best intentions often create problems. On recent meetings in my State of Pennsylvania with aged citizens, social service program administrators, and State officials, I have learned that the new social service section, which actually takes effect on Oct 1, 1975, is already sending shock waves across my State.

Program planners and local groups of aged indicate that as many as 70 percent of the present participants in social services programs—like senior citizens lounges and homemaker services—could be driven away by a negative “means test” which discourages participation. They claim eligibility under the means test is too restrictive, and that the test itself is an indignity which prevents many of those eligible from taking advantage of services offered.

I do not believe this was congressional intention when we passed the Social Services Act last December.

To correct a constraint on social service commitments that would discourage the aged, blind and disabled participation in programs which are designed to meet their independence, I today introduced legislation to eliminate the means test. This bill would also establish a standard for participation similar to those employed under title III and VII of the Older Americans Act, or set by States for use of senior citizens’ multi-purpose centers. These have no specific income limitations for participation, yet are targeted to aid lower income individuals. From experience in Pennsylvania, I am informed that they work successfully.
Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that Congress can move swiftly to correct problems that are brewing in social service programs across the country.

GREAT LAKES WATER LEVELS CALL FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, as is always the case at this time of year, water levels in the Great Lakes are rising as a result of melting snow and spring rain. In my congressional district bordering Lake Erie, this is a recurrent time of flooding of property adjacent to the lake, and many thousands of dollars in damage are suffered each year.

At the end of April, Lake Erie was at an elevation of 572.60 feet above mean water level, more than 23 inches above the long-term average for April. The lake was also 52 inches above its all-time low monthly mean for April. The Corps of Engineers forecasts that Lake Erie at the end of May will be 2 inches above the Illinois Waterway.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce predicts that Lake Erie will approach record high levels in September, above both its long-term and its 10-year average levels. Similar forecasts are made for the other lakes in the system, with all expected to be above long-term and 10-year average levels through September.

Mr. Speaker, there is remedial legislation pending that will offer at least a partial solution to the property loss and human suffering and inconvenience caused each year in low-lying areas along the lakes. I refer to the bills introduced by 50 Members on April 23—H.R. 6297, H.R. 6298, and H.R. 6299—which would authorize the Corps of Engineers to drain Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway when the Great Lakes levels are above their long-term average monthly level and when the withdrawal would not cause flooding along the Illinois Waterway and the Mississippi River. The legislation would increase the maximum diversion from 3,200 cubic feet per second to 10,000 cubic feet per second, an amount that could reduce water levels in the various lakes from 2 to 3 inches and provide the margin of difference for many property owners.

Mr. Speaker, these measures were introduced under the aegis of the Conference of Great Lakes Congressmen. Passage of such legislation would materially benefit countless homeowners, businesses, and communities in the Great Lakes region, at no cost to the American taxpayer and I urge early consideration of the diversion authority as a remedy to a persistent and recurring problem for the people whose well-being is affected in the absence of any positive action to lower the water levels in the lakes.
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THE VIETNAMESE REFUGEES AND THE REAL AMERICAN SPIRIT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, many harsh words have been said concerning the men, women, and children who have fled from South Vietnam in the face of the Communist takeover of their country and have sought refuge in the United States. Some Members of Congress have said there were already "too many Orientals" in their districts. Other legislators have requested that the refugees be sent to any district but the one they represent. Newspaper columnists such as Nicholas von Hoffman have said that the refugees are less than honorable and should not be welcomed to the United States. Perhaps, was the cartoon which appeared in the Washington Star by Oliphant, picturing the Vietnamese refugees standing before the Statue of Liberty as a band of thugs.

The real American spirit, however, is not the one represented by these narrow and erroneous sentiments. In the end, I am confident that those who have expressed such sentiments will regret their words. At the moment when a man's instincts call for a wholesome response, these individuals indicated that their instincts were not good.

The Washington Star of May 9 published a series of letters from readers criticizing the Oliphant cartoon. One letter came from Representative Bob Wilson of California. He wrote that—

As an American citizen, I am insulted by the derogatory cartoon of the Vietnamese refugees as all being crooks, pimps and bar girls. The portrayal of a Viet Namese as all being crooks, pimps and bar girls bears no resemblance to the real tragic human beings we see nightly on television and whom many of us know personally. This cartoon simply reflects a kind of vicious racial slur which one hoped this country and responsible newspapers in it would avoid.

WILLIS C. ARMSTRONG.

DISTRICT HEIGHTS, MD.

To imply that all those frightened and bewildered South Vietnamese refugees are crooks, pimps, and bar girls is the act of malignant cruelty not befitting our country which has always benefited from the diversity of its peoples and has always opened its door to the oppressed.

And how dare Oliphant be so sanctimonious! There may indeed be undesirables among them—though were they so viewed when so many of our countrymen availed themselves of their services over there?

S. L. CARSON.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

As an American citizen, I am insulted by this degradation of our national heritage. Our country is great because it is made up of many diverse races, brought together in the most unique unification of liberty-minded peoples in the history of the world. To debase the ideals of this land of the free in such a manner is reminiscent of the tactics employed during the days of Hitler and Goebbels.

Also on May 9, the Star published an eloquent column by Smith Hemptstone, entitled, "Hostility to Exiles: A National Disgrace." Mr. Hemptstone noted that—

There is no American who is not either an immigrant or the descendant of immigrants. Since 1820, when immigration statistics first were compiled, nearly 54 million exiles have made their way to this land. It may be that among those sad and bewildered people who have lost everything, there is a child at Ft. Chaffe who will grow up to be an Einstein, a Carnegie, a Pullitzer or a Franklin. Five of us own this land. Each of us holds it in trust for those who will come after us. Many of those Vietnamese who have endured hardship and danger to reach these shores already are better Americans than their misguided detractors.

These letters and this column represent the true American spirit. I wish to share them as they appeared in the Washington Star of May 9 with my colleagues, and insert them into the Record at this time:

The American reaction to the refugees disgusts me, and this cartoon is one of the most wretched of American expressions of the entire American involvement with Vietnam.

JOAN G. WOLFE.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Oliphant on the Vietnamese refugees can only be regarded as nauseating. The portrayal of these refugees as all being crooks, prostitutes or other loathsome creatures bears no resemblance to the real tragic human beings we see nightly on television and whom many of us know personally. His cartoon simply reflected a kind of vicious racial slur which one hoped this country and responsible newspapers in it would avoid.

JEFFREY B. GAYNER.
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

14895

NATIONAL CEMETERY SITE PROPOSED

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, there are 1,200,000 veterans residing within Los Angeles County. Currently, there are insufficient national cemetery facilities in the area to serve these veterans. The need for a new site is obvious: Not just to serve the Los Angeles area, but also for the entire State of California. Several sites have been made by the Department of Defense. One of the most attractive is located at March Air Force Base, approximately 60 miles from the center of Los Angeles County. Last month, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors endorsed the March AFB site as the preferred location for a national cemetery. The following letter from the County Executive Officer James S. Mize effectively puts forth the reasons for this point of view:

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 18, 1975.

Mr. M. Speaker, Mr. F. Berriz, and Mr. Flushing, N.Y., has requested that I insert the following statement in the Congressional Record so that Members will have an opportunity to become aware of an important concern among Americans of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian nationality.

Without taking a position for or against the merits of the specific proposal made by Mr. Berriz, I believe his statement deserves proper consideration. Following is his statement:

THE BALTS

Thirty years ago, on May 7, 1945, the German Army surrendered thus ending World War II in Europe and the domination of its people by their conquerors. The Nazi tyranny was ended and the various countries of Europe began the reconstruction of their democratic governments, which were destroyed by the Germans. But unfortunately not all of Europe was freed from foreign influence. The eastern part was occupied by the Red Army of the Soviet Union, which did not allow these countries the freedom they hoped for.

Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania had to accept governments subservient to Soviet Union. Very shortly after the Red Army left the countries that are now the Baltic States, they were occupied by the Red Army and illegally annexed to the Soviet Union.

The eastern part of Europe was jubilant, because the Red Army had not betrayed the people; but these people realized that there was no joy in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The Nazi occupation was exchanged by the Russian occupation and Communist tyranny. Arrears and deportations immediately followed this "liberation." All basic human rights and freedoms were abolished. Privately owned business enterprises, farms, stores, and businesses were all confiscated without any compensation. In most cases the previous owners were arrested and deported to the Siberian slave labor camps.

All this happened at the same time, when the United Nation organization issued the Universal Declarations of self-determination and human rights.

After 30 years the Baltic states are still under Russian occupation. All other countries, which temporarily lost their independence during the war have regained it. Although some are in the Soviet sphere of influence, formally they are independent. But Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are completely absorbed by the Soviet Union. So the only losers in World War II are these three nations, which were not even participants in the war. A more unjust situation can hardly be imagined. The guilty nation—Germany—is a member of United Nations, but the small Baltic Nations are subjected to Russian oppression and exploitation.

This situation needs correction. This can be accomplished in the European Security Conference. The American delegation to this Conference shall demand the freedom for the Baltic states. The Soviet Union shall retreat from their borders and return to the 1939 borders as well as the independence of the Baltic Nations. The Conference shall demand the freedom for the Baltic states. The Soviet Union shall retreat from their borders and return to the 1939 borders as well as the independence of the Baltic Nations.

The Baltic States and the European Security Conference

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. F. Berriz, and Mr. Flushing, N.Y., has requested that I insert the following statement in the Congressional Record so that Members will have an opportunity to become aware of an important concern among Americans of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian nationality.

Without taking a position for or against the merits of the specific proposal made by Mr. Berriz, I believe his statement deserves proper consideration. Following is his statement:

THE BALTS

Thirty years ago, on May 7, 1945, the German Army surrendered thus ending World War II in Europe and the domination of its people by their conquerors. The Nazi tyranny was ended and the various countries of Europe began the reconstruction of their democratic governments, which were destroyed by the Germans. But unfortunately not all of Europe was freed from foreign influence. The eastern part was occupied by the Red Army of the Soviet Union, which did not allow these countries the freedom they hoped for.

Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania had to accept governments subservient to Soviet Union. Very shortly after the Red Army left the countries that are now the Baltic States, they were occupied by the Red Army and illegally annexed to the Soviet Union.

The eastern part of Europe was jubilant, because the Red Army had not betrayed the people; but these people realized that there was no joy in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The Nazi occupation was exchanged by the Russian occupation and Communist tyranny. Arrears and deportations immediately followed this "liberation." All basic human rights and freedoms were abolished. Privately owned business enterprises, farms, stores, and businesses were all confiscated without any compensation. In most cases the previous owners were arrested and deported to the Siberian slave labor camps.

All this happened at the same time, when the United Nation organization issued the Universal Declarations of self-determination and human rights.

After 30 years the Baltic states are still under Russian occupation. All other countries, which temporarily lost their independence during the war have regained it. Although some are in the Soviet sphere of influence, formally they are independent. But Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are completely absorbed by the Soviet Union. So the only losers in World War II are these three nations, which were not even participants in the war. A more unjust situation can hardly be imagined. The guilty nation—Germany—is a member of United Nations, but the small Baltic Nations are subjected to Russian oppression and exploitation.

This situation needs correction. This can be accomplished in the European Security Conference. The American delegation to this Conference shall demand the freedom for the Baltic states. The Soviet Union shall retreat from their borders and return to the 1939 borders as well as the independence of the Baltic Nations.

The Baltic States and the European Security Conference

HON. ANDREW T. FALKIEWICZ
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. FALKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, Mr. F. Berriz, and Mr. Flushing, N.Y., has requested that I insert the following statement in the Congressional Record so that Members will have an opportunity to become aware of an important concern among Americans of Polish, Lithuanian, and Ukrainian nationality.

Without taking a position for or against the merits of the specific proposal made by Mr. Berriz, I believe his statement deserves proper consideration. Following is his statement:

THE BALTS

Thirty years ago, on May 7, 1945, the German Army surrendered thus ending World War II in Europe and the domination of its people by their conquerors. The Nazi tyranny was ended and the various countries of Europe began the reconstruction of their democratic governments, which were destroyed by the Germans. But unfortunately not all of Europe was freed from foreign influence. The eastern part was occupied by the Red Army of the Soviet Union, which did not allow these countries the freedom they hoped for.

Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania had to accept governments subservient to Soviet Union. Very shortly after the Red Army left the countries that are now the Baltic States, they were occupied by the Red Army and illegally annexed to the Soviet Union.

The eastern part of Europe was jubilant, because the Red Army had not betrayed the people; but these people realized that there was no joy in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The Nazi occupation was exchanged by the Russian occupation and Communist tyranny. Arrears and deportations immediately followed this "liberation." All basic human rights and freedoms were abolished. Privately owned business enterprises, farms, stores, and businesses were all confiscated without any compensation. In most cases the previous owners were arrested and deported to the Siberian slave labor camps.

All this happened at the same time, when the United Nation organization issued the Universal Declarations of self-determination and human rights.

After 30 years the Baltic states are still under Russian occupation. All other countries, which temporarily lost their independence during the war have regained it. Although some are in the Soviet sphere of influence, formally they are independent. But Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are completely absorbed by the Soviet Union. So the only losers in World War II are these three nations, which were not even participants in the war. A more unjust situation can hardly be imagined. The guilty nation—Germany—is a member of United Nations, but the small Baltic Nations are subjected to Russian oppression and exploitation.

This situation needs correction. This can be accomplished in the European Security Conference. The American delegation to this Conference shall demand the freedom for the Baltic states. The Soviet Union shall retreat from their borders and return to the 1939 borders as well as the independence of the Baltic Nations.
can be reached by freeway in a matter of one and a half hours. Additionally, March Air Force Base, having been actively used as a military post for the past 57 years and identified with some of the most illustrious leaders of our nation's air arm, it is a location of special inherent historical significance and one that holds considerable appeal to veterans of all branches of military service. Indeed, the cemetery site will be adjacent to an active duty military installation as well as appealing to the veteran population. This is an integral piece of the March Air Force Base National Cemetery site.

OILMEN PASS UP HUGE AMOUNTS OF OIL LEFT IN OLD FIELDS

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, an important part of the national debate over energy policy involves the question of whether or not our domestic industry can economically recover a large percentage of the oil which has already been discovered in the United States. This morning's Wall Street Journal carried an article by James Carberry which outlines the major dimensions of the enhanced recovery debate. I recommend it to my colleagues as excellent background material against which to judge the several petroleum pricing proposals which will soon be coming to the floor of the House. I submit the article herewith:

OILMEN, BLAMING PRICE CONTROLS, PASS UP HUGE AMOUNTS OF OIL LEFT IN OLD FIELDS
(By James Carberry)

Vast supplies of oil, readily available, are being largely ignored by U.S. oilmen, who say that price controls make most of these supplies unprofitable to tap. This is behind the initial sweeps of U.S. petroleum deposits. No one knows how much oil remains, but the amount is estimated at 300 billion barrels. The figure is 12 times the amount currently being produced.

There isn't any way of draining every drop of this oil. And some of it--around 35 billion barrels considered recoverable through conventional methods under existing economic conditions--isn't being ignored at all. But oil experts believe that another 30 billion to 45 billion barrels could be tapped using so-called "improved recovery.

Improved recovery is the injection of water, steam, gas or other chemicals into the oil field in areas where the natural underground water and gas pressures that originally drove the oil into drilled wells have been exhausted. Instead, oilmen have generally expensed a surge in improved-recovery production after world petroleum prices began rising in 1973, but only some 3.5 billion barrels of crude oil a day were produced in this manner last year.

While that was 44% of total domestic production, this was also about the same amount of improved-recovery production as in 1973.

In other words, the predicted surge didn't happen. And this year, once again, the oil industry is expected to invest only a modest sum in improved-recovery ventures--around 800 million dollars this year. This is small potatoes compared to the billions of dollars being spent on the search for and development of new oil fields.

EXPLANATIONS

Oilmens call price controls the main reason they have been reluctant to commit much additional money to improved-recovery. Henry K. Holland Jr., vice president for exploration and production of Mobil Oil Corp.'s North American division, said that even though there are some oil fields, large investments in improved recovery couldn't be recouped. One operator of an Oil Co. says it would have to get around 811 a barrel just to break even.

OILMEN CALL PRICE CONTROLS MAIN REASON

"Old Fields" as the site for a new National Cemetery is respectfully urged.

Very truly yours,
JAMES S. MIKE.

OILMEN HAVE BEEN INTERESTED IN IMPROVED RECOVERY SINCE THE LAZY 1970s. A DYNASTIC WELL was lowered into wells and ignited to jar the oil loose. This produced a lot of noise and excitement, and oilmen tended to be more careful and cooperative.

OILMEN HAVE BEEN INTERESTED IN IMPROVED RECOVERY SINCE THE LAZY 1970s. A DYNASTIC WELL was lowered into wells and ignited to jar the oil loose. This produced a lot of noise and excitement, and oilmen tended to be more careful and cooperative.

DYNAMIC, WATER AND STEAM

Oilmens have been interested in improved recovery since the late 1970s. This resulted in the development ofartificial recovery, such as "oil" which has already been produced in this country's entire oil history. What has been produced in this country's entire oil history.

"improved recovery." This means that the operations are continuous and require an investment by the buyer of old oil. But there was danger that premature explosions would blow the wells and their operators to kingdom come.

Safier and more effective methods of making a second pass at the oil were developed. The most widely used kind of so-called "improved recovery." The pumping of steam into injection wells to thin out highly viscous oil was adopted. But it wasn't until after a predetermined pressure was developed in injection wells that "oil thick enough to make it into a baseball and play catch with it," says one oilman. But, there was danger that premature explosions would blow the wells and their operators to kingdom come.

A THIRD PASS

But these and other secondary methods still leave a lot of oil behind; and, to further increase production, oilmen have come up with ways to tap a third pass at petroleum deposits. Teriary recovery, as it's called, is still in the experimental stage and now yields only a few hundred thousand barrels of crude oil a day. But the Federal Energy Administration, in its Project Independence report suggests ways the oil industry can increase their efficiency in energy, hopes that tertiary ventures will recover 1.8 million to 2.3 million barrels of the mid-1970s.

Oilmen aren't so optimistic, putting the figure at one million barrels a day or so; but if the number were increased it would add about 12% to daily domestic production, based on current production figures.

One tertiary method, developed by Marathon Oil after 18 years of research and a $40 million investment, is the injection into an oil field of something called carbon dioxide, a compound of water, hydrocarbons, alcohol and other ingredients. It is more efficient in displacing oil than waterflooding, Marathon says.

The company estimates the process could recover 30% to 40% of the oil remaining after secondary recovery; and it now is attempting, in an oil field in Southern Illinois, its first commercial production using Marathon.

FREE AND CARBON DIOXIDE

In Santa Barbara County, Continental Oil Co. is experimenting with "fire flooding," "igniting a controlled underground fire on impacted wells to generally expensed a surge in improved-recovery production after world petroleum prices began rising in 1973, but only some 3.5 billion barrels of crude oil a day were produced in this manner last year. While that was 44% of total domestic production, this was also about the same amount of improved-recovery production as in 1973.

In other words, the predicted surge didn't happen. And this year, once again, the oil industry is expected to invest only a modest sum in improved-recovery ventures--around 800 million dollars this year. This is small potatoes compared to the billions of dollars being spent on the search for and development of new oil fields over the years. In earlier days, oil operators competing fiercely for oil in the same fields, and with added so that natural underground pressure were released too quickly and bypassed some of the oil that was left. Now, oilmen don't think they tend to be more careful and cooperative.
into receiving wells with a watering or other treatment.

Both Continental and California Standard say the court of 1972 may have gone too far and plan to expand the scope of their experiments.

Despite this promise, tertiary recovery has its drawbacks. Harold T. Wright, manager of engineering services for the production department of Exxon USA, a unit of Exxon Corp., says:

"Tertiary recovery works best in shallow reservoirs of low salinity and comparatively low temperature. Unfortunately, these represent only a small percentage of reservoirs."

Mr. Wright explains that other olmen say the industry will have to pour a lot more money and manpower into developing tertiary recovery methods if these methods are to work in most oil fields. "How much we invest," says B. L. Walters Jr., vice president in charge of Marathon's production operations in the U.S. and Canada, "depends a lot on whether the government removes price controls."

A VOTE TO UPHELD THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, my vote to uphold President Ford's veto of the emergency farm bill should not be interpreted as an antifarmer vote. Rather, it was the vote of the party for farmers and consumers alike the considerable benefits of a stable and prosperous agriculture. This piece of legislation, raising as it would have crop target prices and loan rates on wheat, cotton, feed grains, and soybeans, would have tended to increase Government involvement in agriculture. In doing this, it ran counter to the Agriculture Act of 1973, which turned us away from a farm program based on Government subsidies to a market-oriented farm policy.

In addition to increasing the Federal Government's role in agriculture, the bill would also have encouraged the increased production of crops already in surplus. For instance, the Department of Agriculture reports the country will have 5.6 million bales of excess cotton in storage by August of this year.

My vote was also an effort to hold down Federal spending. This bill would have added at least $210 million and maybe as much as $1.8 billion to the budget, depending on which estimate—administration or committee—is used.

And this would come on top of an already monstrous deficit which has increased by $260 billion by the most conservative estimates. We have to draw the line somewhere or we'll never get out of the fiscal hole we are in.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I voted to uphold the veto because our Nation's concern would have faced still higher prices for meat, bread and dairy products because of this emergency farm legislation. Even the Department of Agriculture says how much the prices on these items would rise, but there was broad agreement that they would rise to some extent. This was another bad feature of the bill which forced me to oppose it.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WELFARE REFORM IS A NECESSITY

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, to promote the general welfare is one of the objects stated in the Constitution of the United States. Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defined welfare as the "state of faring, or doing well, especially the condition of health, happiness, prosperity." This was 6 years before Congress put the Federal Government into the business of helping States finance cash welfare to poor children without a breadwinner.

Unhappily, 40 years of such aid—now called aid to families with dependent children, AFDC, have brought disrepute to the venerable concept of "welfare." Today the word elicits shudders and sighs, anger and despair. Today's AFDC program is costing Federal, State, and local governments more than $210 billion annually in benefit payments, yet it has failed to achieve a sense of well-being or happiness. It has become a synonym for failure and dependency. Commonly, it is called a "welfare state," a "meatless" one. Daniel Patrick Moynihan has indicted AFDC as a system that "destroys those who receive it and corrupts those who dispense it." He lamented to President Nixon in January 1969:

"The fact is, the more one knows about welfare, the more horrible it becomes."

How has this happened? What has gone wrong with the kindly effort to help defenseless children? Reduced to basics, the AFDC program has produced incentives for the creation of fatherless families, and it has penalized the full-time work of poor fathers by denial of cash aid. The program rewards dependency and family splitting—or the failure to marry—with cash and fringe benefits, so that the浪漫 eligibility for bonus food stamps and free medical care, regardless of income. In many States, it pays old-fashioned two-parent families an AFDC grant for every net dollar earned by a poor family; it is legal for AFDC mothers to work their children. However, before looking at some of the main provisions of the Welfare Reform Act of 1975 (H.R. 8133), it will be useful to examine AFDC in more detail.

Consider the relative growth of the program. According to a study just published by the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University, entitled "The State," the number of AFDC recipients skyrocketed 456 percent from 1952 to 1972, even though the number of children under 18 increased only 41 percent. Thus, the AFDC population increased more than 10 times as fast as the child population. Author Roger A. Free- man concludes:

"The growth in AFDC can largely be traced to the fact that the number of "absent fathers" quadrupled from 900,000 in 1961 to 3,600,000 in 1972. By 1972, 8 of 10 AFDC fathers paid no support whatsoever for their children and many of them—or possibly most—may have abandoned their families because the AFDC program had made it attractive and lucrative to do so."

When the AFDC program began, most children in the United States were living in two-parent families. But by 1972, only nine American children under 18 years old was on AFDC; in some urban areas—St. Louis, Mo., Baltimore, Boston, the District of Columbia, one in three.

The number of AFDC families in January 1975 climbed to 3,366,000, a new all-time record. If all these families were poor and unable to help themselves, they clearly would merit public compassion and aid. But many AFDC families are neither poor nor helpless. In fact, one of the most striking findings of the income range that exceeded the Census Bureau's poverty threshold. Further, 40 percent of the families had no preschool child, and, hence, their mothers were not relatively free to work outside the home, as do most American mothers today.

Although HEW audits indicate that about 9 percent of AFDC recipients actually have income—under $300 per month—above the Government's low-income level, 6 percent in Wisconsin—it is legal for many nonpoor families to receive AFDC. In fact, a Federal rule requires States to keep AFDC families as long after their paychecks are big enough to meet their basic needs. This rule, put into effect in 1969, prohibits States from subtracting a full dollar from the welfare grant for every net dollar earned by a welfare mother. The purpose was to give the AFDC mother a financial incentive to "work herself out of it," but the effect has been to raise the income level so high that most welfare mothers cannot reach it.

In the State of Wisconsin, for example, an AFDC mother of three children does not lose AFDC eligibility until wages reach $829 per month—$9,950 per year—assuming that her work expenses, other than social security and Federal income taxes, total only $31 monthly. Each extra dollar in work expenses raises her income cutoff by $1.50. Income cutoffs for working AFDC families are above $10,000 per year in Alaska, Connecticut, Michigan, New York, and Vermont. To work their way off welfare, AFDC mothers in these States would have to find a full-time year-round job paying 17 times as much as the Federal minimum wage. In 1973, a total of 21.5 million families failed to earn $10,000.

The Welfare Reform Act of 1975 is a 23-page bill that would drastically revise AFDC.

Among other provisions, it would adopt a family income limit, rather than gross income, related to living costs and standards in each State. Once a family's adjusted gross income exceeded 150 percent of the sum that the State had determined was needed for basic living by family size of its size and composition, AFDC eligi-
bility would end. If these were applied to Wisconsin, which has a needs standard of $427 for a family of four, eligibility would end when a family's gross income reached $660.50 a month, or $7,986 a year.

The bill also would prohibit AFDC for children once they reach 18 years of age. Now that 18-year-olds vote and are re­cognized by many States as adults, it is inconsistent to treat them as child dependents. Yet 41 States, not including Wisconsin, offer AFDC to students aged 18 through 20. This proposal would cut the number of AFDC recipients by an estimated 187,000, about 2.5 percent of all "child" beneficiaries.

AFDC eligibility also would be re­stricted by H.R. 5133's provisions to:

- Permit States to standardize the work-related expense exemption—today States must reimburse AFDC families for all actual expenses.
- Reduce the earnings incentive by bas­ing it on net rather than gross income.
- Prohibit AFDC for strikers.
- Require eligibility to be redetermined without benefit of earnings incentives once a person has worked for 4 consecutive months.
- To buttress family responsibility, the bill would:
  - Restrict the definition of continued absence of parents that qualifies the family for AFDC. Recognized as a qual­ifying absence would be desertion, di­vorce, legal separation, institutionaliza­tion, and incarceration, all in excess of 30 days—not work away from home, as in the military forces.
- Require military personnel to make and forward allotments of their pay for the benefit of their families to the military service.
Today we are entering a fourth period of crisis. Because it encompasses all of the market economies of both the developed and developing countries, with nearly three quarters of the world's population involved, it will be more acute—and the potential consequences of our failure to meet it more devastating—than the previous three. The challenge before us, sharpened by the greatly intensified efforts of the nations of the South to develop their self-sufficiency on a par with that of the rich countries, although more equitably, is that of living with growing interdependence. The theme of Agenda for Action, 1975 is on this challenge, and on the corresponding opportunity to construct a new relationship between the rich countries of the North and the poorer countries of its South.

Agenda for action, 1975 is the third in the series prepared annually by the Overseas Development Council. The first Agenda, published in early 1973, had as its central theme the growing interdependence among nations—a reality that came to the fore with great intensity later that year. The second OECD annual assessment evaluated the economic shocks of 1973-74—energy, food, and inflation—and foretold their tragic toll on what the Agenda for Action, 1974 described as the "world's poor majority" in its section on the underprivileged nations. That same Agenda urged nations not to set aside long-term work on the root causes of poverty, and noted a series of measures necessary to repair the damage done by the economic crises of the moment.

HUMANITY EQUALITY

Humanity is a subject that has increasingly preoccupied us during this century. The precociousness of the world's poor majority promises to dominate international issues even more forcefully in the years ahead. In less than a generation, World War II, we have seen the development of mutuality among the advanced nations and the growth of political and juridical equality for all nations. It is only within the past eighteen months that a new search for economic equality has opened in earnest as the developing countries of the South, led by the oil exporting states, have begun to press their claims. This initiative comes at a time when the world has the capacity and knowledge to make a decent life for everyone.

The challenge from the developing countries to the existing international hierarchy of power is even broader than this Agenda — the argument that the world appears to be on the verge of one of the great economic and political discontinuities in history. A global transformation is beginning to emerge that includes, but goes beyond, the consequences of increasing interdependence; indeed, it is as if the molecular structure of the world order was changing. In the rich and poor nations alike, solutions to major issues such as the food and energy crises and stagnation increasingly involve a web of relationships requiring new global approaches if reasonable rates of growth are to continue. New global as well as domestic "social compacts"—involving significant changes in life styles—are needed to meet these new circumstances. Interdependence among nations is evolving to the point of becoming a fact, and reliance on major issues. Because of the importance we attach to the views of the developing countries, we invited them to be presented in his chapter, "The New Independence: From Hierarchy to Symmetry."

OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

The industrialized nations of the world's North now confront a newly intensified challenge from the developing countries of the South. This challenge comes precisely the time when the U.S. involvement in Vietnam has ended and when all nations must construct new approaches to cope with growing interdependence if the progress of the last three decades is to be regained.

The poorer nations, with a greater voice in the management of the international economy and a more equitable share of the benefits of global economic growth, the need to respond to this challenge from the South with such ingenuity that all parties may ultimately gain is the central theme of The United States and World Development, 1974, the second task of the series prepared annually. The Agenda for Action, 1975, the third annual assessment of U.S. policies affecting the developing world was published by the Overseas Development Council.

In introducing the new policy study, Father Thomas F. Power, the Chairman of the Council's Board, said:

"Human equality is a subject that has increasingly preoccupied us during this century. Since World War II, we have seen the precociousness of the world's poor majority promises to dominate international issues even more forcefully in the years ahead. In less than a generation, the world has the capacity and knowledge to make a decent life for everyone.

The new attitude of developing countries has been most apparent to Americans in the collective action of the oil-producing states. OPEC actions have intensified a widespread change in psychology and a strengthened cohesion among all developing countries that was most recently seen in their insistence on the broadening of the agenda of the Paris Conference. The Agenda for Action 1975 concludes that..."
2. In the absence of a system of reserves, the world food situation continues to be very precarious. Under present circumstances, and in the event of only a 1% cent below or above effective market demand, the world food situation could mean either soaring prices and incomes or plummeting prices and lower farm incomes. An encouraging start has been made with the establishment of the World Food Council, the Consultative Group on Food Production and Investment in Developing Countries, and Project 2000 in 1974. But the long-term success of the Eome Conference in establishing a food reserve system and in increasing food production assistance and food aid depends on sustained leadership from the United States, which today requires no food supplies.

3. The widely publicised "trijpe and "lifeboat ethic" arguments against the morality of helping the poor countries develop are based on false premises. Proponents of these "concepts" ignore the basic facts that much progress has been and can be achieved wherever political will is engaged, and that development strategies targeted to benefit the majorities are the most effective way to slow birth rates.

4. The OPEC countries have emerged as major players in this development. Disbursements of some $2.6 billion in 1974 already far exceeds the aid programs of communist countries and accounts for 2 percent of the combined GNP of the major OPEC donors. This sum compares with three-tenths of one percent of the GNP of the Western industrial donors and two-tenths of one percent for the United States. The OPEC aid is expected to rise in 1975 and 1976 as a consequence of aid commitments of $8-$10 billion made in 1974. While much of this aid has been used to advance regional political objectives, the fact remains that the announced speed of new commitments in support of economic and social development elsewhere has been remarkable.

5. The Trade Act of 1974 is a major step forward, but long and difficult negotiations are ahead as the United States attempts to achieve the potential of the Act for the expansion of world trade. Developing countries are already participating actively in test trade talks, and their trade interests add a new element to the negotiations. The United States must now formulate a new policy on primary commodity trade and begin to work with other nations to reach agreement on concepts that meet the needs of consumers for reasonable prices and secure supplies and the needs of producers for reliance and predictability.

6. There is at present a danger that the Law of the Sea Conference may collapse before it has even started. Partly because those developing countries which stand to gain from an ocean regime favoring the interests of coastal states have not hesitated to place their national interests ahead of those of the developing countries as a whole. The United States should continue to support a law of the sea treaty that is basically internationalist—one that would distribute among all nations at least some of the revenues from exploration and provide standards to protect the oceans.

7. The problem of recycling petrodollars that the United States faces last year justified the need to be more under control for the industrial world than for the developing countries. The poor nations, however, continue to pay higher import bills at a time when their export earnings have been diminished by their income-rich countries. The Agenda urges that new institutions be created to meet this need, particularly the IMF subsidy account for its oil facility, the program of the World Bank, and the trust fund of the IMF proposed in late 1974 by the United States.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Agenda for Action, 1975 also contains some 70 pages of up-to-date statistical material on economic relations between the United States and the less developed countries. The director of the Overseas Development Council's Agenda for Action 1975 project was James W. Howe, a Senior Fellow with the Council. The Overseas Development Council is a private, non-profit center founded in 1969 to provide American contributions to the problems faced by the developing countries and the importance of these countries to the United States. The Council analyzes major issues in U.S.-developing world relations and presents its conclusions to policy makers through public lectures, publications, seminars and meetings, and liaison with other organizations.

WHY AMERICA IS BECOMING AN ARMED CAMP

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I have been extremely disappointed lately over the manner in which the TV media have dealt with the issue of gun control. Charged with the responsibility of informing the public on both sides of this hotly debated matter, the media has done the opposite. They have concentrated almost entirely on arguments against gun ownership and have done so in a way which insults the intelligence of the average citizen. Americans, most of who hunger for intelligent, informative material from which to draw their opinions on this issue, are being starved by a steady diet of emotionalism and one-sided editorializing. All too often these editorialis are passed off as documentaries to the unsuspecting viewer.

The most recent contribution to the antigun campaign was given us courtesy of NBC. Those of us who were unfortunate enough to witness the presentation on their evening news program, which was followed by a late-night, hour-long TV documentary entitled "A Shooting Gallery Called America," recognized it at once for what it was—raw propaganda. The show was a classic example of how a producer can take a minimum number of facts, surround them with a maximum amount of emotional reinforcement and turn out a finished product which will create the desired gut feeling in the minds of the viewers. Like most antigun propaganda, the NBC show was targeted at a specific audience; namely, the non-gun owner. It relied on emotional presentations which play on ignorance and fear.

Accordingly while the show was almost totally devoid of substantive content, it was filled with scenes showing blood spattered walls and walls stained, a corpse with a bullet hole in its side, a little boy who accidentally shot himself and little children crying over the shootings of their mother. One scene showed a funeral, with a camera lingering on a coffin being lowered into the grave and slowly lowered out of the frame. We even saw a scene of a^{2}-wound body in the morgue still oozing blood from bullet wounds. We saw one old codger talking in animated and cheerful anticipation of filling the belly of some future assailant full of lead.

We saw and heard more pistols fired in that one hour than in a lifetime of Clint Eastwood police films. We saw gripping scenes of parents whose adopted child was killed in a gun accident. We saw a police officer break down in tears over the loss of relatives and comrades to handguns. We saw graphic footage of police shootouts, and bank rob­bery in progress. We witnessed bodies in the morgue still oozing blood from bullet wounds. We saw one old codger talking in animated and cheerful anticipation of filling the belly of some future assailant full of lead.

We saw and heard two of the most callous thugs ever interviewed on national television testifying clinically to their utter indifference to killing and to their criminal careers. But the thugs were stronger arguments for rewiring the electric shock box than for new controls on guns. Indeed, the problem of recycling petrodollars that the United States faces last year justified the need to be more under control for the industrial world than for the developing countries. The poor nations, however, continue to pay higher import bills at a time when their export earnings have been diminished by their income-rich countries. The Agenda urges that new institutions be created to meet this need, particularly the IMF subsidy account for its oil facility, the program of the World Bank, and the trust fund of the IMF proposed in late 1974 by the United States.

NBC's statistics were impressive: 40 mi­lion handguns out there in Middle America;
two and a half million added to the armory yearly, as NBC has done. But what NBC has failed to explore with sympathy or understanding is why.

The handgun death rates each year represent millions of votes of no confidence by the American people in the criminal justice system. They are more an effect than a cause of crime. The massive inventory of private weapons represents a threat to govern- ment's utter failure to protect the life, home and property of the average citizen.

And there are reasons beyond simply affection for firearms why Americans oppose gun controls. One of them is the source of the proposals. Inevitably, they are advanced as the solution to the crime crisis by people who seem to oppose every other proposed solution. In effect, they are a means to solve the symptoms of a national disease—by the millions. A price rise is not going to deter a criminal, to whom the price of his weapon is a cost of doing business. And a few extra dollars is not going to deter a citizen who thinks he is buying protection of himself and his family.

We advocate the confiscation of handguns, with a criminal penalty attached to ownership, would that reduce crime, or would it, like Prohibition, make lawbreakers out of millions who would prefer to keep their weapons illegally in today's climate than to give up the protection they believe they have? In this observer's judgment, there is a measure of truth in the bumper stickers that read: If you want to outlaw guns, outlaw American criminals. Certainly, confiscation of handguns would have to begin with a line at the door of every house who use them to commit suicide each year. They could buy a rifle or a bottle of pills. When they have that choice, as millions of these are hunting accidents, with rifles. And it is right for government to confiscate the weapons legally owned by millions who feel that few hundred are so careless with them each year as to take their own lives?

We doubt that shows the like- lihood at six-to-one that the individual shot with your handgun will be an acquaintance or family member. Well, most Americans are already instinctively aware of that statistic. Which is why they do not have guns in their homes. But what is happening in society is that the fear of the rapist, the armed robber and the juvenile terrorist is rapidly overcoming the apprehension of Americans about having a gun in their homes or offices. And one is hard put to blame them.

NBC is guilty of a common political sin. It has dealt with the symptoms of a national problem, rather than the cause. The cause of the crime is fear, that sort of crime that has produced a boom market in the sale of watchdogs, burglar alarms, trip wires. Under the Vietnam war begins to deal with the crime crisis in ear- nest, America will remain an armed camp, no matter the disarmament decrees handed down by Kabul. It was said in New York City, where the gun laws are the most stringent, there are something like a million weapons in private hands.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Since gun-control legislation is a burning issue in the nation, and since NBC has been at the center of the "crime capital of the world," one is hard put to say to some store owner, who may have been beaten and robbed half a dozen times, that he has no right to a weapon to give himself the protection the police and government are no longer able to provide.

One may walk away from this documen- tary, produced by Lucy Jarvis and narrated by Carl Stern, with the impression that all these gun purchases represent a sort of gun lunacy in America. But that is not the case. The explosion in gun sales represents the very rational decisions of very rational but frightened Americans who have concluded, with justice, that their government cannot protect them, and, therefore, they had best provide for their own protection.

The sentiment is widespread, indeed, one recalls that not too long ago, here in the capital of the West, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable—perhaps he should have been a Boy. Perhaps, but pistol in hand is exactly the way Judge Roy Bean would have greeted a similar late-night caller in the more se­ cure days of the Wild West years ago.

CONFIDENTIAL RESOLUTION IN THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS ARENA

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, events of the past 3 days have been moving very quickly regarding U.S. efforts to obtain the release of the American merchant vessel Mayaguez, which was seized by Cambodia. Today it appears that we have been successful in securing the ship's release but not before we made use of military force.

I think the Nation and the world gen­ erally is in a very perilous situation when nations can only resolve problems by a show of military strength. By resorting to the use of overt force, we admit that we are unable or unwilling to deal through diplomatic channels with our adversaries. It is a very sad day in the history of the Nation when we withdraw from the negotiating table only to immediately take up arms to achieve what our diplomats were incapable of achieving, namely a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

Columnist, Anthony Lewis today speaks to the issue of "gun-boat" diplo­ macy. Although he recognizes, as we all do, the gross miscalculations on the part of the Cambodians in seizing the American vessel, he raises some very legitimate questions regarding our response to that act.

I insert his column in the Record for my colleagues at this point, for I believe that his questions are ones which we as legislators have a responsibility to at-
I intend to dazzle you with any hypothetical proposals which might serve to help extract us, collectively from the dilemma that our country finds itself today, this 200th birthday party. That is not my purpose today. I believe that as business people, as professional people, we can help here. And, I hope you also have a proposal or two of your own for eventual solutions.

My purpose here is to serve as a catalyst. My wish is that when these meetings close you’ll leave our city with a common, consistent, about to be the solutions to these problems—commit yourself, as I have, to speak out and hopefully cause something positive to happen some who would say lost, not for the want of courage or conviction—but by default.

There are those who would speculate that irretrievable losses have already been suffered. Hopefully, this is not the case and we will stiffen in our resolve to deal effectively with the challenges to our Free Enterprise System.

If my thesis is correct—and public opinion surveys will substantiate that the majority of our citizens continue to strongly favor a free market economy—the challenge must be to awaken our friends, our families, our fellow workers, all Americans to the gradual erosion, the acquiescence of our free market system into servitude, collectivism. To be more specific we are, hit by bit, piece by piece, giving up the System that has made our country the most prosperous and successful nation in recorded history.

To further illustrate the condition, you might remember several months ago when President Ford commented on a “bright spot” in the economic picture. He said the auto rebate plan was a welcome example of “good old American free enterprise.” As Fortune magazine said later, it was a striking statement because a time when economists, politicians, businessmen, and practically everybody else were furiously debating just what could be done to counter the recession with public service jobs, increased unemployment benefits, tariffs on imported goods, government loans to businesses, controls on credit and other therapeutic measures. “Good old American free enterprise,” seemed like the last thing that anyone was asking for help.

Frightening isn’t it. Yet reliance on the government, massive legislation and regulation,, can no longer be countenanced unless we take a close look at the issues that led us to this point.

When I was asked to speak to this group, your chairman suggested that I share some of my thinking with you on a subject that is of interest and importance to this country today. It has to do with this whole matrix of issues, problems and challenges related to our Free Enterprise System. I accepted the invitation not because of any illusions that I might bring you novel or original insights on this problem, Nor did
It is a powerful and moving and sig- nificant book.

"JOURNEY," BY ROBERT MASSIE AND SUZANNE MASSIE

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the House a most remarkable book which has just been published entitled, "Journey," by Robert Massie and Suzanne Massie.

As Members of the House may know, Mr. Massie, with the help of his wife, Suzanne Massie, a professional writer, has written "Nicholas and Alexandra."

The book, "Journey," concerns the impact on the life of the entire Massie fam-i-ly of the fact that the Massie's son, Robert, has had hemophilia from his earliest years.

In their book, the Massies also talk about the implications of their family's experience for medical care in the United States.

But some of the difficulties the Massies faced were unique to those whose lives are touched by hemophiliacs, or, as they say, people with "Buffy." The question of having to beg for blood donations (one afternoon at Yankee Stadium an appeal over the Public Address System for blood donations and capital investment needed to generate jobs and the goods and services so necessary to increase the wealth of this nation"
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The 38th Birthday of Major Michael J. Masterson

HON. JIM LLOYD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. LLOYD of California. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, May 16, 1975, is the 38th birthday of Major Michael J. Masterson. What should normally be a happy occasion, however, is a tragic event. Major Masterson, an Air Force pilot since 1961, was forced down on a mission over Laos on October 13, 1968, and has never been heard from since.

His wife, Pru, and daughters Sue and Shelly, live in the 35th district. On their behalf, and for all of the men missing in action in Southeast Asia, and their grieving families, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives not to forget these Americans.

Major Masterson's hobbies are water skiing, bowling, and motorcycles. He was a faculty member of the Academy of the highest order. On behalf of the House of Representatives, I would like to salute Maj. Michael J. Masterson on his 38th birthday.
in committees. And while Rule 8 at least permitted a Member to depart from caucus instructions on a floor vote if he considered the proposition unconstitutional or had made a contrary pledge to his constituents in the previous campaign, the legislative procedure for such a vote provides for no such exceptions.

Mr. Speaker, special report 93-12 of the Democratic Study Group, entitled "Committee Control of the Floor Vote," issued April 4, 1975, makes it quite clear that, under the DSG interpretation, committees are the principal forum for expressing the party's position. While in the service of committees they are primarily agents or representatives of the Caucus—especially when the Caucus is not in session.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, according to this interpretation, committees are formed primarily as organs of the party caucus. We are the House or the people, and a Member's first allegiance is to his party caucus rather than to conscience or constituency.

In defending binding instructions on committee votes, the DSG-types explain that such instructions are merely "procedural" and not "substantive," and that Members are still free to vote their conscience on substantive floor votes. What this line of thinking overlooks is that procedure often determines substance and that the House more often than not allows and enforces the judgment and decisions of its committees when the legislation reaches the floor. For instance, we have already had situations where the Caucus has instructed the Rules Committee to force certain amendments in order to a bill on the floor while excluding the offering of other amendments.

In effect, the Caucus narrowly proscribes the substantive issues which may be considered by the full House. And, in directing certain committees to report bills containing specific provisions, the caucus precludes a committee from exercising its independent judgment and applying its expertise based on its subsequent hearings and deliberations on matter. The legislative process in committees is thus rendered meaningless because the results have been predetermined and imposed by the Caucus.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, one should be debuded for a moment that any real reforms are about to be achieved beyond the Caucus doors of the smoke-filled King Caucus chambers. That smoke is nothing more than a smoke-screen being thrown up to insure that King Caucus will continue to be shrouded in a cloak of secrecy as he dictates his instructions to his committee appointees. I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to follow our lead in the House Republican Conference by throwing open their caucus doors and letting the fresh air and sunshine in—to clear away all that smoke before they choke or croak.

Perhaps all this is too much to expect from a caucus which cowards and cringes before a powerful minority which deems itself the custodians of secret machinations. I would hope not. But, if that is the case, I would welcome my colleagues to join as cosponsors of my House Resolution 8, entitled "An Open House Amendments," which would effectively prohibit a party caucus or conference from issuing binding instructions on a Member's concience or floor votes. Specifically, by amendment to clause 1 of House Rule VIII would add the following:

No Member may be bound by order or instruction of his party caucus or conference to vote contrary to his conscience. A point of order shall lie with respect to any provision or measure so voted in committee provided it is made by a Member so bound and was first made in committee in a timely manner and not improperly overruled or not properly considered. A point of order shall also lie with respect to any provision or measure when a Member has been bound, by order or instruction of his party caucus or conference, to vote in the House or Committee of the whole, contrary to his conscience, provided such point of order is made by a Member so bound.

Mr. Speaker, interestingly enough, this rule is based on article 36 of the Basic Law or constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany which specifies that the deputies to the German Bundestag shall be representatives of the people, not of party committees or instructions. And, shall be subject only to their conscience. I am pleased to report that my proposed House Rule amendment now has 80 cosponsors. I am not pleased to report that I have not yet received a reply to my letter of March 19, 1975, to the chairman of the House Rules Committee requesting hearings on this and may other eight "Open House Amendments."

At this point in the Record, Mr. Speaker, I include a full list of those Members who have agreed to be considered by rule to prohibit binding party instructions as well as the article from the Sunday, May 11, 1975, Washington Post by Richard L. Lyons headlined, "House Democrats Eye 'King Caucus'."

COSPONSORS OF HOUSE RULE TO PROHIBIT BINDING PARTY INSTRUCTIONS

James Abdnor (R-S. Dak.),
Mack Andrews (R-N. Dak.),
Bill Archer (R-Tex.),
William L. Armstrong (R-Colo.),
L. A. (Skip) Bafalis (R-Fla.),
Robert E. Bauman (R-Md.),
Alphonzo Bell (R-Calif.),
Edward G. Bieker, Jr. (R-Pa.),
William S. Broomfield (R-Mich.),
Clarence J. Brown (R-Ohio),
James C. Buchanan, Jr. (R-Pa.),
John Buchanan (R-Ala.),
Clair W. Burgener (R-Calif.),
Tim L. Burtch (R-Mo.),
Bill Chappell, Jr. (D-Fla.),
Del Clawson (R-Calif.),
James F. Coile (R-N.H.),
William S. Cohen (R-Maine),
Barber B. Cuniale (R-N.Y.),
Silvio O. Conte (R-N.Y.),
Laurence H. Davis (R-N.C.),
Samuel L. Devine (R-Ohio),
William L. Dickinson (R-Mich.),
Robert W. Edgar (D-Pa.),
David F. Emery (D-Me.),
John N. Erlenborn (R-III.),
Marvin L. Esch (R-Mich.),
Edwin D. Edwards (D-Texas),
Millicent Fenwick (R-N.J.),
Paul Findley (R-Ill.),
Hamilton Fish (R-N.Y.),
Edwin B. Forsythe (R-N.J.),
Bill Frenzel (R-Minn.),
Louis Frey, Jr. (R-N.Y.),
Benjamin A. Gilman (R-N.Y.),
Barry M. Goldwater, Jr. (R-Calif.),
William P. Goodling (R-Pa.),
Charles E. Grasly (R-Iowa),
Gilbert Gude (R-Md.),
Tom Hagedorn (R-Minn.),
James F. Hastings (R-N.Y.),
Andrew J. Hinchaw (R-Calif.),
Malcolm H. Havers (R-Del.),
Frank Horton (R-N.Y.),
Henry J. Hyde (R-Ill.),
James M. Jeffords (R-Vt.),
Albert W. Johnson (R-Pa.),
James P. Johnson (R-Colo.),
Robert W. Kasten, Jr. (R-Wis.),
Richard Kelly (R-Fla.),
Jack F. Kemp (R-N.Y.),
Robert J. Lagomarsino (R-Calif.),
Delbert L. Latas (R-Ohio),
Norman F. Lent (R-N.Y.),
Trent Lott (R-Miss.),
Manuel Lujan, Jr. (R-N.Mex.),
Robert McClory (R-Ill.),
Larry McDonald (R-Iowa),
Robert C. McEven (R-N.Y.),
Stewart B. McKinney (R-Conn.),
James G. Martin (R-Minn.),
Robert H. Michel (R-Ill.),
Donald J. Mitchell (R-N.Y.),
W. Russell Moore (R-S.C.),
Carlos J. Moorehead (R-Calif.),
Charles A. Mosher (R-Ohio),
George M. O'Leary (R-Md.),
Peter A. Peyser (R-N.Y.),
Larry Pressler (R-S.D.),
Joel Pritchard (R-Wash.),
Ralph S. Regula (R-Ohio),
John J. Rhodes (R-Ariz.),
Matthew J. Rinaldo (R-N.J.),
Philip E. Rupke (R-Mich.),
Ronald S. Sarasin (R-Conn.),
Patricia Schroeder (R-Colo.),
Richard T. Scully (R-N.Y.),
Keith G. Sebelius (R-Kans.),
Garner E. Shriver (R-Kans.),
Jane Snyder (R-Mo.),
Floyd Spence (R-S.C.),
J. William Stanton (R-Ohio),
Alan Stemsteel (R-W.Va.),
William A. Steiger (R-Wis.),
Steven D. Symms (R-Idaho),
Burt L. Talbott (R-Calif.),
Charles Thome (R-Nebr.),
David C. Treen (R-La.),
William Whitehurst (R-Va.),
Bob Wilson (R-Calif.),
Larry Winn, Jr. (R-Kans.),
C. W. Bill Young (R-Fla.).

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1975]

House Democrats Eye 'King Caucus' At Issue

House Democrats, under Republican twit­
ting, appear on the verge of abolishing an ancient and dust-covered rule: the binding caucus vote.

Rule No. 8 of the caucus of all House Dem­
ocrats provides that by a two-thirds vote the caucus can order all its members to vote for or against a bill on the House floor. A member can safely ignore such a direc­
tive, but by statutory law it considers the caucus position unconstitutional or that he or she had made contrary pledges to constitu­
ten. Otherwise the member would be sub­ject to party discipline up to expulsion from the caucus and loss of committee seniority. The rule has been invoked only once in the
last 40 years—In 1971 to repeal a provision giving the House and Senate majority leaders control over the use of all committee staff funds. But since it is in the rules, Republicans have set up a bowl that it is an outrageous and autocratic method for mounting secret power plays by which, conceivably, a minority of the House would create a majority for or against legislation.

The Executive Committee of the Democratic Study Group (DSG), an organization of liberal House Democrats, has recommended repeated repeal of the rule and a motion to do so is expected. But the only likely targets of a binding directive would be the conservative minority within the party. The repealer is expected to be approved.

The DSG leaders issued a statement saying repealing the rule "has no purpose other than as a prop for Republican fairy tales about the evils of King Caucus."

The binding rule was used extensively for a decade after autocratic powers were removed from the Speaker of the House in 1969. But last January, King Caucus to ram through one bill after another. But it has been used only twice in the last 60 years, as often moved from the caucus to committees.

But now the Democratic caucus has been responding. There were three committee chairmen were toppled last January, Republicans apparently fear the binding rule will be revived too.

While urging repeal of the rule binding members on floor votes, the DSG leaders said the caucus should continue its current practice of directing members how to vote in committee. They distinguished between the two situations:

"How a member votes in the House is a matter totally between the individual member and his or her constituents and his or her personal convictions. The caucus does not elect members to the House and it therefore has no right to tell members how they must vote on matters of public policy."

"However, the caucus does give members their committee assignments and has "an inherent right to instruct their members to take a particular action in committee"—as when the caucus recently instructed Democrats on the House Rules Committee to allow a floor vote on the oil deple­tion issue. Rep. John R. Baker, D-Ohio, said, "I don't think this inherent right" of the caucus is used.

The DSG proposal would not be a full an­swery to the idea of "independent trade unionism". The "independent" trade union organization of the National Coordinating Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy—NCC­TUAD—was proposed to the House Rules Committee for the penetration of the trade union movement. Gaboury did not iden­tify himself when he testified before the Senate Labor Committee. He identified himself as Peter Brennan as Secretary of Labor.

At that time Gaboury claimed to represent "independent trade unionism." The "independent" trade union organization it represents is the National Coordinating Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy, NCC­TUAD, where Gaboury is director of the Communist Party's ap­paratus for the penetration of the trade union movement. Gaboury did not iden­tify himself when he testified before the Senate Labor Committee. He identified himself as the Secretary of Labor of the Communist Party. Nor did he state that he was a paid CUPSA functionary, not a volunteer organizer for TUAD.

The case is ironical, says the testimony of Douglas Lilke who seems to parallel this.

In my remarks of May 6, 1975, I care­fully pointed out that Lilke did not open up a majority vote in open session to close the discussion "would en­danger the national security."

First, the statement of the liberal majority was that this motion from the conservative wing was an attempt to weaken the caucus, whose revival was the result of years of procedural changes spearheaded by the DSG. There has been talk of a compromise that would open the caucus to the public when it is asked to deal with legislative action.

Another target of those who would open up the system is the House-Senate conference where final compromises are hammered out. This process is both in a different form. This is where the wheel­ing and dealing is done, where bills can be gutted behind closed doors with no written record of who said what or voted which way.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The House has voted to open conferences where it is agreed by both majorities, unless a majority of the House votes against, but the Senate has taken no action.

COMMUNIST PARTY SUPPORT FOR H.R. 50

HON. LARRY MCDONALD
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1975
Mr. MCDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed and concerned to read in these pages of the Congressional Records of May 13 that my distin­guished colleague from California rejects the evidence of Communist Party, U.S.A.—CPUSA—support of H.R. 50.

I wish to point out that in the Congres­sional Record of May 6, 1975—page 13256, and April 16, 1975—pages 10437-10439, I quoted the CPUSA press show­ing the party's support for the aforementioned bill which is, if passed, a major step toward socialism.

When the Communist Party suc­ceeds in involving itself with responsi­bility for the full employment bill—one of its stated purposes—its inherent right to instruct their members to take a particular action in committee.

I quoted the CPUSA press showing the party's support for the aforementioned bill which is, if passed, a major step toward socialism.

The conference also approved a general resolution calling for a "drastic cut in mili­tary spending" and a cut-off of military aid to Indo-China dictators.

In a workshop session on the Hawkins Full Employment bill attended by Hawkins' staff aide William Higgs, participants decried the watering down and weakening of the bill.

The workshop rejected the bill's proposal for implementation of the full employment goal within three years, and urged instead its implementation within one year. It also rejected a substitute version which calls for local "advisory councils" appointed by the President, instead of the earlier version which called for local "planning councils" elected by the people to draw up and oversee local projects.

One speaker pointed out that the earlier language specifically stated that Black and Brown people, youth, senior citizens, and women must be fully represented on these councils. This guarantee must be restored, the speaker said.

Also demanded was "guaranteed community control" of the job-creating local proj­ects mandated in the bill.

These proposals were later approved unani­mously at the conference plenary.

Several of the Congressional aides present pointed out that strengthening the bill would risk its defeat in the recreational dom­i­nated Congress.

John Steele, chairman of the Young Workers Liberation League, national chairman, John Steele, as reported in the CPUSA's own newspaper, the Daily World, stated that the YWLL had created a "firewall of military spending.

The Daily World's front-page report read in part:

NEW YORK, January 28—The National Labor Commission of the CPUSA released a statement yesterday criticizing the Gomp­erz Program of Government make-work pro­jects, trade with the Soviet bloc and slashing billions from the defense bud­get. This is a capsule version of demands of the CPUSA-run "National Conference for a Drastic Cutback in Military Spending" held in April which I referred to in my remarks of April 24, 1975, pages 11873-11875.
today called upon the rank and file members of the U.S. labor movement to launch a fight for a program of jobs, price rollbacks and immediate legislative measures for economic relief.

George Meyers, national secretary of the communist Party, prepared a report to the commission that the key demand in the struggle for jobs is the winning of the six-hour workday with no cut in pay.

TEXT OF STATEMENT
(The statement follows:)

What is needed to combat unemployment is a rank and file movement for the six hour day no cut in pay. This must be accompanied by the immediate setting into motion of a massive public works program at union wages.

Unless this happens, the millions of currently unemployed, plus the millions just coming into the labor market, will never have jobs.

Urgently needed also is the removal of discriminatory tariff barriers to trade with the Socialist countries, and trade with the Arab and developing countries on an equal basis.

A key demand of such a rank and file movement should be for tax relief for working families, the elimination of excess profits taxes, and the elimination of all property taxes on family incomes of $25,000 per year or less; shifting the tax burden to the corporations, job-to-job security, and unemployment insurance at least equal to company retirement savings enough to meet today's inflation; food stamps and welfare allotments for those in need; and the removal of billions of dollars into housing and public works, billions that can and must be taken from the war budget.

As an example of Communist Party involvement in "grassroots" support for H.R. 50, on January 9, 1975, Richard Ashby reported in the Daily World on preparations for January 15, 1975, demonstrations in Chicago. Ashby wrote:

CHICAGO, JANUARY 8.—Chicagoans will demonstrate for jobs here Jan. 15, in one of a series of actions around the country on that date in support of full-employment legislation and other goals.

The Chicago action is being organized by a coalition of labor, religious and community organizations.

JOBS BILL
The coalition is seeking to pressure Congress to pass the full-employment bill sponsored by Rep. Augustus Hawkins (D-Calif.) and Sen. Hubert Humphrey (D-Minn.).

Coordinators of the Chicago action are Frances Davis, from Operation PUSH; Sylvia Kushner, from the Chicago Peace Council; and Don Jones, President of American Federation of Government Employees Local 1985. Jones is also chairman of Chicago Acts Against Inflation (CAAI).

COMMUNITY SUPPORT
Ishmael Flory, chairman, and Jack Kling, state secretary of the Illinois Communist Party today issued a statement calling for support for the Jan. 15 demonstration here:

Ashby did not mention in the Daily World that Sylvia Kushner, one of the three coordinators of the demonstration, is an identified member of the Communist Party. Nor did he mention at that point that Chicago Acts Against Inflation—CAAI—is the Chicago affiliate of CPUSA's National Coalition To Fight Inflation—Unemployment.

Also of interest is this article is an article by Fred Gaboury, the Communist Party's Midwest trade union secretary mentioned previously in this response. In the April 1975, issue of Labor Today, the Communist Party's trade union publication recently described by Gus Hall as "the TTAD engine,"

Gaboury's article, "Mobilization Against Unemployment," read in part: Labor Today readers should welcome the initiative of the National Coalition To Fight Inflation and Unemployment in calling for a nation-wide demonstration against inflation and unemployment in Washington, D.C. Organized to bring mass pressure on a reluctant Congress to take immediate action to deal with growing unemployment and continued inflation, one of the demonstration's chief legislative goals will be the "Equal Opportunity and Full Employment Act of 1976," popularly known as the Hawkins-Reuss Bill. Numbered "H-50" in the House of Representatives and "S-50" in the Senate where it has been introduced by Hubert Humphrey, this bill would mandate as government policy, the right of all citizens to a job. (A detailed analysis of the Equal Opportunity and Full Employment Act of 1976 is given in the February issue of LT.)

In addition, the March 1975, issue of Economic Notes, the publication of Labor Research Associates, founded some four decades ago by Alexander Trachtenberg and characterized H.R. 50 in these terms:

The most advanced bill in Congress, popularly dubbed the Hawkins Bill (sponsored by Congressman Hawkins and by Senator Humphrey) is H.R. 50, "The Equal Opportunity and Full Employment Act of 1975."

"The Hawkins Bill ** represents a tremendous advance over the Employment Act of 1946 and 1958 by making the fight for an equal opportunity and full employment act as a new government responsibility to the working class.

I wish to express my deepest appreciation for my distinguished colleague's prepared statement concerning H.R. 50. The witness list shows that the greatest majority of witnesses were persons of honor and integrity.

However, some persons who are either identified CPUSA members or actively involved in CPUSA front organizations did manage to testify. These include Fidelia Coward of the Young Workers Liberation League, and the Honorable Coleman Young, identified in sworn testimony by Mrs. Berenice Baldwin as attending Marxist-Leninist education classes open only to members of the Communist Party, in addition to Doug Little, chairman of its Committee.

A brief review of those with recent activities in CPUSA fronts includes Rev. Al Dorich, a founding sponsor and participant in the CPUSA's National Alliance Against Imperialism and Political Repression, initiating sponsor of CPUSA's National Anti-Imperialist Movement in Solidarity With African Liberation and former head of the Socialist Party of the United States; Luc Fried, coordinator of the Coalition for Economic Survival, a local chapter of the National Coalition To Fight Inflation and Unemployment; and a rather interesting person, Brian Williams.

Mr. Brian Williams wrote an article in the April issue of Labor Today, the publication of the CPUSA and National Coordinating Committee for Trade Union Action and Defense, describing how the TTAD was setting up another front to deal with the unemployment crisis. The article read:

FIGHT FOR JOBS MOUNTS IN PHILADELPHIA
(By Brian Williams)

In Philadelphia, unemployment is at its highest level since the end of World War II. Massive lay-offs and plant closings are coming every week. Unemployment compensation is running out for thousands.

In response to the growing crisis, the Philadelphia Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy has initiated the Committee for Full Employment from the ranks of unemployed workers.

The Committee for Full Employment (CPE) is mounting a campaign to educate and inform people about the Hawkins-Humphrey Full Employment Bill. In three weeks CPE collected 3,000 signatures at one unemployment center on a petition supporting the bill.

The CPE has met with Congressman Flaum who agrees that fact-finding hearings in the Philadelphia area is building a coalition of trade unions and people's organizations to accomplish the goals of the Communist Party," characterized H.R. 50 in these terms:

This trade makes jobs.

Unless this happens, the millions of currently unemployed, plus the millions just coming into the labor market, will never have jobs.

Increasing unemployment compensation to 75% of gross pay with a $60 minimum and $250 maximum.

Extending unemployment compensation to all jobless workers including first time job seekers.

A moratorium on all repossessions and evictions.

The opening of temporary emergency centers to process new claims.

The Committee for Full Employment hopes to form a national network of people's organizations to come to grips with the economic crisis and works closely with Operation PUSH, the National Coalition Against Inflation and Unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that my colleagues will agree with me that the Communist Party has a right to seek to determine the shifting tactics of the voice of the Kremlin. Nor can a busy
congressional office assign more than a minimum of staff time to any such project.

My colleagues will remember that the House formerly had a full committee to do just this sort of informational work. Approached by national and local groups to make laws or repeal laws on every conceivable subject, we need a Committee on Internal Security to examine these pressures and determine which are legitimate and which merely the disguised tactical fronts of the Soviet Union, the Communist Chinese, the Cubans, the North Vietnamese, et cetera.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 16, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. military actions taken last night and early this morning to rescue the SS Mayaguez and her crew will undoubtedly be a source of controversy for some time to come. Congressional investigations of the incident and will no doubt take place. We must obtain a clear picture of the sequence of events which led to the recapture of the ship by U.S. Marines and of the action which took place on Tang Island, as well as the air strikes made by our planes on targets located on the Cambodian mainland.

However, on the information which is available, I can only conclude that President Ford acted correctly throughout the incident, and made the right decision when he ordered military action be taken to rescue the 39 crewmen of the Mayaguez.

Normally, I would be appalled at the prospect of renewed fighting in Southeast Asia, especially if it involved American troops. However, the Mayaguez seizure involves special problems and issues which cannot be ignored.

It is important to remember that our Government attempted to have the ship released through diplomatic channels prior to the military action. Since the new Cambodian Government has no reputation with anything but the most transparent and unmitigated evil, such an approach would be an extremely difficult task. All channels available to us were apparently exhausted, including communications through the People’s Republic of China and the United Nations.

The Cambodian Government itself did not make any statement on the seizure of the ship, or the fate of the crew, until American military action was already underway. At that point, President Ford asked for confirmation of the fact that Cambodia intended to release the ship and crew, offering to cease all military operations if the crew were released immediately.

Before we begin to protest another “act of belligerence” by the U.S. Government, we should take some time and examine a few basic facts.

We were not the aggressor in this incident. The Mayaguez is an unarmed, privately owned merchant ship on a regular run through waters which have always been assumed to be international territory. When fired upon and seized by the Cambodian gunship, the vessel was assumed to be covered by the “right of innocent passage.”

American lives could only be considered as jeopardized by the actions of the Cambodian Government.

The inherent right of the United States, or any nation, to enjoy peaceful commercial traffic on the high seas was being challenged on two fronts: the disputed claim to jurisdiction over international waters.

And apparently, the operation was a success, since all members of the crew, as well as the Mayaguez, were recovered. Unfortunately, this was accomplished at the cost of at least two American lives and the loss of the vessel.

In looking at the long-range aspects of the problem, it becomes apparent that sooner or later, an American action of

OVERTURES TOWARD CUBA—
WHEN WILL WE LEARN?

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1975

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the architects of American foreign policy during the past three decades have not been known for their ability to learn from history. Time and time again they have been fooled by the same rhetoric and burned by the same blunders. They continue to pursue nebulous policies which reflect no conviction, no national purpose and no comprehension of our adversaries’ goals and strategies. We have experienced an uninterrupted string of setbacks as a result of a foreign policy which, in the final analysis, translates into conciliation at any cost.

As a new chapter in our relations with Communist Cuba begins to unfold, it appears that we are once again blinding ourselves to the lessons of our own experience. Consider the recent chronology of events in this regard:

Last fall, Cuban dictator Fidel Castro delivered a fiery speech devoted entirely to bitter denouncements of the United States. That day he was entertaining two prominent U.S. Senators (Javits and Pell). At a midnight press conference in Havana, the Senators proclaimed to the world: “We believe that Premier Castro is interested in working toward better relations with the United States.”

In the ensuing months, Mr. Speaker, Americans again witnessed anti-Americanism at work in another part of the world—Southeast Asia. The tragic and brutal capture of Cambodia and South Vietnam by Communist forces was a graphic reminder to all Americans that Communist aggression is not a right-wing theory; it is a harsh reality. The flagrant violation of these insurgent armies was made possible by: First, the signing of the Paris peace accord, which the United States honored and the Communists did not; and, second, the massive support of these forces by Red China and Russia. While our leaders expounded upon the virtues of “detente” with these two nations, we failed to heed the warnings which those forces of Red China and Russia. While our leaders expounded upon the virtues of “detente” with these two nations, we failed to heed the warnings which those forces of Red China and Russia.

And apparently, the operation was a success, since all members of the crew, as well as the Mayaguez, were recovered. Unfortunately, this was accomplished at the cost of at least two American lives and the loss of the vessel.

In looking at the long-range aspects of the problem, it becomes apparent that sooner or later, an American action of
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this sort was inevitable, unless we are willing to surrender responsibility for the safety of U.S. seamen. I sincerely hope we are not ready to do so.

If the United States wishes to maintain and strengthen its merchant marine fleet, we cannot allow any nation to seize, harass, and obstruct our vessels at will. Of course, force is always a last resort. But apparently, in today's world, we cannot rule out completely the prospect of U.S. military action to protect our rights on the high seas.

In southern California, we are very familiar with this problem, since tuna boats, based in our harbors, have been seized by Ecuador and other South American nations claiming a territorial right 200 miles off their coasts. This has been going on for more than 20 years, and the United States has been totally ineffective in stopping the seizures.

Had our allies Cambodia to do as it pleased with the Megagaza and its crew, the United States would have lost all credibility as a protector of its rights on the high seas, and as a government concerned with the safety of its citizens.

Force should always be a last resort. Unfortunately, the new Cambodian Government left us with no alternative in this latest incident.

SENATE—Monday, May 19, 1975

The Senate met at 11 a.m., and was called to order by Hon. DALE BUMPERS, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God Omnipotent, Ruler over all nations from everlasting to everlasting, grant to us who labor here an awareness both of Thy guidance and of Thy judgment. Speak to our hearts when faith grows faint, when vision is dim, when patriotism fades, when courage fails, and love grows cold. Keep us hopeful, resolute, steadfast, and wise. Strengthen our trust in the invincibility of goodness and in the triumph of justice. In our daily duties grant us strength and courage to strive for the better world yet to come; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. DALE BUMPERS, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES G. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BUMPERS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 18, 1975, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY STATE SENATOR JOHN DE CAMP OF NEBRASKA ON VIETNAM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the war in Vietnam divided this country as no other war has ever done. Some people have said in substance that we should forget Vietnam and not answer questions.

I disagree. I believe that we should find out why our Armed Forces were not permitted to win the war. Why did we not heed Generals MacArthur and Wedemeyer in the years before?

I believe that we need to determine what mistakes were made, how we blundered into a war so wildly repudiated in its ensuing years, how foreign policy in this country should be made, and what was the effect of congressional preferences in the performance of the constitutional duties of the President.

We lost over 50,000 men in that war and hundreds of thousands of others were wounded or maimed. We owe them, and their families, some answers. State Senator John DeCamp of Nelgh, Nebr., sent me a personal statement formulating many of the questions we still have to face.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Senator DeCamp's remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This is Alpha—Not Omega

(By Senator John W. DeCamp)

Americans heared a sign of relief; Jane Fonda followers feel victorious; Saigon shall henceforth be known as Ho Chi Minh City; and Americans believe Vietnam has finally been put to rest and we have reached the end.

Is it the end or is it really just the beginning of our problems?

"The United States can't be the world's policeman," "The Domino Theory is for the birds," "The United States has no business in Vietnam," "Hey, Hey, LBJ, how many boys did you kill today," "Those people would be better off under Communism anyway," and finally, "Peace with Honor."

Remember them, they are the "magic phrase" over 100,000 Americans battled verbally and physically for almost a decade.

"I BELIEVE"

I believe America will learn that our surrender in Vietnam will turn out to be as humiliating and devastating a defeat as our victory in World War II was glorious and beneficial. I believe the Domino Theory will have meaning when the Communists open