

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. BURTON and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 16906. A bill to strengthen and expand the Headstart program, with priority to the economically disadvantaged, to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 16907. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 16908. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, to provide financial assistance for handicapped individuals establishing or operating small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16909. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to provide that community disaster grants be based upon loss of budgeted revenue; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 16910. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to promote full employment and restore a diversified production base; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to stem the outflow of U.S. capital, jobs, technology and production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEIBERLING (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 16911. A bill to provide comprehensive adjustment benefits and services to unemployed workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16912. A bill to amend the tax and customs laws in order to improve the U.S. position in foreign trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 16913. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the liberalization and automatic adjustment (in accordance with rising wage levels) of the earnings test thereunder, which provides for deductions in monthly benefits on account of excess earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS (for himself, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CURLIN, Mr. BLACKBURN, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 16914. A bill to consolidate, simplify, and improve laws relating to housing and urban development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 16915. A bill to provide grants to States or political subdivisions thereof or to certain other persons to assist the restoration of historical cemeteries or burial plots,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 16916. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require that radio and television receivers meet certain technical standards for filtering out interference; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 16917. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a refundable credit against the Federal income tax for a certain portion of the State and local real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 16918. A bill to create a corporation for profit to develop commercially feasible processes for the conversion of coal to crude oil and other liquid and gaseous hydrocarbons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.J. Res. 1311. Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the foreign economic policy of the United States in connection with its relations with the Soviet Union and any other country which uses arbitrary and discriminatory methods to limit the right of emigration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself and Mr. BOGGS):

H.J. Res. 1312. Joint resolution to provide grants for Allen J. Ellender fellowships to disadvantaged secondary school students and their teachers to participate in a Washington public affairs program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BELL, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CELLER, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GUDE):

H.J. Res. 1313. Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the foreign economic policy of the United States in connection with its relations with the Soviet Union and any other country which uses arbitrary and discriminatory methods to limit the right of emigration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PEYER, Mr.

PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, and Mr. REID):

H.J. Res. 1314. Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the foreign economic policy of the United States in connection with its relations with the Soviet Union and any other country which uses arbitrary and discriminatory methods to limit the right of emigration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr.

REUSS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. YATES, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. LUJAN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. MORGAN, and Mr. METCALFE):

H.J. Res. 1315. Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the foreign economic policy of the United States in connection with its relations with the Soviet Union and any other country which uses arbitrary and discriminatory methods to limit the right of emigration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.J. Res. 1316. Joint resolution authorizing a study of whether to create a corporation for profit to develop commercially feasible processes for the conversion of coal to crude oil and other liquid and gaseous hydrocarbons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON:

H. Res. 1139. Resolution in support of U.S. veto of United Nations resolution on terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDADE:

H. Res. 1140. Resolution in support of U.S. veto of United Nations resolution on terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. Res. 1141. Resolution to establish an Ad Hoc Congressional Oversight Committee for the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Conference on Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 16919. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Ronald J. Hodgkinson, U.S. Army (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 16920. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to Kaiser Steel Corp. the remaining interest of the United States in and to certain public lands in Riverside County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RESOLUTION COMMENDING HERBERT C. "HERB" SANDUSKY, JACKSON, MISS.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution by the Pearl River Bass Club, composed of sportsmen

from central Mississippi, commending Herbert C. "Herb" Sandusky, of Jackson, Miss.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION COMMENDING HERBERT C. "HERB" SANDUSKY

A resolution by the Pearl River Bass Club recognizing and commending Herbert C. Sandusky of Jackson, Mississippi, usually and affectionately referred to as "Herb", for his inestimable, outstanding, untiring and continuous services and contributions to sportsmen, past, present and future, of Mis-

issippi; the Legislature and Game and Fish Commission thereof, in all phases of conservation and propagation of wild game, consisting of fish, fowl and animals, including the various facets thereof, by which he has earned the title of Spokesman for Sportsmen of Mississippi.

Whereas, Herb speaks and writes from an indestructible foundation of personal observation, participation in and knowledge of, fishing and hunting. Since his early teens he has been a devotee of the outdoors, its streams, rivers, lakes, reservoirs, fields and woodlands, which are the habitats of wild game, consisting of fish, fowl and animals in Mississippi and surrounding states; his activities and honors are too numerous to de-

tail herein, so therefore, we speak and write only in ultimate facts; and

Whereas, the Pearl River Bass Club is composed of sportsmen from Central Mississippi who are fishermen and hunters dedicated to the propagation and preservation of wild game consisting of fish, fowl and animals; and

Whereas, since 1945, hoping and feeling that such knowledge as he had and could acquire, together with his observations, predictions and suggestions, would be of service to sportsmen, Herb created, named and writes the column entitled "Outdoor Mississippi" which appears weekly in the Sunday joint edition of the Clarion-Ledger and Jackson Daily News of Jackson, Mississippi; and

Whereas, Herb is always a gentleman, personally and professionally honest, possesses infinite intelligence, knowledge and wisdom upon the subjects upon which he speaks and writes; he fortunately possesses that rare knack of writing in such manner that each reader of his column feels Herb is personally speaking to him. Herb is revered by all sportsmen for "saying it like it is!" Many of his innumerable, knowledgeable suggestions, observations and recommendations, oral and written, have been enacted by our Mississippi Legislature into state laws. Since 1945 his dedicated cooperation with our State Game and Fish Commission has been of invaluable service to all sportsmen; he has spoken to many clubs upon the activities mentioned herein and has been selected to serve as one of the judges in various duck calling, turkey calling and other sportsmen's contests; and

Whereas, Herb, because of his multitude of friends, his speaking and writing, which we trust will continue for years to come, has caused innumerable young men to become true sportsmen; he has added to the knowledge of those who have attained sportsmanship. He has always staunchly advocated the preservation and propagation of wild game, consisting of fish, fowl and animals; the strict enforcement of all game and fish laws; the observance of safety in boating, handling of fire arms, and bows and arrows; conservation and improvement of said wild game and fish environmental areas; steadfast, active opposition to pollution of air, streams, lakes, rivers, reservoirs, fields and woodlands; and

Whereas, Herb always advocates courtesy by hunters and fishermen toward the landowners; the acquisition and development of places to fish and hunt for the past, present and future; and

Whereas, Herb has richly earned the title of Spokesman for Sportsmen of Mississippi; this honor is his reward for what he has so generously and ably given and continues to give to Mississippi and her sportsmen, not for what he has received; now, therefore

Be it unanimously resolved, by the members of this Club, that Herb should be and is hereby recognized, commended and honored for his talents, leadership, services, activities and writing, and we hereby bestow upon him the title of Spokesman for Sportsmen of Mississippi.

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution, adopted by the members of this Club, be delivered to Herb and a copy sent to the Press.

This the 13th day of September, 1971.

#### DEEP CONCERN OVER PROPOSED JANE FONDA VISIT TO YORK, PA.

**HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this floor to express my profound distress over a report that comes to me that

Jane Fonda is scheduled to conduct an antiwar rally in my congressional district on October 1, 1972.

This permission, it has been reported, has been extended by the York City School Board of York, Pa. Yesterday I sent a wire to Mr. Darrell M. Nixdorf, president of this board, urging that this permission be promptly withdrawn. The wire follows:

This is a serious and urgent request for the York City School Board to immediately revoke the permission which, it has been reported, the Board has given to Miss Jane Fonda to speak on October 1, 1972, in an Anti-War Rally at the Hannah Penn Junior High School auditorium.

As a Federal legislator, I strongly object to this permission because Jane Fonda's conduct in Hanoi was both pernicious and unpatriotic. It has been reported that she strove to engender doubts in the minds of American servicemen who are serving in Vietnam and who are sworn to the duty of their country.

As a taxpayer interested in those citizens who are paying their tax money to support the Hannah Penn Junior High School, I feel it is a deep injustice and a sharp blow to the patriotic interests of these taxpayers.

For your information, I am, through public release, appealing to the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other like-minded patriotic organizations and individual citizens to petition the School Board for revocation of this permission extended to Jane Fonda.

I am an ardent defender of the Constitutional right of free speech. I am also a strong defender of the rights of tax-paying citizens who do not wish to see a facility supported by their tax money used for what many consider to be unpatriotic purposes. This is so whether it be Hannah Penn Junior High School or any other tax-supported institution concerned.

I urge the Board's immediate revocation of the permission extended to Jane Fonda for an October 1, 1972, appearance at the Hannah Penn Junior High School.

Mr. Speaker, there are some serious overtones to this matter, because the truth of the matter is that Jane Fonda made more than 20 broadcasts to American troops in the Vietnam area, urging that they refuse to obey orders of their military superiors. It is reported, for instance, that over Radio Hanoi, Jane Fonda appealed to American servicemen in the following manner:

Please think of what you are doing—have you any idea what your bombs are doing when you pull the levers and push the buttons?—how does it feel to be used as pawns?—tonight when you are alone ask yourselves: what are you doing? Accept no ready answers fed to you by rote from basic training—I know that if you saw and if you knew the Vietnamese under peaceful conditions, you would hate the men who are sending you on bombing missions—if they told you the truth, you wouldn't fight, you wouldn't kill—you have been told lies so that it would be possible for you to kill.

Mr. Speaker, it has been reported that Jane Fonda supports Senator McGovern in his race for the presidency, and I have appealed publicly to the Senator to turn her support aside, through an article in the September 10, 1972, issue of the Sunday-Patriot News. "Anyone who speaks derogatorily about the United States while visiting the North Vietnamese," I advised Senator McGovern, "can never be considered a patriot as she describes herself."

I have also, in a previous public statement indicated that while I will fight to

have Vietnam Jane retain her right of free speech, I will fight to the death to prevent her from doing this in an institution supported by taxpayers who fundamentally feel that her tact is unpatriotic and antagonistic to the best interests of America.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is simple and clear. Jane Fonda has the right of free speech—the tax-paying citizens of York, Pa., also have a right to challenge the use of their tax money for what they consider to be an unpatriotic and against-the-national-interest purpose.

#### SOVIET PARTICIPATION AT NATIONAL PARKS CONFERENCE

**HON. JOE SKUBITZ**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, it was my great honor and pleasure as well to have been a delegate to the second World Conference on National Parks which took place at Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks last week. The success of the conference is apparent from the wide participation by representatives from all over the world.

I was particularly impressed by the remarks of the Soviet delegates, V. V. Krinitskii, who heads the Department of State Natural Reserves, Ministry of Agriculture, U.S.S.R., and V. G. Korenevskii, Director of the Caucasian National Park Sothi, U.S.S.R.

These gentlemen presented the conference with three gifts from the people of Russia: A stuffed rare mammal found only within the Soviet parks, a carving of a European bison made out of the horn of the animal, and a book on the wildlife of national parks in Russia. In return, the United States presented the Soviet representatives with an Indian peacepipe, made from materials known to our park regions.

The exchange of knowledge and gifts by the Soviets and Americans at Yellowstone is another example of the important cooperation instigated by President Nixon's visit to Moscow. I sincerely hope that these friendly relations continue to grow in the atmosphere of peaceful competition that the President outlined as the crux of our future relations with the Soviet Union.

I believe my colleagues will find the remarks of the Soviet representatives as interesting as I. I include them in the RECORD at this point:

#### SOVIET DELEGATE REMARKS

Ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues: We are here to express our admiration with the efforts of great pioneers of the past and with those of our contemporaries who devoted all their gift and knowledge, all their courage and will to preserve for present and coming generations the outstanding natural beauty—the Yellowstone National Park.

Yellowstone National Park has set an example to many other countries in their job of establishing their national parks and natural reserves.

Research workers of the Soviet Union consider the Second World Conference on National Parks and Natural Reserves which is being held in the oldest National Park of the United States on the day of its 100th anni-



versary an event of greatest significance for the worldwide development of the conception and implementation of the National parks movement. The exchange of experience will certainly be of the greatest value for the participants.

The Soviet Union has always supported the idea of fruitful and friendly international cooperation in the field of environmental conservation.

On behalf of our Minister of Agriculture V. V. Matskevich, I have the honour to greet all the participants of the Second World Conference and to express my assurance that this Conference will successfully solve all the noble tasks it faces.

Let me congratulate on behalf of all the workers of natural reserves of the USSR the honoured staff of Yellowstone National Park with the remarkable event and wish prosperity to all national parks of the United States.

It is well known that the II International Congress of World Trust for Nature Conservation held in 1970 called for the establishment of 100 national parks in all countries of the world by the centenary of Yellowstone National Park. I am glad to inform you that since 1971, 5 natural reserves and national parks have been established in the Soviet Union and the establishment of 4 national parks more have been planned.

I have the honour to give the hero of the anniversary the presents made with great love and respect by the workers of Caucasian, Astrakhan and Voronezh natural reserves.

#### HOW A COMPANY CHANGES YOUNGSTERS' LIVES

#### HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to bring to my colleagues' attention an article appearing in the current September issue of *Nation's Business*. This article, entitled "How a Company Changes Youngsters' Lives," refers to the Washington Workshops Congressional Seminars, and how the Union Carbide Corp. has splendidly sponsored a number of bright and involved high school students to attend these fine seminar programs in American Government each year. I am sure many of my colleagues are already familiar with the unique work of the Washington Workshops Foundation, and I am happy to append this very interesting article at this time:

#### HOW A COMPANY CHANGES YOUNGSTERS' LIVES

To be a "Union Carbide scholar" is to soak up history and political science where the action is—at the seat of the federal government.

For the past three years Union Carbide Corp. has participated in the Washington Workshops Congressional Seminar program, picking up the tab for visits to the nation's capital by outstanding high school students in communities where the firm has offices and plants.

During eight activity-packed days the youngsters sit in on sessions of Congress, meet with Cabinet members and other high-ranking federal officials and stage a mock Congressional session of their own.

They are selected in a variety of ways, but generally through essay contests and student body elections. The company pays all expenses, including pocket money.

The seminar program was started in 1967 by Leo Tonkin, a Congressional aide who had

watched thousands of high school youngsters wander aimlessly around the Capitol on springtime field trips.

"I saw so many of them going through our great institutions of government and taking nothing back with them," he recalls. "I decided to do something about it."

The program has grown to the point where there are now nine sessions a year. The students are housed at Washington's Mt. Vernon College, which offers college credit to boys and girls invited to return and work in Congressional offices—as some are.

Some 30 of the students attending one seminar this summer did so courtesy of Union Carbide.

The company feels it is making a good investment. Howard J. Devol, manager of a Union Carbide plant at Dexter City, Ohio, reports:

"When we give to one of our worthy local charitable or service organizations, we get a sincere thank-you. But when a young man or woman comes back into your office after attending the seminar and tells you Union Carbide has changed his or her life—now that makes your week."

Says Union Carbide President William S. Sneath:

"These highly motivated high school students are learning that change is not only possible within our system, it is constantly happening. By coming back to our communities and talking to school and civic groups about their experiences, they are serving as ambassadors from America—to America."

#### SPECIAL BULK MAIL RATES FOR PTA'S AND NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT GROUPS

#### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, I introduced H.R. 16762 which would establish the eligibility of neighborhood improvement organizations and parent-teacher associations for special third-class bulk mail rates.

Under present Postal Service regulations, neighborhood improvement organizations are specifically denied the privilege of special third-class bulk mail rates. Some parent-teacher associations now qualify for these rates as nonprofit educational organizations.

The Postal Service has proposed new eligibility standards for nonprofit and educational organizations. These clearly indicate that the Postal Service intends to disqualify all PTA's from eligibility for these special rates. Postal officials, through correspondence and conversations, have verified this intent.

I think it is time to recognize and establish that parent-teacher associations throughout the country perform a vital function in educating and informing people on matters that concern them as taxpayers. Can anyone deny that it is educational for people to know how their tax dollars are being spent in educating their children?

In my own district, the Postal Service has revoked the special third-class bulk mail permit of the Minneapolis Parent-Teacher Association on the grounds that the PTA's function is not educational.

In Minneapolis, there are 34 neighborhood improvement organizations in-

involved in efforts to maintain and strengthen residential neighborhoods. They perform an important function in disseminating information to promote public improvements, encourage property upkeep and provide a "watchdog" service for zoning changes. There are thousands of such grassroots community groups throughout the country.

Postal regulations severely limit the communication function of these nonprofit groups.

Without the use of special third-class bulk permits, a heavy financial burden is placed on these organizations. Mailing costs under special third-class rates are now 1.7 cents per piece. Regular rates are 4.8 cents per piece—3.1 cents more per piece.

Congress can endorse the concept that an informed public is the core of our democracy by extending to neighborhood improvement organizations and parent-teacher associations special third-class bulk mail rates.

The text of my bill follows:

H.R. 16726

A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to establish the eligibility of neighborhood improvement organizations and parent-teacher associations for special third-class bulk mail rates, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter V of chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3686. Special bulk mail rates of neighborhood improvement organizations and parent-teacher associations

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this title or any regulation of the Postal Service to the contrary, for the purposes of any regulation of the Postal Service establishing the eligibility of organizations and associations for special third-class bulk mail rates, or for special or other bulk rates of any class of mail established after the effective date of this section, any neighborhood improvement organization or parent-teacher association shall be deemed an organization or association within the classes of organizations or associations eligible for such special third-class bulk mail rates of for special or other bulk rates of any class of mail established after such date."

(b) The table of sections of subchapter V of chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"3686. Special bulk mail rates of neighborhood improvement organizations and parent-teacher associations."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective at the beginning of the second calendar month which commences after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### COMMONSENSE BEATS VANDALISM

#### HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the cities of our Nation are under heavy pressure these days. Bad news seems to outnumber the good. This is true of the city of Detroit.

Here and there, nevertheless, victories are being won. They are often quiet victories, but they are on the plus side of the ledger. A recent WWJ-TV editorial describes one such success as a large corporation, which was contemplating relocation from the city, solved its vandalism problem with an application of commonsense.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the text of the editorial for the benefit of my colleagues:

#### COMMONSENSE BEATS VANDALISM

Good old fashioned common sense can solve a lot of problems. And here's an example where it paid off for a Detroit manufacturing company. The Fruehauf Corporation plant on the city's east side was beset with a problem of smashed windows and general vandalism last year. But, an application of common sense resulted in a plan to give the neighborhood youngsters something better to do than smashing windows. Fruehauf created a playground adjacent to the factory. And, with the help of Northeastern Branch of the YMCA, the Police Athletic program and the Martin de Porres School, they launched a summer program of supervised athletics and playground activity. The result has been an almost total disappearance of vandalism. In fact, the program is so successful, Fruehauf is planning to expand it on a year-around basis. We salute the Fruehauf Corporation and the neighborhood leaders who turned this into a success story. It serves as a shining example of how common sense solved a serious urban problem.

#### FARM GIVEAWAY PROGRAMS ARE A WASTE OF TAX DOLLARS

**HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, administration spokesmen have suggested the necessity of tax increases for next year.

After successive years of inflation and the highest national debt in our history—interest on which costs the taxpayer over \$20 billion a year—it should appear obvious that something must be done to reduce Federal spending in order to get the most out of the tax dollar. It is high time the Government gave some thought to living within its income, but rather than increase taxes, which currently eat up about 20 cents of every earned dollar, we should review those programs which erode tax dollars.

The President estimates that the Federal Treasury will take in \$245 billion under the so-called "full employment" budget. Certainly, that is enough to meet our needs.

Instead of dipping deeper into the pockets of the wage earner for additional taxes, let us cut the fat and waste and eliminate programs which serve no purpose.

While there are several programs which should be dropped, one of the first programs to feel the axe should be the farm "giveaway" program which subsidizes the huge landowners for not growing crops.

I am opposed to this program as I feel it is a disaster in three important aspects:

First, it is a waste of the taxpayers' money;

Second, it has not kept down the price of groceries;

Third, it benefits only those agribusinesses which are not in need of this kind of "welfare."

#### WASTE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY

For the 5-year period 1966 through 1970, the Department of Agriculture paid between \$2.5 and \$3.3 billion annually in direct payments to producers participating in the cotton, wheat, and feed grain programs. In 1970, 17 producers received between \$500,000 and \$3.5 million each; and over 300 producers received over \$100,000 each.

In 1970, to restrict what was quickly becoming "welfare for the rich," Congress limited to \$55,000 the amount of direct Federal payments a person could receive annually under the cotton, wheat, and feed grain programs.

This restriction was to save an estimated \$68 million a year. However, due to administrative decisions made by Agriculture Department officials, there was no significant reduction in 1971.

The General Accounting Office conducted a study of the arrangements made by some agribusinesses to avoid the intent of the law, and slip through the loopholes allowed by the Department of Agriculture. They revealed that agribusinesses were simply leasing part of their acreage, and thus collecting both government payments and rental fees.

One such scheme was in California.

According to the General Accounting Office:

A California corporation and its wholly owned subsidiary leased about 11,600 acres of cotton allotments, worth about \$2.5 million on the basis of 1971 direct payments, to five newly created organizations qualifying for 53 separate payment limitations. In addition to receiving lease fees, the corporation contracted with the organizations to farm the cotton for fees based on the cost to produce the crops. This latter arrangement, called custom farming, allowed the 53 individuals to receive Federal payments of about \$2.5 million without actually farming.

Another such method to avoid the intent of the law is the practice of forming partnerships, a la John Wayne. The GAO revealed a case in Mississippi which illustrates this technique:

Under the 1970 cotton program, a Mississippi farmer received about \$87,000 and his adult son received about \$46,000. Had the father made no changes in his farming operation for 1971, he would have qualified for payments, in the absence of the payment limitation, of about \$79,300. Application of the \$55,000 payment limitation would have resulted in reducing his payments by about \$24,300.

In 1971, however, the father and son combined their farming operations and joined with a son-in-law to form a three-member partnership. The partners increased the size of their farming operations by leasing additional cotton allotments and, as a result, were eligible, before application of the payment limitation for \$165,152 in 1971 cotton program payments. Because each of the three partners could receive \$55,000, or a total of \$165,000 a savings of only \$152 resulted.

These are not rare examples, Mr. Speaker. According to a March 1972 Department of Agriculture report:

Of about 1350 producers who received more than \$55,000 each in 1970 payments under the three programs, 1046, or 77%, changed their farming interests or operations for 1971.

#### GROCERY PRICES BECOME HIGHER AND HIGHER

While the taxpayer pays up to \$3.3 billion to benefit agribusiness, he does not receive the benefit of low-cost food and fiber.

Choice steers at Omaha rose from about \$29 per hundredweight in January 1971 to nearly \$34.50 in December 1971. In February 1972, choice steers at Omaha were at a 20-year high of \$37 per hundredweight.

In fact, food costs have increased by over 7 percent since the beginning of phase II in November 1971.

According to a study commissioned by former Secretary of Agriculture Hardin, food and fiber can be produced at reasonable prices without the Government subsidy. The report, issued on June 16, 1972, states:

We feel the agriculture industry can provide adequate supplies of food and fiber at reasonable prices and equitable returns to resources, including family labor, with a minimum of government intervention. Programs costing the U.S. taxpayers \$4 to \$5 billion annually are not needed for these purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the housewife who buys the family groceries knows that prices are high and getting higher.

This farm giveaway program cannot be justified by claiming to keep down the price of groceries.

#### CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayer is tired of paying his hard-earned dollars to the Government. He is especially irate when the program is of no benefit to him, but, instead, benefits the wealthy.

The taxpayer would like a cut in taxes, but that cut cannot come until we reduce Government spending.

Let us get the fat-cat agribusinessmen—who would not know a boll weevil from a weaved bowl—off the backs of the taxpayer. Let us dump the farm program, and save the taxpayer billions of dollars a year.

How can anybody possibly justify paying billions of dollars to agribusiness for not growing crops while millions of Americans are being denied an adequate diet? While the taxpayer continues to bleed? While the national debt climbs to almost a half a trillion dollars? And while the consumer pays record-high prices for groceries?

I cannot.

Therefore, we should put an end to this scandalous waste of money, and start spending tax dollars which benefit the general public, rather than the select few.

#### TRAGEDY AT MUNICH

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the shocking attack by the radical Arab



group on the Israeli athletes at the Olympics continues to add to the problems in the Middle East. Certainly, it is no justification for this attack. Many of the publications serving my district commented editorially on the tragedy, but none as succinctly or effectively as the Star-Tribune of Sunday, September 10, which I insert into the Record at this point:

#### TRAGEDY AT MUNICH

The entire civilized world recoils in horror at the senseless tragedy at the 20th Olympiad at Munich.

Dead in the aftermath of a naked act of political blackmail are 11 members of the Israeli athletic team. Going to the Olympics in the traditional spirit of clean, competitive sportsmanship, they became unwitting pawns in a power struggle that began before they were born.

That this bloodshed should have taken place at the scene of activities dedicated to furthering the cause of international brotherhood makes the massacre at Munich all the more reprehensible. Despite the savagery of the attack and the enormity of its toll in human lives, however, the plot did not attain part of its probable goal—the Olympics were continued.

Mankind mourns the loss of the Israeli athletes, struck down without warning in their young manhood. But their deaths must not be allowed to pass without complete realization of their greater significance. All nations must now become firm in the resolve that the world community will no longer tolerate acts of political terrorism.

The Olympic torch still burns, as it has for 80 years, a beacon lighting the way to better understanding among men of all nations, and now also as a silent symbol of mourning for the young Israeli athletes.

#### COLORADO-WYOMING OPTIMIST ORATORICAL CONTEST

#### HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, this year 100,000 young Americans took part in the Optimist International Club's oratorical contest. I am pleased to report that one of my constituents, Joe Tutchton of Lakewood, Colo., was the winner of the contest in the Colorado-Wyoming district. As a result, he has been awarded a \$500 scholarship to the college of his choice.

The Optimist's contest is one of a number of activities sponsored by that organization which encourages the youth of the Nation to give serious thought to the issues which confront the United States. This year's topic was entitled "Our Challenge: Involvement." I believe Joe Tutchton's winning entry contains a number of points which my colleagues will find of great interest. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I insert Joe Tutchton's remarks in the Record at this point:

#### OUR CHALLENGE: INVOLVEMENT

(By Joe Tutchton)

"Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by

war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage." These words were spoken eleven years ago by John F. Kennedy in his inaugural address. His words still apply to us today, for we are that new generation of Americans, and the time has come for that torch to light the way of progress.

But the way of progress has been blocked; blockaded by an undefinable force. Specifically, the force is apathy, and it is embodied in a movement existing in America today, that of the Silent Majority.

Let's look closer at this social phenomenon called the Silent Majority. Its habitat is cursed for the ills which it breeds. Resources upon which life depends are destroyed by those who depend upon them, yet the majority is silent. Poverty and starvation exist side by side with affluence and material wealth, yet the majority is silent. Racial prejudice and hatred exist in a land formed by a revolution against those very elements, yet the majority is silent. Why? Is it that our minds are dull and our tongues lame? I think not. The ability is there, but tradition and indoctrination have told us that involvement leads to personal disaster. Realize the reason is never given, it is merely stated as fact, and we accept it as such. But why is something which is never proven accepted on such a universal level? The answer is simple: We are trained not to become involved. Our parents tell us to mind our own business, and just take care of ourselves. Our educational system extends the indoctrination into apathy. Here we are taught that non-conformity leads to rejection by our peers. Advocating change is unwise because opposition to the power structure is futile. Thus the basis for the Silent Majority is well formed, and it becomes even stronger as we grow older. The original cause is lost in the past, and with it apparently, the solution. It would seem as though the torch of which John Kennedy spoke, the torch of involvement and action, has been extinguished.

However, the solution to the problem exists today. It would seem as though we have forgotten that this government is one "of the people, for the people and by the people". We run this government and it responds to the will of the majority. But if that majority is silent and refuses to act, the government has no direction. Now you may well be asking, how do the people control the government? An examination of the Constitution provides the answer. The right to vote enables us to determine the course of action our government will take. Remember that the majority rules, and it is their voice, truly the voice of the people, which will be heard. But also remember that before the majority can rule, the people must become involved. Therefore in the final analysis, the involvement must come on an individual level. It begins right here with you and me, and the challenge of involvement belongs not only to the majority, but to you as an individual.

Perhaps we can take a lesson from the younger generation. Through what could very well be the most important piece of legislation of this century, nearly eleven million citizens between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one will be able to vote in the upcoming elections. This has led to two major developments. First, the violent demonstrations on our college campuses have diminished; evidence that the young realize that their voice will now be heard. Second, politicians seeking office realize the importance of the youth vote and thus they have no choice but to listen to the voice of the young. Indeed, it is the young who must pass the torch to the next generation. They have earned our respect, for they have proven that if they are given responsibility, they will act responsibly. They have assumed their new power with a refreshing enthusiasm and vitality, and in doing so have shown us the way to meet our challenge of involvement.

MRS. SHELDON GLUECK, PIONEER IN STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, PASSES

#### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues will be saddened, as I was, to learn of the death of Dr. Eleanor Touroff Glueck, who, with her husband, Prof. Sheldon Glueck of Harvard Law School, was one of our Nation's foremost authorities on crime and juvenile delinquency.

Dr. Glueck, an educator and sociologist, and her husband, who is now the Roscoe Pound professor of law emeritus at Harvard, were pioneers in the study of juvenile delinquency and prison reform. Their first book, published in 1922, was the first extensive study ever conducted of the effectiveness of prisons and reformatories. It is still considered a landmark by authorities in the field.

My own sorrow at Mrs. Glueck's passing is tempered by many happy memories of my association with the Gluecks at Harvard Law School. I was privileged to be a frequent dinner guest at their home and then to host them during their visits to Hawaii. Consequently their views strongly influenced my philosophy.

I am submitting for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Washington Post which describes Mrs. Glueck's distinguished career. I am sure that my colleagues will join me and Mrs. Glueck's many friends and associates throughout the Nation, in extending deepest sympathy to Prof. Sheldon Glueck and his family.

The article follows:

ELEANOR T. GLUECK, 74, PIONEERED IN CRIME AND DELINQUENCY STUDIES

Eleanor Touroff Glueck, who with her husband, Sheldon, was a pioneer and a foremost authority in the study of crime and delinquency, died yesterday at her home in Cambridge, Mass. She was 74.

The Gluecks had worked for more than 40 years on research into the causes of crime and delinquency, with their work centered at the Harvard University Law School.

"All of us who have been connected with the law school share a sense of deep sorrow over the death of Eleanor Glueck. With her husband, Sheldon, professor of law emeritus, she carried out a lifetime of research and writing on the problems of juvenile delinquency of fundamental importance to the field. As a friend and colleague, she will be missed by everyone at the school who had the privilege to know and work with her," Harvard President Derek C. Bok said yesterday.

Born in New York City, Mrs. Glueck studied at Barnard College and the New School of Social Work. She received a doctor of education degree from Harvard in 1925.

At the time she was doing graduate work at Harvard, her husband was also doing graduate work in law, psychology and sociology.

Their partnership began with their marriage in 1922 and their first major work, "Five Hundred Criminal Careers," grew out of a Harvard seminar in which Glueck noted there had been no extensive study of the effectiveness of prisons and reformatories. They were given a grant to produce one.

Both taught in the old department of

social ethics at Harvard and later moved to the law school. Always working together on juvenile delinquency and crime subjects, they published the results of numerous studies, the best known of which was "Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency," a comparison of 500 delinquent with 500 nondelinquent boys.

A series followed later, resulting from a 15-year follow-up study of both the delinquents and non-delinquents, which was the first such follow-up in the history of criminology that included a control of nondelinquents.

They also set up social prediction tables in an attempt to identify potential delinquents at the age of 6 that were successfully tested in New York and Washington. They later identified potential delinquents at 2 and 3 years of age.

The Gluecks received the August Vollmer Award of the American Society of Criminology and the Beccaria Medal of the German Society of Criminology. Harvard awarded them honorary doctor of science degrees. They also received a gold medal from the Institute of Criminal Anthropology of the University of Rome.

Mrs. Glueck retired as research associate in criminology at the Harvard law school in 1964 after 36 years on the staff. Her husband became Roscoe Pound professor of law emeritus in 1963.

Both continued active research after their retirement. Their last joint work was "Toward A Typology of Juvenile Offenders," published in 1970.

Singly, Mrs. Glueck had written "Community Use of Schools," "Extended Use of School Buildings," "Evaluation Research in Social Work" and "Adventure in Japan."

#### BOTH PARTIES NEGLECT LATIN AMERICA

#### HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, September 27, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, I have long felt that we as a nation are sending far too much of our technical expertise and economic assistance to the far reaches of the world while we pay too little attention to our close neighbors in Latin America. With the permission of the Speaker I am inserting an editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Eagle which points out that the platforms of both political parties indicate a continuation of this neglect of our neighbors.

The editorial follows:

[From the Wichita Eagle, Sept. 19, 1972]

BOTH PARTIES NEGLECT LATIN AMERICA

The Republican party platform on Latin America covers about a dozen lines, most of which are vague generalities about common interest. The document states that Cuba is ineligible for readmission into the community of American states because it continues to foment revolution.

The Democrats gave Latin America only a little more space in their platform. They promise to reduce military assistance, end military intervention in domestic affairs, and they call for a re-examination of relations with Cuba.

This indifference occurs at the worst possible time. Latin America is seething with ferment which could create crisis at our very doorsteps.

Chile, Argentina, Paraguay and Panama are all likely blowup points, and no one in the United States is prepared.

In his four years in office, President Nixon has visited only Mexico, though he has received the presidents of Venezuela, Paraguay, Brazil, and Louis Echeverria Alvarez of Mexico.

Former Treasury Secretary John B. Connally has been sent to Latin America by Nixon as was White House Counselor Robert Finch. It has been nearly four years since Gov. Nelson Rockefeller made his celebrated tour of the Latin republics.

Since that visit the President has devalued the dollar, to which Latin currencies are tied. Brazil and Mexico weren't hurt much, but most other Latin countries went from bad to worse.

Chile appears near civil war and Argentina has economic and political problems. Panama is a potential powder keg because of the stalled canal treaty negotiations. There is also unrest in Ecuador, Bolivia, Uruguay and parts of the Caribbean where unemployment runs as high as 30 per cent.

Disinterest in Latin America stems from the fact that it is not a military threat to the United States. But there are 300 million persons living in Latin America, and the population is growing.

Trouble could erupt at any time, and if the U.S. acts as it usually does, nothing will be done until there is a genuine crisis.

It would be wise to alter the North American attitude toward Latin America. Because it is so near and because the ingredients of unrest are so plentiful, it should receive a greater percentage of this country's attention.

#### BEL AIR STABLES

#### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, horses and horseracing have long been an integral part of the life and spirit of Maryland, and particularly of Prince Georges County, which I represent.

Outstanding racehorses were bred in Maryland dating back to 1750, and our State has continued to produce prize-winning horses since that time.

At present, Prince Georges County houses several racetracks.

Also, horseback riding is a popular sport among people of all ages in Prince Georges County, including myself.

All in all, horses have played a substantial role in the development of the pastimes and customs of the county and the State.

One of my constituents, Mr. J. P. de Journette, has written a poem called "Bel Air Stables," which details the history of the stables and the great horses that it produced. The area that once comprised this horse-breeding farm is now a populous area of Bowie, Md. Mr. Speaker, I now insert the poem in the RECORD:

#### BEL AIR STABLES

(By J. P. de Journette)

American racing was cradled here,  
By the Bel Air horses who had no peer!  
"Othello", "Queen Mab", "Selima", "Spark",  
Were British blue-bloods who made their mark!

Arriving here 'fore seventeen-fifty,

They all were fast and strong and shifty!  
The "Selima Stakes" at Laurel is run,  
To honor this mare, the beautiful one!  
"Selim", great son of "Selima", was foaled,  
To beat every horse until he was old!  
A British stud "Spark", to Baltimore went,  
As a good present the Prince of Wales sent!  
The stud "Othello", because he was bold,  
For the good governor, got many a foal!  
The lovely "Queen Mab", in England was sold,  
And shipped to Bel Air to bring home the gold!

"Moll Brazen", "Miss Colvill", "Olde Bulle Rock",

Had fast "products" and put them in stock!  
"Tayloe's Bel Air two" then swept every turf,  
So surely and fast one drank to his birth!  
The back-stretch gallop and quarter-pole trot,

Won for the owner a lucrative pot!  
Thoroughbreds here could run with great rhythm,  
And leap from gates like prisoners from prison!

The Derby wreath of bright red roses,  
Was won just as our horse passed noses!

The oval blanket of black-eyed Susan,  
Is the Preakness prize for never losin'!

The Belmont Crown of white carnation,  
To many horsemen was temptation!

The Churchill Downs . . . the Derby Dome,  
Play each year "My Kentucky Home"!

"Maryland My Maryland", at the Preakness,  
A musical way of honoring sleekness!

The tuneful "Sidewalks of New York",  
Is Belmont's theme to toe your mark!

When "Galant Fox" thrilled every man,  
In the stirrups rode "Earl-ee Sande"!

The rhythmic "Fox" would rise and dip,  
Not often would he feel the whip!

His forward thrust made him a star  
Just as he raced across the bar!

In the "Run For Roses", Bel Air silks,  
Did billow around like Scotsmen's kilts!

A flowing blouse and "Ascot dot",  
Could grab the eye and stop the heart!

From nineteen-thirty to "fifty-five",  
The Bel Air stables then came alive!

The Derby, Preakness, Belmont Stakes,  
Were hard . . . but won, there were no fakes!

The Bel Air horse had class and pride,  
Awaiting the day he should ride!

With few his equal, fewer his peer,  
The thoroughbred steed who lived right here!

With the strong and famous Bel Air steed,  
The flirting filly came here to breed!

The Bel Air horses were the few,  
Who made your racing dreams come true!

So sleek, so strong, so fast, so slim,  
They were so quick, they looked so trim!

'Twas "Johnstown", "Granville", and  
"Nashua,"

"Gallant Fox", "Fairino", "Omaha".  
All aspired the Triple Crown,

But four took the "Double" round!  
And when they ran the "Equipoise",

All betting windows filled with noise!  
Now the Bel Air horse must long endure,  
His story by an old raconteur!

#### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

#### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistic—ally practicing spiritual and mental



genocide on over 1,757 American prisoners of war and their families.  
How long?

#### McGOVERN CREDIBILITY GAP

### HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, when GEORGE McGOVERN was nominated by the Democrats in July, he was heralded as a refreshing breeze in the political arena by his ardent supporters. They claimed that here at last was a man of his word who spoke only the truth, did not equivocate or vacillate, and would in no way lend himself or his campaign to what has come to be known as a "credibility gap."

No claim could be further from the truth.

Even during the convention, various instances of deception, duplicity, and double dealing were brought to the attention of the public. Shortly thereafter the Eagleton affair followed. No more striking example of the candidate's complete lack of candor with his followers, his inconsistency, his inability to make tough decisions, and his tendency to vacillate on important issues could be found than in his handling of this matter.

As a result of his very obvious maneuvering and political shenanigans, the candidate lost the invaluable commodity of believability before the campaign had really begun. Since then, this credibility gap has consistently grown. This has been repeatedly demonstrated by both the candidate and the members of his staff. Time after time they have issued contradictory statements and claims and were later forced to recant and attempt to explain these very obvious contradictions and evasions.

The point has now been reached where these problems of credibility are being attributed to respected members of the press by McGOVERN and his staff. An excellent editorial touching on this matter and raising very real doubts about the consistency of the candidate's record on Vietnam appeared in the Washington Post on September 28. As I believe it will be of interest to all of my colleagues, I would like to insert this article by John P. Roche in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### McGOVERN LASHES AT JOURNALISTS

(By John P. Roche)

Recently Sen. George McGovern got quite cross at the press, accusing the political reporters who have been covering him of impugning his "credibility." After all, the senator said modestly, credibility was his strong suit.

With specific reference to the deposition of Sen. Thomas Eagleton, McGovern said that, properly understood, his position had been quite consistent. He allowed that his contradictory statements on the Salinger mission were a blunder—but still not a reflection on his credibility. Indeed, he complained to *Newsweek* that "there was a little too much

effort to try to find some credibility problem. . . . Some of those syndicated columnists are terrible."

Sorry about that, but the fact is that the McGovern campaign has a credibility problem of the first magnitude. As one who puts respect for the truth above partisan loyalty, it seems to me an obligation to point this out. I'll do as much for President Nixon anytime, but when he says he is opposed to quotas, I believe him. To date, the main attack on the President's credibility has been based on a bogus quote, a statement he never made that he had a "secret plan" to end the war.

Take the whole matter of McGovern's record on Vietnam. By now, you might have the impression that he was the Patent Office "dove." But I was there and my political evaluation is based on a man's voting record, not on his speeches. True, McGovern was unhappy about Vietnam back in 1963, but how unhappy? He did not join Sens. Wayne Morse and Ernest Gruening in opposing the Tonkin Gulf Resolution in 1964.

But the war was escalated between 1964 and 1968 and every year the Senate was given an opportunity to register its views in a very concrete fashion: the vote on the Supplementary Appropriation to finance the U.S. military effort in Vietnam. In 1966, only Morse and Gruening voted "Nay." In 1967, a third man joined. George McGovern? No, Sen. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin. In that same year, Gruening introduced a measure to forbid the shipment of draftees to Southeast Asia except as volunteers. Only Morse and Gruening voted for it.

In 1968, McGovern again voted for the Vietnam Supplemental (Morse, Nelson, and Gruening opposed it), and for a measure that authorized the use of defense funds in Laos and Thailand for support of local forces (later referred to as "mercenaries" by the anti-war movement). True, McGovern was even more unhappy about events in Southeast Asia than before, and he made a number of anguished speeches. But how do you judge a legislator? By his speeches? Or by his votes?

If the Senator has credibility problems, his staff certainly compounds them. Experienced political reporters specialize in accuracy, and in my judgment it is inconceivable that, say, Dave Broder of *The Washington Post*, Max Frankel of *The Times*, or a number of others at the top of the profession, would invent incidents or put words in people's mouths. But in recent weeks we have seen members of Sen. McGovern's staff flatly denying stories by reputable reporters. Needless to say, the latter do not enjoy being called liars.

Arnaud de Borchgrave of *Newsweek* is, for example, surely one of the ablest foreign correspondents in the business, noted for his remarkable interviews with such varying characters as Charles de Gaulle, Mrs. Golda Meir, Gamal Abdel Nasser, Mrs. Indira Gandhi. In a recent column I cited his report of a session that McGovern's "ambassador," Abram Chayes, held with newsmen in Paris. Subsequently Chayes flatly denied the attributions—in effect, calling Borchgrave a liar. Then the world fell in on Chayes, who seemed to think nobody was at the meeting but Borchgrave; the New York Daily News obtained a full transcript from French sources and it sustained Borchgrave at every key point.

The point is that there is one way of maintaining one's credibility: by sticking to the truth.

As the campaign progresses, it appears highly probable that the McGovern credibility gap will continue to grow and contribute significantly to what already appears to be an almost certain political debacle for the Democratic Party.

#### TAX REFORM: A COMPLEX ISSUE

### HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, on few issues has there been more debate and less action than on the question of tax reform. Although the Congress has been discussing this issue for the past 2 years, there is no chance for securing passage of any substantial tax reform legislation before the end of the current session.

Because time is running out on the 92d Congress, and because tax reform is not likely this year, I have introduced legislation which would force the next two Congresses to undertake tax reform systematically and comprehensively. My bill, introduced in conjunction with Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the Ways and Means Committee—which has jurisdiction over taxes—would repeal all the deductions and exemptions in the income tax laws over the next 4 years unless the Congress reenacted them. Clearly, such drastic action would force immediate and broad reforms in the tax system.

#### WHAT IS WRONG WITH OUR TAX SYSTEM

It is not hard to find things wrong with the present tax system. The most obvious, and most often discussed example of inequities in the system, is the fact that last year 112 taxpayers with over \$200,000 in income paid no taxes whatsoever. It should be noted, however, that this is only thirty-six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the taxpayers in that bracket.

The middle-income taxpayer, making \$8,000 to \$10,000 pays approximately the same total percentage of his income in Federal, State, and local taxes as the worker earning \$25,000 to \$50,000. This figure may be somewhat misleading as far as Federal taxes are concerned because the most regressive taxes, sales and property, are State/local taxes, rather than Federal.

Nonetheless, it is obvious that the present tax system has failed to make our taxes truly progressive. Many millions of dollars escape taxation through so-called loopholes each year. Although it sounds comparatively simple to close those tax loopholes, in reality it is quite complicated.

Every so-called loophole was written into the law to serve some useful national purpose. Let us look at a few for an example:

One of the loopholes that has received the greatest adverse publicity is the lower tax rate for capital gains. The profits on property or stock held for more than 6 months is taxed at only 50 per cent of the normal rate for income. Thus a man making \$10,000 in profit from the sale of stock pays only one-half the taxes he would have if he had made the same amount in salary. This sounds inequitable. Yet this provision was written into the law to encourage people to risk their money in investments which would expand the

entire economy. After all, it was argued, he might have lost \$10,000 just as easily as gained it on his investment. He should be given an incentive to risk his money on expanding the economy rather than just leaving it safely in a bank. The assumption in this preference is that an expanded economy is of more importance to the Nation than the taxes would be. Congress must ask itself whether the advantage to the economy of this risk-capital is more important than the disadvantage of having one person pay a lower tax because of the way he earns his money.

One of the most widespread loopholes is the deduction allowed for interest payments and real estate taxes. This deduction is used by millions throughout the Nation and is obviously of greatest value to the middle-income homeowner. Its purpose has been to encourage home ownership on a massive scale, and it has been effective. Yet it results in a far larger housing subsidy for middle-income families than all the programs for lower income housing combined. Once again the Congress must consider whether the good to the Nation as a whole gained by encouraging home ownership is more important than the inequities this incentive puts on the poor who receive far less in the way of housing subsidies.

There is no question that the establishment of tax-exempt foundations and large gifts to charities have lessened the taxes paid by some of the very rich. There is also no question that these foundations and charities have undertaken thousands of worthwhile programs which the Government would otherwise have had to assume or which might have been entirely left undone. The cure for polio, for instance, was discovered because of charitable and foundation research grants. Billions of dollars have supported our colleges and universities; hundreds of thousands of poor students have been helped through school; hundreds of medical centers have been established; Williamsburg was developed as a living museum of our national heritage of freedom; agricultural research has helped fight hunger around the world. Congress must consider whether the Nation is better served by the very considerable contributions of private foundations and charities or whether these funds should be taxed at a full rate and let the Government assume the functions which charities have traditionally served.

It is estimated that 50 percent of the property in Manhattan is totally exempt from taxation because it is owned by churches, foundations, charities, and other tax-exempt organizations. Although property tax is primarily under the control of the States, the Federal Government is concerned as well. Congress and the State legislatures must decide whether the major contributions of the church to American society and to the stability of our family and hope life outweigh the additional tax revenues which would result if all their property and income were taxed.

Clearly, the questions of tax reform

CXVIII—2070—Part 25

are not simple. The closing of each loophole to encourage equity in the tax system will be balanced by disadvantages to society and the economy on the other side. The fact that reform is complicated, however, does not mean that it should be ignored. Although every exemption and deduction was established to serve some useful purpose, there is considerable question whether all of those purposes are still valid, and whether the goals of society might not be met in a more direct and equitable fashion. My bill would require the Congress to undertake this long-term study and would force it to take action on its findings. I am convinced that such a study should be undertaken immediately.

#### CAN TAXES BE CUT?

All too often discussions of tax reform leave the implication that, if the tax structure is reformed, each individual will have to pay less and only the rich and the corporations will assume the tax burden of the Nation. That simply is not true and any politician who implies such a falsity is doing a great disservice to the people and to the Nation. If taxes are reformed to close loopholes which no longer serve the national interest, the wealthy will undoubtedly assume a higher percentage of the tax burden. But the total costs of government are not likely to go down in the near future and tax increases are far more likely than tax reductions.

It may be of interest at this point to note that the United States has one of the very lowest tax rates of all the western nations. Taxes on the Federal, State, and local level combined consist of 32 percent of the entire U.S. gross national product. In Sweden, in contrast, 48 percent of the GNP is taxed; in Great Britain, taxes take 39 percent; in Germany and France, it is 38 percent. Of the 14 major industrial nations of the West, only three tax at a lower rate than the United States.

The costs of government will, almost inevitably, continue to increase. There are, of course, many ways to cut Government expenditures through the abolition of programs which no longer serve any important purpose; through improved efficiency, by cutting the mass of red tape which seems to surround so much of government; through better contracting procedures to insure that the Government is getting the most for its money; through improved budget procedures and controls, especially in the Congress. All these types of cost control should be undertaken. Indeed, the approval of an absolute spending limit as proposed by President Nixon would be a major step in that direction.

But these efforts will not, in the long run, significantly bring down the level of expenditures. We are demanding more and more from our Government. We are insisting that the Government solve more and more problems which we previously were willing to let slide—from poor housing and inferior education to cures for "incurable" diseases.

Pollution control is one obvious area

where expenditures will have to increase. By 1980 the Nation will have to spend approximately \$25 billion per year on water pollution control and \$14 billion per year on air pollution control to meet the standards we have set for ourselves in cleaning up the environment.

#### PROPERTY TAXES

Educational expenditures are rising rapidly and will continue to increase as we make the effort to bring our worst schools up to the standards of our best ones. The cost of our elementary and secondary schools has almost tripled in the last 15 years and the increase is expected to continue. Schools account for almost one-half of the funds spent by local governments.

This causes another very difficult problem for our tax system. For the most part local governments raise their tax funds through property taxes and, throughout the Nation those taxes are reaching such a high level that home ownership is being discouraged. At the same time, a number of courts have declared the property tax is unconstitutional as a school financing base since wealthier communities have a much larger property tax base and therefore can more easily finance education.

Obviously any broad scale tax reform must include a reform of our property taxes. Property taxes are not controlled by the U.S. Congress; therefore the Congress can do little about the level of these taxes. However, the Federal Government can, and should, undertake a number of steps to relieve the property tax burden. First, the Federal Government should assume a greater portion of our educational expenditures. At the present time less than 10 percent of elementary and secondary education costs are borne by the Federal Government. I strongly feel that this should be increased to at least 30 percent and perhaps higher. Though there is much need for reform in the Federal tax structure, as discussed earlier, this structure is far more equitable than the property tax and much of the burden should be shifted to it. It is important however to make sure that the Federal Government does not control the schools. Local control of the schools is a vitally important tradition and one which must not be countervailed where increased Federal support is provided.

The property tax is particularly onerous to the older citizens of the Nation who must live on fixed incomes. All too often in recent years we have seen our senior citizens forced to sell their homes because they could not meet the rising property tax costs. I strongly support proposals that give senior citizens with incomes of under \$6,000 a rebate on up to 75 percent of their property taxes through the Federal income tax system. It is unconscionable to force older people out of their homes for which they have worked for so many years because they cannot afford their taxes.

#### PAYROLL TAXES

Over the past few decades the Federal individual income tax has been reduced several times—in 1954, 1964, 1969, and 1971. At the same time, the payroll tax



for the social security system has increased drastically. Payroll taxes have increased from 2.5 percent of the GNP to 4.8 percent of the GNP in only 10 years.

The social security system has made enormous contributions to the Nation and has done much to make the lives of our senior citizens more secure. But these significant achievements should not blind us to the reality that the payroll tax which finances it is a regressive tax which puts the heaviest burdens on lower income workers. For the workingman making \$9,000 a year, the direct tax rate is 5.2 percent, while for the man making \$50,000 the direct tax rate is about 0.8 percent. This kind of payroll tax hits particularly hard at poverty level workers.

As the social security system continues to expand, I feel it is essential to reform this tax as well. Several possibilities exist—from supplementing the social security system through regular income tax sources to removing the wage ceiling on the payment of the tax and therefore lowering the total tax rate. Social security is an essential part of our national economy and every effort must be made to make it meet the criteria of fairness and equity. Congress must devote time and attention to undertaking this reform in coordination with its consideration of reform on the normal tax system.

W. M. "BILL" DAVIS

### HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of my district deeply regret the passing of an outstanding educator and humanitarian, W. M. "Bill" Davis.

Mr. Davis came to Knoxville in 1935 and served us well as principal of Fulton High School, Giffen and Lincoln Park Elementary Schools, assistant principal of Stair Technical Institute, and as a teacher at Rule High School. Mr. Davis, in addition to his demanding administrative duties, also found time to coach athletics at several of these schools. In fact, at one time Mr. Davis coached Billy Hitchcock, former major league baseball player and current president of the Southern Baseball League.

His interest in sports was further exhibited by his willingness to serve as a member of the board of control of Tennessee Secondary Schools Athletic Association, which governs high school athletics. Bill also found time to be active in Little League baseball and served as vice president of the Fountain City Recreation Committee.

Bill Davis' fellow citizens recognized the many contributions he made during his 47 years in education by electing him to the Knoxville Board of Education last year. Extremely active before his death, Mr. Davis was serving as president of the Tennessee Retired Teacher's Association, as treasurer and teacher at Broadway Church of Christ, as well as being a member of the Uptown Optimist Club.

All of us in the Second District are proud at having known this gentleman who after working his way through Lincoln Memorial College went on to serve his fellow man so well in the field of education.

Mr. Davis' wife and family are joined by all of us who are most thankful for the contribution he made to better education in our district.

I would now like to share the following September 22, 1972, Knoxville Journal editorial with all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

#### A SCHOOLMAN'S COURAGE

The career of W. M. "Bill" Davis in education extended over almost a half century and ranged from classroom teaching through administrative positions to a place on the Knoxville Board of Education. There could be no cause for questioning his genuine concern for the education of the young.

Parallel with this public service was his intense interest in clean athletics as another way of inculcating good traits of character in young people.

While all who knew Mr. Davis were bound to appreciate his attainments in those two fields, there are those who will remember him most vividly for the fortitude of his last days. Suffering from cancer of the lymph glands, which resulted in his death last Tuesday, he continued to take his part at meetings of the school board so long as he was physically able to be there.

It was plain to all who attended those meetings that "Bill" Davis was there under painful difficulty. He was barely able to speak, yet he did not spare himself. He seemed determined to perform his elected duty although he must have known the end was close at hand.

That was courage.

#### ISRAEL'S SILVER YEAR

### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 26, at 3:15 p.m., Newark Airport was the scene of a very special celebration. For Israel, described again and again in biblical scripture as a "light unto the nations" has entered her 25th year, and delegates from Jewish communities through New Jersey had come to initiate ceremonies commemorating this joyous silver anniversary. Twelve torches, one for each of the communities represented, stood before the eyes of all who came to participate.

The gathering was addressed by Deputy Consul General Jacob Aziyad of the Israel Consulate in New York. Stressing the importance of American participation in the development, life and future of the State of Israel, Mr. Aziyad presented the first torch to Mr. Martin Fox, president of the Jewish Community Council of Essex County, N.J. He stated:

This beacon light symbolizes Israel's progress over the past 25 years.

Following Mr. Fox's brief acceptance speech, Msgr. Thomas Fahey, president of Seton Hall University, Rev. Raul Stagg, general secretary of the New Jersey Council of Churches, Prof. C. Walter Heckel, former dean of Rutgers Univer-

sity Law School and national moderator of the Presbyterian Church, and Newark Mayor Kenneth Gibson expressed their thoughts and feelings on the significance of this occasion. Prayers were then offered by Rabbi Sidney of Kearny and Rabbi Zev Segal of South Orange, N.J.

Although I was unable to join in this beautiful ceremony, I sent the following statement to all those in attendance. I would like to share my words with you at this time:

Silver anniversaries are always very special occasions, filled with shared joys, fulfilled hopes, unforgettable experiences, indelible remembrances and deep dreams. This particular 25 year celebration of life is a milestone dear to the hearts of a great many individuals in all parts of the world. Combined with an outlook, and an approach implanted with realism, pragmatism and with the continued fight for survival, as Israel begins her silver year, she is a nation filled with the excitement, the vigor and the idealism to look forward confidently to building a future of positive goals and very special dreams. And, as she continues to move forward, I join my voice with all those here today to share her dream for peace and progress and to reaffirm my belief in the principles for which she stands.

PETER W. RODINO, JR.,  
Member of Congress.

AMTRAK'S INAUGURAL RUN TO MONTREAL, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1972

### HON. RICHARD W. MALLARY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. MALLARY. Mr. Speaker, Friday, September 29, is a day of jubilation in my home State of Vermont, because tonight an Amtrak passenger train is leaving Washington on its way to return passenger service to Vermont. When the "Montrealer" rolls into Brattleboro at 2:50 a.m. tomorrow morning, a new era in renewed rail travel will begin.

I want to take this opportunity to welcome Amtrak to New England and to Vermont in particular. I am sure that Amtrak will be pleased with the support awaiting it in Vermont. I am hopeful that this route through New England will be more profitable than other routes in the Amtrak system.

This route through New England came about as the result of massive efforts on the part of the people at the grassroots level in Vermont and New England and others with the interest of rail travel and New England at heart.

It is these people who worked so hard for the New England route to Montreal whom I would like to take this time to recognize and to extend my heartiest thanks. Some of the leaders in this effort are:

Joe MacDonald, a Vermonter residing in New York, whose many facts and figures and endless letterwriting made sure that Amtrak officials were aware of the advantages of the New England route and who aroused the lobbying instinct of Vermonters, and his very understanding employer, Continental Can Co.

Dorothy Chittenden Miller, Canadian,

Vermont, and Virginian, who wrote letters and organized people and letterwriting campaigns in both Vermont and Washington;

Carl N. Monaghan, St. Albans, Vermont legislative director of the United Transportation Union, another letter-writer and people-organizer;

Herbert G. Ogden, Hartland, who organized the Vermont Association of Rail Passengers;

Russell M. Stockman, Brattleboro, who organized a "passenger-in"—a sit-in demonstration—at the Brattleboro train station in April complete with packed suitcases;

Jack Stanton of the Burlington-Lake Champlain Chamber of Commerce;

Silas Carpenter of the Public Service Board in Montpelier;

James M. S. Ullman, chairman of the Rail Passenger Committee of the Greater Meriden Chamber of Commerce; and

Members of the Vermont press, particularly Gordon T. Mills, editor, and Betty Sproston, reporter, of the Burlington Free Press; Cliff Noyes, editor, and Ron Longo, reporter, of the St. Albans Daily Messenger; and Norman T. Rynnion, managing editor of the Brattleboro Daily Reformer.

Many thanks go to the thousands of people who wrote letters and made calls and who turned out to greet the experimental train in July and to the Brattleboro Union High School Band, the State Street School Band, the Montpelier High School Band, and the St. Albans High School Band for providing rousing music for the reception at their respective stations.

Vermont groups involved in the effort were the St. Johnsbury Chamber of Commerce, the Vermont State Chamber of Commerce, Windsor County Young Republicans, Woodstock Chamber of Commerce, the Vermont Association of Student Councils, St. Albans Chamber of Commerce, Burlington-Lake Champlain Chamber of Commerce, Montpelier Area Chamber of Commerce, conservationists, environmentalists, mayors, selectmen, and citizens of the towns along the route and other towns throughout Vermont.

Also, a great deal of appreciation goes to interested organizations outside Vermont including members of the Canadian Club of Washington, the Dartmouth Alumni Society, the Society of New England States, the Vermont Society, the McGill Society, the Railroad Historical Society, and the United States Eastern Amateur Ski Association.

This effort was totally a grassroots effort and I am pleased that these people will be rewarded for their efforts by now having the availability of train service to Montreal through New England.

#### THE NEED FOR JUSTICE IN SOCIAL SECURITY

**HON. ROBERT PRICE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the American people have come to accept

social security as an important factor in their plans for providing for their retirement years. These citizens, who work hard and pay a lifetime of contributions into the social security fund, rightfully look forward to the day when they can retire and begin to receive the fruits of their labors. Sadly, all too many persons approaching retirement find out that retirement, instead of being a time of fulfillment, will actually mean deprivation, since social security is not a retirement or pension system in that contributions to this fund do not automatically build equity. Under certain circumstances, persons can pay some 40 years' worth of contributions to social security and yet be able to leave nothing to their families.

Furthermore, a person can pay into social security for a lifetime only to find himself ineligible at the age of 65 to collect one thin dime's worth of benefits should he or she continue to work at a salary of a certain amount. Not only that, the same person who chooses to work after age 65 must continue paying social security tax on his or her earnings. I find these facts tragic and shocking.

In an attempt to bring greater justice to the social security law, I am today introducing a bill to abolish the limitation placed on the amount of outside income an individual may earn in order to continue to receive his or her social security benefits. It is my hope that the Congress will act quickly to pass this legislation.

The time has come for the American people to receive the benefits of their hard work—no longer should a person who at age 65 chooses to continue working be penalized for his initiative or efforts, both past and present, by not being able to collect that money which is rightfully his.

#### JEWIS IN RUSSIA

**HON. JAMES M. COLLINS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our country has always taken the lead in its advocacy for the rights of the freedom of the individual. Today, as we are building closer relations with Russia, I hope they can begin to understand better our concern for each individual.

I am concerned with the reluctance of Russia to allow their Jewish citizens to emigrate. They have recently raised the exit fees. The difficulty of accumulating capital in their Communist society precludes the opportunity of moving to Israel and a new life.

We Americans believe strongly that citizens who do not feel comfortable in our country should be free to go and live where they chose. I can well understand how these Jewish citizens who are hard-working and industrious would prefer to live in a country operated under a free-enterprise capitalistic system. I can understand these Jewish people, who are very religious, wanting to live in a country dedicated to God instead of a Communist state.

I believe so strongly that everyone should be entitled to live in the country

of their choice, that I submitted a bill in Congress for our Government to buy a one-way ticket for anyone who wanted to leave America. I believe that we owe it to our neighbors and fellow citizens to help them relocate where they would like to spend the rest of their life. For instance, Communists and radical socialists in America should be given an opportunity to relocate in Russia or any other Communist country. Since they are now in America we have the responsibility of paying for their tickets to move to that country.

I would suggest to our Russian neighbors that they adopt a similar policy with the Jewish people. These people believe in the free-enterprise business system and they have strong religious beliefs, so they will never be part of Communist Russia society. Instead of charging an exit fee, Russia should be a good neighbor and provide travel for the Jewish people to relocate.

#### THE U.N. TERRORISM SYNDROME

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as the U.N. announces plans to outlaw terrorism, one of its committees, "The Special Committee on—Independence to Colonial Countries and People," has tendered a report from three of its members who have been touring the jungles of Africa as guests of "terrorists."

This is the same stripe of U.N. pseudo-intellectuals whose decolonization committee recently censured the United States for colonial paternalism over Puerto Rico, yet could find no suspicion of Soviet colonization in Cuba.

Then we have today's announcement that: The United States has abandoned its claim to sovereignty over three groups of Caribbean islets off the Coast of Central America. Perhaps our leaders decision was reaction to a fear of new colonialism charges in the U.N. A better decision might have been to have the three islet territories apply for U.N. voting membership to help us out in voting strength. After all the U.N. is controlled by the colonial powers—the Soviet Union and Red China who keep every colonial vote they can manipulate.

Who ever heard of a Ukrainian election, army or aircraft—or that matter Byelorussian. Yet these Soviet colonies each has a U.N. vote.

Terrorism is where you find it—right now it is concentrated mostly in New York City at the U.N.

Americans may one day awaken and discover that the U.N. fathers are guilty of exercising colonial powers over the United States and our people—and terrorism, too.

The articles follow:

THREE-MAN REPORT HELPS ILLUMINATE U.N. IMBECILITY

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

NEW YORK.—It is no trick at all to demonstrate the hypocrisy of the United Nations: Witness the sanctions imposed upon Rho-



desia. To demonstrate the U.N.'s imbecility ordinarily takes a little longer, but a report has come recently to hand that happily simplifies the task.

This is a report submitted in July to the General Assembly's "Committee of 24," known formally as the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The report comes from the special three-man mission assigned to the situation in Portuguese Guinea.

Now, Portuguese Guinea does not rank large among the powers of the world. It is an enclave of 14,000 square miles—about the size of Connecticut and Massachusetts combined—carved out of the west coast of Africa south of Senegal. Its population was estimated last year at 560,000.

For the past 10 years, more or less, a guerrilla outfit known as PAIGC (Partido Africano da Independencia da Guine e Cabo Verde) has been trying to overthrow the established government.

The jungle struggle is important to the Communists, who are seeking to gain power; and it is important to Portugal, which is trying to hold power, but it has small importance otherwise. It is a fair surmise that most of the natives stand indifferent in the cause. Back in the jungle, such concepts as freedom, nationalism and self-determination are as shapeless as the river mud. The people will be ruled by the remote authority of Marcelo Caetano, a benevolent man, or by the more immediate authority of Amilcar Cabral, who is scarcely benevolent at all. So much for Portuguese Guinea.

On March 14, the Committee of 24 announced that its special mission would visit the liberated areas of Portuguese Guinea. The three gentlemen—one from Ecuador, one from Sweden, one from Tunisia—met the PAIGC leaders on April 2. They were led about the jungle for six days, more or less, and came out on April 8. Thereupon, they made their report.

Imagine, if you please, three Cub Scouts who have just come burbling home from their first overnight hike. They are filled with wow, golly and gosh! They heard a bear—or that's what the older boys said it was. They found a wildcat's track—or anyhow that's what it looked like. They walked for miles and miles and miles, and they got so tired. But they saw all these marvelous things, you know, like birds' nests and snake skins and funny rocks, and they sang songs around the campfire and it was awful spooky at night, and oh, mother!

That is precisely the tone of this ludicrous report. The three U.N. diplomats supposedly were inspecting "liberated areas" under guerrilla control, but clearly the areas were not liberated in any ordinary meaning of the word. The Cub Scouts hiked by night and hid with their leaders in the jungle by day.

Indeed, the U.N. investigators loved everything they saw or heard. Their report betrays not the slightest hint of a neutral objectivity. The rebels are depicted as heroic, brave, dedicated, hard-working, mature, valiant, peaceful and determined.

By contrast, the Portuguese are insane and hysterical fascists who find despotic amusement in the bombing of little children.

The outraged Portuguese have denounced this caper as "Mission Invisible." They strongly suspect that the guerrillas, with a nice black humor, led their bug-eyed and breathless guests on a merry chase through a few square miles of a border-area forest. For all the hard evidence produced by the U.N. mission, it could be so. The report, in any event, is a farce.

#### TWO NATIONS CLAIM BARREN ISLETS (By Jeremiah O'Leary)

A U.S. decision to drop its claim to three groups of islets in the Caribbean has precipitated emotional and war-like responses in

Colombia and Nicaragua, which both claim sovereignty over the pinpoints of sand and rock.

The islets or cays would be among the least significant land masses on earth, except for the patriotic surges they evoke in the Colombians and Nicaraguans. The groups are called Roncador (the Snorer); Serrana (bucolic poem) and Quita Suená ("Stop sleeping" or "Stay awake").

None is habitable, but there is a lighthouse on Quita Suená operated by the Panama Canal Co. and some navigational beacons on the other two.

The Quita Suená group is under water at high tide, and the largest land mass among the three, Southwest Cay in the Serrana group, is only one square mile.

After the United States signed a treaty with Colombia last week dropping its claims to the islet groups, Bogota announced it would send warships and dignitaries to take formal possession. In Managua, the government dominated by Gen. Anastasio (Tachito). Somoza threatened to put jet fighter patrols over the islets to keep intruders away.

Colombia, which has a small Navy of old destroyers, is more than 400 miles from the islets while Somoza's T33 jets have only about 150 miles to go from the Mosquito Coast bordering the Caribbean.

As far as Washington sources know, the battle has been in words so far. The State Department is hoping the two nations will settle the dispute without some military collision.

Acting Nicaraguan Foreign Minister Julio Cesar Alegria yesterday accused Colombia of "an act of force" in sending the military and parliamentary mission to the Cays.

Alegria added that Nicaragua did not intend to use force in the conflict "because there are many ways of defending the sovereignty through judicial channels."

He said the foreign ministry is also preparing a protest note to the United States against a State Department declaration that the Quitasueno Cay is submerged and therefore considered to be part of the high seas and not subject to any territorial sovereignty claim.

The protest will charge the United States with "intervention in the Nicaraguan claim that this cay is on the continental shelf of Nicaragua."

The problem, however, is a sticky one involving territorial rights. Nicaragua claims Quita Suená is part of the continental shelf, an extension of the mainland. Nicaragua has even granted an oil exploration concession to a California petroleum company.

Colombia contends the islets are part of the San Andres group, a prosperous vacation spot farther south which has been Colombian since the days of Bolivar.

The original U.S. claim was based on the 1858 Guano Act — American entrepreneurs once sold bird-droppings found there as fertilizer.

The land mass of the islets changes because of shifting sand, but U.S. sources list Southwest Cay at Serrana as having a maximum height of 32 feet. The Roncador group is 7 miles long and 3 miles wide while Quita Suená is 34 miles long and 13 miles wide.

#### VOTING RECORD

#### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, so far during the 92d Congress, 860 votes and quorum calls have occurred. I have answered almost 90 percent of them. It is

not practical to list each and every vote, although that information is readily available. Below are some of the more important votes I cast over the last 2 years.

#### AGRICULTURE

For a rural telephone bank.

For expansion of lending authority to farmer-owned cooperatives.

For pesticide controls where it presents an imminent hazard.

For a comprehensive rural development program to improve job opportunities, income, and the quality of life in rural America.

Against the Sugar Act, which increases the price of sugar to consumers.

Against the wheat and feed grains national reserve bill permitting the Government to purchase 325 million bushels of grain for storage.

Against reimbursement to domestic manufacturers for losses due to ban on cyclamates.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS

For lowering voting age to 18 in State and local as well as Federal elections.

For repeal of authority for emergency detention camps in time of war.

For Federal court enforcement of anti-job discrimination laws.

For equal rights amendment for women.

Against CBS contempt citation, which infringed upon freedom of the press.

#### CONSUMER PROTECTION

For establishment of a Consumer Protection Agency, Office of Consumer Affairs and Consumer Advisory Council.

For the Consumer Protection Act of 1971.

For amendments to the Flammable Fabrics Act.

#### CONGRESSIONAL AND CAMPAIGN REFORM

For limitations on campaign expenditures and strict public disclosure requirements.

Against tax checkoff for presidential campaign contributions.

Against automatic increase in congressional fringe benefits.

#### ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

For strengthening of Bald Eagle Protection Act.

For the Noise Control Act to curb its harmful effect on the environment.

For a 5-year moratorium on killing whales.

For the prohibition on hunting from aircraft.

For the expansion of the Water Resources Planning Act.

For the protection of wild horses and burros.

#### FOREIGN RELATIONS

For humane treatment and release of U.S. prisoners-of-war.

For the continuation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

For human rights for Jews in Soviet Russia.

For the Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement signed by President Nixon in Moscow.

For withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam as soon as possible.

For Presidential reports to Congress any time armed U.S. troops are moved to foreign territory.

## HEALTH

For free and reduced cost lunch programs for poor children.

For increased manpower for health professions, including nurses.

For National Cancer Attack Act.

For coordination of drug abuse prevention programs of all Federal agencies.

For sickle cell anemia national program.

For medicare coverage for disabled persons.

## LABOR

For an increase in the minimum wage.

For an end to the west coast dock strike.

## LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

For restricting obscene mail to minors.

For drug abusers treatment programs.

For the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act.

For an Institute for Continuing Studies for Juvenile Justice.

## MILITARY AND DEFENSE

For military pay increases.

For extension of the military draft limited to June, 1973.

For \$21.3 billion for procurement, research and development of weapons systems, aircraft and naval vessels.

For drug treatment for armed services addicts.

## SOCIAL SECURITY, PENSION PLANS AND BENEFIT PROGRAMS

For increases in social security benefits.

For increases in railroad retirement annuities.

For automatic cost-of-living increases and an increase in the outside earnings limitation for social security recipients, extension of coverage of medicare protection and a new program of aid to the needy aged, blind, and disabled.

For extension of black lung benefits to children whose fathers died of the disease.

For low-cost nutritious meals for the elderly.

For rehabilitation programs for the physically, mentally, or socially disabled.

## TAX, FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICIES

For increasing interest rates paid on government bonds.

For the extension of the President's authority to limit wage and price increases.

Against revenue sharing payments totaling \$30 billion.

## TRANSPORTATION

For greater marine safety in our ports and waterways.

For additional funding for Amtrak.

Against funding of the supersonic transport—SST.

Against widening of buses.

Against a \$250 million Federal loan guarantee to Lockheed Aircraft Corp.

Against \$315.5 million for high speed ground transportation research and development.

Against a \$2 million additional authorization for Transpo 72 exposition.

## VETERANS

For additional unemployment compensation payments for ex-GI's.

For drug abuse treatment for veterans.

For educational, vocational rehabilitation, and special training allowances for veterans.

## NIXON TRIP

## HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the Russian Jews is an issue that has become a basic part of the U.S. relationship with the Soviet Union and, unfortunately, an issue in the current political campaign.

The latest reports out of Russia indicate that the situation of the Soviet Jews is deteriorating. The new policy of demanding ransom for educated Jews who want to emigrate to Israel has been coupled with increased harassment of individuals. In one report the atmosphere was described as "prepogrom."

While all of this has been going on the administration has claimed that the situation of the Russian Jews has never been better. In fact, one spokesman claimed the President's recent trip to Russia resulted in a great improvement in the Soviet Government's treatment of its Russian citizens.

However, it has been learned that the President's trip was actually a disaster for the Russian Jews.

In a recent article in the Philadelphia Inquirer, Richard Reston, quoted a secret memorandum now being circulated in the White House which outlines just how bad things really are for the Russian Jews.

At this time I enter Mr. Reston's article into the RECORD:

NIXON TRIP CALLED DISASTER TO SOVIET JEWRY  
(By Richard Reston)

WASHINGTON.—A confidential memorandum now circulating in the White House says that President Nixon's spring summit conference in Moscow has compounded the problems of Russian Jews.

"It is the conviction of the Soviet Jewish leadership that the President's trip was a disaster for them," a copy of the memorandum says.

"They expressed the opinion that the United States seemed more interested in selling corn than in protecting human rights and individual freedom."

The document also warns of growing Jewish pressure on the United States to use economic pressure on the Soviet Union to obtain better treatment of the Russian Jewish population.

The private analysis of the administration's Soviet policy comes at a time when Mr. Nixon and the Republican Party are wooing Jewish votes and campaign contributions.

The memorandum was submitted to the White House from outside the government. It was written by Leonard W. Schroeter, a Seattle attorney and an employee of the Israeli Ministry of Justice from 1970 until earlier this year.

Schroeter visited the Soviet Union to look into the status of Soviet Jewry after Mr. Nixon's trip.

Schroeter particularly was interested in the new education taxes imposed on those who want to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

The Seattle attorney had lengthy conversations with Russian Jewish leaders and intellectual dissidents, his document says.

"A view reiterated to me by Jewish leadership . . . was that they were living in the most difficult time they have faced in recent years," the memorandum declares.

"They attribute the difficulty of their situation to the recent visit of President Nixon."

At the Israeli embassy a spokesman said, "Everything stated in the document is correct. Schroeter saw the right people and the information is excellent."

"I was advised of . . . their belief that the Soviet climate for Jews is unusually perilous," Schroeter's memorandum says.

"They feel that there is grave danger of government-inspired and/or spontaneous physical attacks upon the Jewish population . . ."

"Prior to (the Nixon) visit there were wholesale preventive arrests and the imprisonment of Jewish leaders without explanation in the jails of distant cities and the house arrest of scores of others."

"These men were not released until after the President's visit ended and they were told that their arrests were occasioned by the President's trip."

AN INTERVIEW WITH MR. JOHN C. HOFFMAN

## HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House may recall that it was my privilege last June to address commencement exercises for the Capitol Page School.

I suppose it is no secret that I have a special feeling for these fine young men who serve this House so well.

In the next edition of the Courier, the school's newspaper, there will appear an interview of the page school principal, Mr. John C. Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman, as I read it, has done an outstanding job of administering the educational programs of our pages, and at the same time providing an outstanding example of quality leadership for those in his charge.

It is my pleasure to present herewith for publication the Courier interview:

## INTERVIEW FOR CAPITOL PAGE NEWSPAPER

Mr. John C. Hoffman, Principal of the Capitol Page School, finds time every summer to select and coach a fifteen year old Babe Ruth All Star team from Prince Georges County and this summer his team won the Maryland State Championship, traveled to Canada to win the Mid-Atlantic championship then to Pine Bluff, Arkansas to place third in the World Tournament. In overall tournament competition the team won 11 out of 13 games. Among those on hand to congratulate the boys at Arkansas was Sen. John L. McClellan. Mr. Hoffman has been very active in working with youth having been a coach in baseball, basketball, and football for over thirty years.

Among his recognitions was a testimonial given by over three hundred of his former athletes, the Prince Georges County Junior Chamber of Commerce Physical Fitness Leadership Award, the Governor of Maryland's Distinguished Citizenship Award for outstanding contribution and devotion to the instruction, guidance, and training of the youth of Prince Georges County and the Metropolitan Area demonstrating integrity and ability, the Washington Amateur Baseball Association Award, the Prince Georges County Boys' Clubs Board of Directors' Award in appreciation for many years of coaching youth, the Home Plate Club Award in recognition of dedication and contribution to the welfare of sports in the Greater Washington Community. In 1970 Mr. Hoffman was



honored with Life Membership in the Metropolitan Baseball Umpires Association which officiates Atlantic Coast Conference, Mason-Dixon, and other colleges, high schools, and sandlot baseball games. (He has umpired the annual Republican-Democrat baseball game for several years.)

As well as having been an outstanding player, manager, and coach, Mr. Hoffman has been a dedicated educator in the D.C. Public Schools. After being discharged for wounds incurred in World War II he matriculated at George Washington University to receive a Bachelor of Science Degree then Maryland University for a Masters Degree in Guidance and Personnel and joined the D.C. Public Schools in 1948.

He has chaired numerous committees on the exceptionally gifted and the mental retardate. He received recognition for volunteer service as a parole advisor at a District of Columbia Training School for Boys and was honored with Life Membership to the District of Columbia Congress of Parents and Teachers. He was honored by the D.C. Bar Association in 1963 for authoring the booklet titled, "But Your Honor I Didn't Know." His unit based on the booklet which explained laws apropos to juveniles was used in the D.C. Public Schools. He has lectured in the field of juvenile delinquency and special programs for emotionally disturbed children and his more recent quest in his perpetual pursuit of knowledge to best guide his students at Capitol Page School was a three day trip to the U.S. Air Academy to study their academic and guidance program.

This is our principal!

#### PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION SHOULD NOT BE INCREASED

### HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means on September 27 reported favorably and without amendments the bill, H.R. 16810, to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limitation and to place a limitation on expenditures and net lending for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

I call to the attention of the Members of the House the dissenting views to this legislation of Congressman JAMES BURKE, Congressman RICHARD FULTON and myself, and ask that these views be placed herein in the RECORD:

DISSENTING VIEWS OF HON. JAMES A. BURKE, HON. RICHARD FULTON, AND HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

Someone else on this committee recently observed that "It may seem anachronistic to oppose on principle a bill with something for everyone, but it is essential that we do so." Similarly, it may seem the height of folly to oppose, on principle, a bill which everyone is for, at least in theory. Certainly, everyone seems to be against inflation and for curbing reckless spending. The undersigned would certainly insist on being included in this group. However, the decision by majority of this committee to include in the debt ceiling legislation before us a spending ceiling of \$250 billion this fiscal year without any restrictions or direction as to where the necessary cutbacks will occur raises the most serious constitutional questions which this Congress will ignore to the lasting detriment of future Congresses and to the peril of the very Republic itself.

Now at first glance, the concept of a spend-

ing ceiling legislated by Congress and signed into law by the President cannot but appeal to anyone concerned with inflation and its toll. There is no question but that certain Federal programs, in fact almost all Federal programs, have been growing like Topsy and seem to have nowhere to go but up. However, these Federal programs are growing because Congress and the President have passed and signed legislation to authorize them to grow and provide the necessary funding. Now, no one who has ever observed Congress in action has ever accused it of moving swiftly or recklessly in the overwhelming majority of cases. One must, therefore, conclude that all these funds are being spent only after the most thorough examination, review, and deliberation in the executive departments that recommend the program funding levels, in the various authorization committees of both Houses, and on the floor of both Houses; then again in the various Appropriations Committees of both Houses; the floor of both Houses and finally, in the White House. Months of review have gone into these programs involving cross-examination of Government department witnesses, with each program having to defend itself inside and outside executive sessions. In fact, lately the lament has been that Congress has been taking more and more time each year in getting through the budget requests, with continuing resolutions and delayed funding becoming the order of business in the last few years.

In other words, spending has been authorized and appropriated only after all the various and numerous programs competing for the funding available have been thoroughly reviewed and justified themselves for a piece of the pie. While there are constituencies which are vitally interested in particular programs and wage a continuing lobbying effort for the continuance and increased funding of any given program, there are also lobbying groups and vitally interested constituencies behind new programs that are competing with existing programs for the funding available. What it all boils down to is a matter of priorities as the various authorization committees see them and as both Houses in passing authorizing legislation, see them. Even then, we all have a second crack at determining a particular year's actual level of funding when we go through the appropriations process. If Congress is not about its proper business in reviewing and establishing priorities after considering executive department recommendations then we do not know what Congress true business really is. We, the representatives of the people, having raised the revenues, have incumbent upon our shoulders the responsibility to pick and choose between the various competing programs, to determine what the real problems facing this Nation are, in 1972 and 1973, and then what funds are available to deal with them.

No one can deny we have been overspending. We have been trying to fund that little bit extra each year and in the process, we have raised the national debt and we have, no doubt, contributed to inflation. The solution we are now being offered—and in its very simplicity, it is bound to be attractive—is if Congress cannot discipline itself and exercise restraint, put a legal clamp on the funds that can be spent this fiscal year, whatever Congress appropriates. Quite apart from rejecting the implication that Congress alone is somehow to blame and the Executive is powerless in all of this, and ignoring the very valid arguments presented by numerous economists for stimulating the economy out of its doldrums and relying on effective wage and price controls to curb any inflationary side effect, we would do well to examine some of the more serious implications contained in this simplistic approach. When we do we find, as is so often the case with simplistic approaches to difficult problems, there are real dangers and serious risks

involved. While we are not in disagreement over the wisdom of curbing spending, where good men fail to agree, even with the best will in the world, is where the ax should fall and how much. This concern cannot be dismissed by those who want to curb spending as just a messy detail. The problem is all too central to any budget consideration. In authorizing a ceiling without resolving this dilemma, we in Congress are doing nothing more than authorizing someone else—the executive department—to make the decision for us.

While Congress has been under increasing pressure to do something to halt rising spending, we have at the same time been under attack for abdication our constitutional responsibilities. Students of government argue that Congress is no longer an equal partner in governing but has increasingly become little more than a rubberstamp and a weak sister to the other two branches. If the tragic war in Southeast Asia has taught this House a lesson in the past decade, it is what can happen when Congress abdicates its responsibilities and its right to be consulted as an equal partner in the field of foreign affairs and the conduct of war. In the past few months, the distinct impression has gained credence that even those who still could not bring themselves to vote for an immediate end to the war, would never again allow themselves to be put in a position where they were forced to make such a difficult choice, where they felt so powerless to influence the course of events or where they had to support an unpopular war out of loyalty to the President even though they had never had a chance to declare it or to determine whether our national interests really required our involvement in Southeast Asia.

Another issue which has been a source of disgruntled feelings of late has been the impounded funds controversy. Studies have been made, speeches have been given, special orders have been taken—all to focus attention on another area where the executive department seems to be encroaching on congressional power. While those in the executive department can point to a silence in the Constitution on the question of whether the Executive must spend every penny Congress appropriates and can cite past instances, in recent years, under previous administrations where funds have been impounded, there can be no denial that the practice has become more a way of life and reached higher figures than ever before in our history. As far as we are concerned, in the very consistency with which funds have been impounded, in the very fact that it has become a way of life for the Executive, the impounding controversy has its most serious implications. At any given time, every Member has been concerned with the dollar amounts involved and impounding's impact on a particular program as it affects his district; but important as this concern is, it does not begin to approach the concern we all should feel over the long-range Constitutional implications of impounding as a daily tool of government.

We have witnessed in the past several years the growth of a new center of power in our Government. We are referring to the Office of Management and Budget. When the proposal was made to consolidate the budget authority and its management in one advisory office in the White House, there were few Members of Congress who felt that this was more than a routine Government reorganization bill which would tidy up some loose ends and give a sense of direction and control to the Chief Executive Officer, the President, over the far-flung bureaucracy. But the OMB has not stopped here. Not satisfied with establishing its suzerainty over the executive department, the OMB has taken on the airs of a super review agency over the decisions of Congress and in the process, we are witnessing a shift of power from Congress to the Executive.

If our Constitution enshrines any role in the political process as the prerogative of Congress, the representative bodies in our Government, it is the power of the purse-strings, the power to raise and collect revenue and power to determine how those moneys should be spent. The President either approves or disapproves at that time. What we are witnessing increasingly, however, is that after Congress decides, and the President signs, its decisions are reviewed by that new super-agency, the OMB. An agency over which Congress has no control, seems to be exercising considerable control over Congress. Granted, one can never be precise about such matters as this and one can search the Constitution in vain for clear lines between the Executive and Congress, one would have to be positively blind not to see that the intent of our Founding Fathers in framing the Constitution was to give the power of legislating national priorities and channeling the limited funds available, to Congress, not the Executive. One would also have to be insensitive to tradition to see that this is the way it has worked, by and large, for the nearly two centuries we have been in business. One would also have to be extremely naive not to see the clear trend in the last 4 years or the last decade goes against the spirit and we would argue, the letter of the Constitution. Carried to its logical and absurd conclusion, we could theoretically be faced with the situation where the executive department chooses not to spend a single penny on what Congress deems to be the national priorities.

To some extent, Congress has been an unwitting participant in this erosion of authority in allowing too much leeway to Government departments in determining priorities within certain areas and permitting funds to be allocated as deemed appropriate. What has happened is that this discretion has in many cases, left the Government departments at the local level and filtered upward to that new center of power, the OMB, with the resulting irony that discretion originally intended by Congress to be exercised by an agency in the field familiar with local needs and conditions has been absorbed by that most bureaucratic of all agencies, tucked away in the Executive Office Building, the OMB. The fact of the matter is, that the OMB with its bookkeeping mentality and its double-entry approach to things is not capable of either appreciating or reflecting genuine human needs where they exist. This Congress is and it has this responsibility. We have no business abdicating authority such as this to a bank of computers and calculators whose sole criteria in allocating funds are balance sheets and ledgers. We were elected to represent people and their problems, to respond to them when help was needed. The more decisions we defer to the OMB, the more we are abdicating our responsibilities to the people we were elected to represent.

What is the problem? Are the decisions too difficult to make or the political risks too great? Have we decided we would rather have the tough decisions made for us by some back room computers and when the electorate faces us, we can simply commiserate with them and say, "The decision was not ours to make, but rather the OMB's"? The decision is ours to make and not the OMB's. And anything to the contrary constitutes abdication of power and responsibility.

If this Congress wants to do something about inflation, then we can do it ourselves, program by program. And we are convinced we should be doing more about inflation. If we want to have a \$250 billion ceiling this fiscal year, then it is up to us to make the cuts where they must be made, to tell our constituents what we have done and if it displeases them we will be the first to know. That is what we were elected to do. If the voters make it clear to us they do not want to see programs cut back, and the

majority feeling is for deficit spending, then we might legislate differently. We know the same ones who want to control inflation and put a lid on spending are the same people who will be the first to write when their favorite program of Government spending is cut back. Everyone wants somebody else's favorite program to be reduced as long as their own is left untouched. But this is the way it has always been in a democracy. This is the way it has been for the last 200 years. If these problems and dilemmas are too great for any Representative in this House, then he should resign his seat rather than resign his authority to a Federal agency. He should abdicate his position rather than abdicate his responsibility to a Federal agency.

In voting to put a ceiling on spending without specifying where the cuts are to be made or where they are not to be made, Congress is abdicating its power. Congressional authority is being further eroded. The executive department will be stronger tomorrow because of it. The agency which has become a past master at impounding will become the supreme master of Government spending. The emergency will not be lifted next month or next year. We could well be establishing a precedent today which will characterize the next decade or more of Government. We are creating today a new czar in the executive department—only this time over all Government spending. Now, when Congressmen return home to their districts they can tell their constituents to write to the OMB to see how much money will be available for their constituents' problems this fiscal year. Congress can recommend, but the OMB has the final decision. If this bothers anybody, it should. Because without being melodramatic and without exaggerating one iota, we will be taking one step further down the road to government by decree, rather than by law; government by an all-powerful Executive, rather than by representative government. Dictatorship, no matter how benevolent, is not what this Government is supposed to be.

One of the reasons periodic review of requested increases in the national debt was favored was that it was felt that the national debt was getting out of control.

In other words, Government spending had to be subjected to greater scrutiny. It also was a way for Congress to become actively involved every 3 or 4 months in budget review and economic planning. It was a way of examining what the OMB and the Council of Economic Advisors were up to, how accurate the administration's forecasts were, and how successfully they were managing the Nation's economy on a day-to-day basis. We considered the national debt early this session, we considered it again in June, and now we are considering it again. However, we will be defeating our whole purpose of riding herd on the managers of our economy by attaching this insidious, nefarious rider to this latest debt increase. It is not bad enough we are giving the administration a comfortable cushion to operate the economy for the next few months. We are now giving the OMB power to control spending. Between the cushion we will be giving them with the increased debt ceiling and the power to keep spending below \$250 billion, we think we are going to be in for a new era of misleading statistics. We are going to be hearing such glowing reports about keeping within the debt ceiling and cutting back deficits that anyone is going to look good managing our economy. This kind of freedom of maneuver and margin of error goes far beyond the bounds of prudent generosity in our opinion.

It is true, no one need worry about this problem much before November. We are not going to see any big cutbacks in any of these programs before election day. But wait until after the election and you will have only yourself to blame. Several amendments to the spending ceiling, were offered in com-

mittee, providing that no expenditure cuts shall be made in the areas of social security, aid to the blind, disabled, and aged, child welfare, health, and veterans benefits. Every one of these efforts met with failure. The mood was: give it to them, no strings attached.

What more power do we have to give the President? The President already has the power to make the budget requests. The President already has the power to veto both any authorization bill and any appropriation bill. The President is already impounding funds, whether he has the authority or not, and now Congress is prepared to cede yet another grant of authority to the executive and give it legislative authority to determine which programs will be fully funded and which programs will be substantially reduced. Surely, there are committee chairmen left who feel capable of wielding power. Surely, there are Members left in this House who feel they would like a say in what programs get what money. Surely, there are Members left who are concerned about implications and what the future has in store.

As for those who argue that previous spending ceilings failed to work because certain programs were exempted from the ceiling, it is important to note that what was being exempted before was the mammoth Defense Department budget which because of the conflict in Southeast Asia proved to be essentially open-ended—in fact, supplementary appropriations were necessary. Insofar as Defense Department spending received more funding than any other domestic program at that time, it is not surprising that any spending ceiling which specifically exempted that Department from a spending ceiling was found to meet with little success. Not a surprising development when one considers, in the view of most economists spending for the war in Southeast Asia has been one of the major contributors to the inflationary spiral that has plagued this country in the past several years. The most often discussed list of exceptions to the spending ceiling in committee did not include the Defense Department budget and even if it did, the changed scale of our commitment in Southeast Asia today has made this budget less open-ended than was previously the case.

It must be underscored, too, that we propose no exception to the \$250 billion ceiling. We do propose and recommend Congress insist on excepting, within the limit, some spending which may be cut.

Congress' reluctance to exercise its legitimate authority and specify where the cuts should be made or should not be made is even more difficult to comprehend when one considers how simple a matter it would be to legislate along these lines. There are a variety of approaches which would achieve this objective, none of which would overtax the technical skills of any committee's staff in drafting legislation. Whether the bill specified the dollar amount of cutback in any given program, listed those programs which would be exempted, or stipulated that all programs would be reduced by the same percentage to insure even distribution of the impact of the rollback—Congress would at least be addressing itself to its responsibilities in this area. Executive department assurances that rollbacks will be accomplished in a fair and equitable manner are no substitute for Congress facing up to its own responsibilities. We all know where government by executive department assurances has taken us in the not-too-distant past.

Thus, the Constitutional issues clearly outweigh, in the opinion of the undersigned, any monetary relief which might be gained from the imposition of a no-strings-attached spending ceiling, constituting as it does a blank check grant of congressional authority to the White House. Each of the undersigned recognizes the need for a spending limit if inflation is to be successfully curbed. How-



ever, there are perfectly practicable ways of legislating such a spending limit with proper constitutional safeguards. The committee chose to avoid making the difficult choices and instead chose the path of least resistance. Consequently, we have no choice but to oppose this legislation as currently drafted. In its present form, the spending ceiling provision of this bill stands an excellent chance of becoming the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution of the seventies in domestic affairs. Future generations of students, in analyzing the committee's bill, will refer to it as the day when Congress abdicated its constitutional responsibility for controlling the purse strings.

JAMES A. BURKE.  
RICHARD FULTON.  
JAMES C. CORMAN.

#### DIVIDING COUNTIES BETWEEN CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

#### HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the chief problems that has arisen during congressional redistricting in my State as well as in others is that of divided counties. Many difficulties arise when counties are divided between congressional districts that could well result in less service and inferior representation of constituents by their Congressmen.

In order to better understand the situation and to try to gauge the impact of divided counties, I directed my staff to contact other Members of the Texas congressional delegation to elicit their views. The following is a summary of the findings:

#### REPRESENTATIONAL PROBLEMS RESULTING FROM DIVIDING COUNTIES BETWEEN CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

Sources of Information: The following information has been collected from talking with staff members in the offices of seven Texas congressmen (Mahon, Burleson, Teague, Kazen, Wright, Pickle, and Eckhardt). These congressmen's districts include both urban and rural areas, and three of the districts presently include a portion of a county that has been divided among other congressional districts.

Time devoted to county work: Congressmen Teague and Kazen's offices estimated that their staffs spend approximately 15 to 20 percent of their time serving the interest of some county-wide organization or governmental unit. Eckhardt's office estimates 10 percent of its time is spent on county work. The other offices felt unable to make a rough estimate of time devoted to county work, instead characterizing such work as "continuous" or involving "a great deal of time".

Problems arising from divided counties: It was generally agreed that dividing counties would at least result in inefficiency and delay for county organizations needing congressional assistance. County groups would initially be faced with the dilemma of deciding whether to work through one or both congressional offices. If the organization should decide that both offices must be consulted, there would be a resulting duplication of time and effort in contacting more than one office. Such duplication could be particularly hard in rural counties. County commissioners and other county governmental units can seldom afford specialized or large staffs. Requiring them to work with two or three congressional offices could be unnecessarily

time-consuming and detrimental to the best interest of the individual voter. Since the majority of the requests for assistance will involve the congressional offices serving as intermediaries between the county organization and some federal agency, it will be extremely important for congressional offices to work together to insure that duplicate or possibly even conflicting efforts are not made by the two offices. This means constant checking by one office on what another office is doing.

Even if relations between the two offices are good, such constant checking will be inefficient and confusing, resulting in a decrease of service to the constituent group. If the representatives are of divergent political philosophies or from different political parties, their offices could end up working at cross purposes rather than working together to serve the country.

Often, requests for services will be made to the congressional offices located in the district rather than to the Washington offices. In large urban areas where two district offices may be located in the same federal building, the problems of two district offices coordinating their efforts will essentially be the same as those for Washington offices. However, in rural areas the communications problems will be further complicated by the fact that offices may be located several miles apart (particularly in Texas), and opportunities for meetings with personnel of two offices will be limited. Communication will have to be primarily by phone or mail, perhaps increasing the opportunities for misunderstanding or mistake.

Should a county group decide to work through the office of only one representative, there is still the possibility that the office of the other representative could have a negative influence on the efforts in behalf of the group. When federal grants are involved, agencies will sometimes solicit the comments of the representatives from the area in which the grant may be allocated. If an office had not been contacted by a county organization but was contacted by the governmental agency involved, the response to the agency might not be in accord with the request submitted by the county.

Dividing counties may do violence to the community of interests concept. Because of the common interests and problems of individuals within one county, many governmental programs are designed to be administered through county organizations. These organizations and others which come into being to deal with local problems may find that their lobbying effectiveness may be undercut because of the small number of voters who may be within any one district. A congressional representative will naturally be more concerned with serving the needs of the whole counties whose voters will have more impact on his or her re-election.

BOB ECKHARDT.

#### CONVERTING TO THE METRIC SYSTEM OF MEASUREMENT

#### HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the United States, accompanied by Southern Yemen, Tonga, Trinidad, Burma, Muscat and Oman, Sierra Leone, Gambia, Ghana, and Liberia, utilizes an anachronistic system of weights and measures which was first adopted for sound trade purposes and has continued largely through inertia and procrastination. John Quincy Adams participated in the

first metric study in 1821 which was, I am certain, similar to the one authorized by Public Law 90-472 in 1968.

The other body has taken affirmative action and passed the Metric Conversion Act. So we have, after 150 years of consideration by the Congress, finally arrived at a method of gradually converting to the metric system of measurement and catching up with every other industrialized nation in the world.

Our present inch-pound system, or the English system, has even been rejected by England in favor of the standardized metric system. A friend of mine at the Florida State University, Dr. Michael Kasha, has provided me a section from an old English handbook which relates to units of measure. I would like to place a retyped version of this section in the Record to illustrate the foundation of our present system. We can thank Dr. Kasha for sharing this passage with us so that we might know whether we are getting a good price on the next curnock of wheat or rundlet of wine we might decide to purchase.

It is as follows:

#### UNITS OF MEASURE

From The Present State of England by Edw. Chamberlayne, 1692, 17th Impression, pp. 14 and 15.

Measures. All measures in England are either Applicative or Receptive.

The smallest Mensura Applicatives, or applicative Measure, is a Barley Corn, whereof Three in length make a Fingers breadth or Inch, 4 Inches make a Handful, 3 Handful a Foot, 1 Foot and a half make a Cubit, 2 Cubits a Yard, 1 Yard and a quarter makes an ell, 5 Foot makes a Geometrical Pace, 6 Foot a Fathom, 16 Foot and a half makes a Perch Pole, or Rod, 40 Perch make a Furlong, 8 Furlongs, or 320 Perch make an English Mile; which according to the Statute of 11 H. 7. ought to be 1760 yards, or 5280 Foot, that is, 280 Foot more than the Italian Mile; 60 Miles, more exactly 69 English Miles and a half make a Degree, and 360 Degrees, or 25020 Miles compass the whole Globe of the Earth.

For measuring of Land in England, 40 Perch in length, and 4 in breadth, make an Acre of Land, (so called from the German word Acker, and that from the Latin word Ager), 30 Acres ordinarily make a Yard-land, and one hundred Acres are accounted an Hide of Land; but in this, and also in some Weights and Measures, the Custom of the place is otherwise, which must be regarded.

Mensura Receptions, or the Receptive Measures are two-fold; first, of Liquid, or Moist things; Secondly, of Dry things.

About a Pound Avoir du Poids makes the ordinary smallest Receptive measure, called a Pint, 2 Pints makes a Quart, 2 Quarts a Pottle, 2 Pottles a Gallon, 8 Gallons a Firkin of Ale, 2 such Firkins make a Kilderkin, and 2 Kilderkins, or 32 Gallons make a Barrel of Ale, 9 Gallons a Firkin of Beer, 2 such Firkins, or 18 Gallons, make a Kilderkin, 2 such Kilderkins, or 36 Gallons, make a Barrel of Beer, 1 Barrel and a half, or 54 Gallons make a Hogshead, 2 Hogsheads make a Pipe or Butt, and 2 Pipes a Tun, consisting of 1728 Pints or Pounds; a Barrel of Butter or Soap is the same with a Barrel of Ale.

The English Wine-Measures are smaller than those of Ale and Beer, and hold proportion as 4 to 5; so that 4 Gallons of Beer measure are 5 Gallons of Wine measure, and each Gallon of Wine is 8 Pounds Troy weight. Of these Gallons, a Rundlet of Wine holds 18, half a Hogshead 31 Gallons and a half, a Tierce of Wine holds 42 Gallons, a Hogshead 63 Gallons, a Puncheon 84 Gallons, a Pipe or Butt holds 126, and a Tun 252 Gallons, or 2016 Pints.

To measure dry things, as Corn or Grain there is first the Gallon, which is bigger than the Wine Gallon, and less than the Ale or Beer Gallon, and is in proportion to them as 33 to 28 and 35, and is counted eight pounds Troy weight. Two of these Gallons make a Peck, four Pecks a Bushel, four Bushels the Comb or Curnock, two Curnocks make a Quarter, and ten Quarters a Last or Wey, which contains 1520 Pints, and about so many pounds; so that in a Garrison 5000 Men allowing each but a pound of Bread per diem, they will consume near a Last, or 80 Bushels every day; and 250 Men in a Ship of War, will drink a Tun of Beer in two days, allowing each Man but his Pottle per diem.

#### THE NEXT 4 YEARS

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times today endorsed Senator GEORGE S. McGOVERN for President in the belief that—

His humanitarian philosophy and humane scale of values, his courage and his forthrightness can offer a new kind of leadership in American political life.

It is in just these areas, the Times declares:

The Presidency of Richard M. Nixon has largely failed.

GEORGE McGOVERN's promise as President extends well beyond the excellence of his innovative solutions to pressing national and international problems. It extends to the fact that he is a man who can provide the moral leadership our Nation needs. He can replace cynicism and expediency with honor and truthfulness.

The Times editorial follows:

#### THE NEXT 4 YEARS

In less than six weeks, we, the American people, will be choosing the President and Vice President of the United States for the next four years. But we will be doing more than that; we will be determining whether we want this country to continue along the course it has been taking during the past four years, or whether we want to restore to American political life its traditional values of democratic liberalism and social concern.

In an America striving to realize its own vision of equality and liberty under the rule of law, the Presidency requires particular qualities of character, leadership and moral force that transcend the narrow bounds of personal ambition and of party politics. It requires a perception of the things that are wrong with America—politically, socially, economically, morally—as well as the things that are right; and a sense of priorities that gives precedence to human needs and public integrity over the panoply of wealth and the arrogance of power.

The New York Times urges the election of George McGOVERN for President of the United States. We believe that Senator McGOVERN's approach to public questions, his humanitarian philosophy and humane scale of values, his courage and his forthrightness can offer a new kind of leadership in American political life. We believe he can restore a sense of purpose to the American people as a whole, a sense of participation to their component parts and a sense of integrity to their Government.

In these respects, it seems to us, the Presidency of Richard M. Nixon has largely failed.

Mr. Nixon has indeed had his spectacular triumphs; and this newspaper has never hesitated to applaud the accomplishments of the President and his Administration when we thought that he was serving the best interests of the American people, even when in doing so he was adopting policies that he had spent a lifetime in opposing. But despite his best efforts—in regard to China, the Soviet Union, economic controls and so on—Mr. Nixon has failed both in principle and in practice in other areas of public policy even more vital than those in which he has scored his successes.

Not only has Mr. Nixon failed to carry out his explicit pledge to end the Vietnam conflict, on which he won the election by a hair's breadth four years ago; he has pursued a policy that appears to move in one direction while actually moving in another. Constantly emphasizing the winding down of the war and the withdrawal of American troops, Mr. Nixon has nevertheless enlarged the scope of hostilities, undertaken the biggest bombing campaign in history and committed American prestige to an increasingly authoritarian regime in Saigon.

The Vietnam war is but one area where President Nixon has failed either to carry out his pledge or to give the nation the moral and political leadership that would indeed unite us—as he promised to do four years ago. This Administration appears to be without basic philosophy, without deeply held values, an Administration whose guiding principle is expediency and whose overriding purpose is to remain in office.

The pursuit of excellence has been subordinated to pursuit of the next election, as evidenced by some of Mr. Nixon's appointments in such ultra-sensitive areas of Government as the Department of Justice and the Supreme Court. In many of its social, economic and fiscal policies; in lax standards of probity and truthfulness in government; in favoritism toward special interests; in its addiction to secrecy; in its disregard of civil liberties and constitutional rights, the Nixon Administration has been a failure.

President Nixon has shown himself willing to exacerbate America's racial divisions for purely political purposes; he has countenanced and encouraged an ominous erosion of individual rights and First Amendment freedoms, and has demonstrated his indifference to such dangers by deliberately selecting Spiro T. Agnew as his potential successor to the Presidency. Protected by the White House curtain, he has stood above the political battle as the odor of corruption and of sleazy campaign practices rises above the Washington battlefield.

A McGOVERN administration, The Times believes, would reverse the unmistakable drift in Washington away from government of, by and for the people. It is undeniable that since his nomination Senator McGOVERN has been on the defensive, partly because of the Eagleton episode, partly because of ill-considered comments on specific points that he has subsequently modified or corrected, and partly because of the confused management of his own campaign. But on his record, and on what he has consistently stood for in his years of public office—a consistency in striking contrast to that of his opponent—it is clear that Mr. McGOVERN will fight for effective and necessary reforms in American social, political and economic institutions.

What this election comes down to is a decision on the direction in which the United States is going to move for the next four years.

Are we going to continue to pursue a foreign policy that, for all its success in certain areas, is essentially based on military supremacy, on a strident nationalism and on a cynical power game that could alienate

this country from substantial segments of the international community?

Are we going to continue to pursue a domestic policy that, in its fundamentals, is contemptuous of civil liberties, oblivious of deep social conflicts and racial and economic cleavages in the cities of America, and oriented toward that very "military-industrial complex" against which President Eisenhower perceptively warned us so many years ago?

On virtually every major issue from the war to taxes, from education to environment, from civil liberties to national defense, Mr. McGOVERN—faltering though many of his statements have been—seems to us to be moving with the right priorities, with faith in the common man, and within the democratic framework. While this newspaper does not necessarily accept his program in every detail as he has thus far outlined it or as the Democratic platform has structured it, we are convinced that the direction of American policy in the next four years would be in safer hands under a McGOVERN-Shriver administration than under the present regime.

There can be no doubt that Mr. McGOVERN is now far behind in the Presidential race. But if he succeeds in these next few weeks in getting his basic philosophy of democratic government across to the electorate, a philosophy that rejects the meretricious appeal of his opponents, Senator McGOVERN may yet touch a chord in the American voter that will respond to his own practical vision of an American society that cares and an American democracy that works.

#### THE ENERGY CRISIS AND OUR COASTAL STATES

### HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions in the past, I have taken this floor to discuss what is really two aspects of a single problem, not just confronting my State, Louisiana, but our Nation as a whole. I am referring, of course, to the growing energy crisis and the urgent need to apply the same treatment regarding revenues from mineral production on Federal lands to coastal States as is presently applied to inland States.

At the present time, inland States, because they provide valuable public services at considerable cost, receive 37½ percent of the revenues arising from mineral production on Federal lands within their borders. This is an entirely equitable and justified procedure because inland States provide public services which make mineral production possible.

At the same time, however, there is no formula by which coastal States can share the revenues from mineral production on Federal lands lying off their shores on the Outer Continental Shelf, Louisiana, for example, builds the roads, constructs the hospitals and schools and provides countless costly public services which make mineral production on the Outer Continental Shelf possible, but it does not receive a penny of the revenues generated by that production.

Because they incur growing expenses in providing these governmental services



which make possible production on Federal lands, several inland States are now asking an increase in their share of the revenues.

Coastal States are entitled also to share in these revenues.

The New Orleans Times-Picayune, under the leadership of its distinguished editor, George W. Healy, Jr., is leading a vigorous public education campaign for the case for the coastal States.

Following are two editorials and an editorial report which appeared in recent editions of the Times-Picayune. I am inserting them in the RECORD and calling them to the attention of any colleagues on both sides of the aisle:

[From the Times-Picayune, Aug. 22, 1972]

#### OFFSHORE CAMPAIGN NOT OVER

The coastal states, with Louisiana in the forefront, lost a battle at Miami Beach this past weekend.

This setback should not mean the loss of the war for equitable treatment of the coastal states in the sharing of revenues from offshore federal lands.

Members of the Republican platform committee proposed a plank urging sharing of revenues from offshore federal lands with adjacent states in the same manner that revenues from inland federal lands are shared.

Failure of this subcommittee proposal to obtain a two-thirds majority in the whole platform committee followed a talk by the Hon. Rogers C. B. Morton, the secretary of the interior. The secretary reported that he is conducting negotiations with several states regarding the proportion of revenues from federal lands which they are receiving under the Minerals Leasing Act of 1920.

Most of the states in which federal lands are producing revenues are receiving 37½ percent of those revenues. Alaska is receiving 90 per cent.

Because they incur increasing expenses in providing governmental services which make possible production of the federal lands revenue, several of the inland states—with Wyoming in the forefront—are asking a larger share.

An original argument for sharing lands revenues with states within which those revenues are produced was that the states collected no ad valorem taxes on these lands. Subsequently, as production of revenues from the lands increased, the states experienced mounting costs for providing roads to the federal lands, for educating and providing police protection for the growing number of families of workmen engaged in oil, gas and other minerals activities in the federal lands and for other governmental services.

Wyoming received \$75,722,939.53 as its 37½ per cent share of inland federal lands revenues 1968 through 1971. It feels that it should receive more, and it may have a valid claim.

Louisiana and other coastal states received no share of the \$3,422,741,000 produced by offshore federal lands during the same four years. We know that the adjacent coastal states deserve a share of this revenue.

Although the coastal states would not collect ad valorem taxes on submerged lands, they could collect severance taxes on oil, gas and other minerals severed from those lands. If collectible, Louisiana's severance tax on natural resources extracted from federal lands adjacent to this state between 1955 and 1968 would have brought \$397,356,668.42 to our state treasury.

Secretary Morton, we believe, desires to settle the matter of sharing of revenues from all federal lands, both inland and offshore, at one time. Alaska, California, Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming and other states now receiving substantial shares of

revenues from inland federal lands certainly should agree that the coastal states deserve some share of revenues from offshore federal lands. Perhaps, because of the ad valorem tax factor inland states deserve a slightly larger percentage of federal lands revenues than do coastal states—even if the coastal states' loss from inability to collect severance taxes on minerals produced from adjacent submerged lands means a loss of considerably more revenue than would be generated by ad valorem taxes.

The most compelling reason for an early settlement of this long controversy, in our opinion, has been summed up by Secretary Rogers.

Writing about the nation's acute need for sources of energy in The Journal of Ocean Business, April, 1971, Secretary Rogers said: "A proven way (of avoiding energy shortages), of course, lies in the accelerated development of the oil and gas resources of the Outer Continental Shelf. There are about 800,000 square miles of prospective territory remaining virtually untouched. Even off Louisiana, more than 9 million acres remain to be leased. There is no part of the United States out to 200 meters in depth that current technology cannot develop."

Unlike Louisiana, Atlantic Coast states have not encouraged offshore exploration for oil and gas. They have resisted it for understandable reasons. First their state government expenses would be increased, without compensation, if they did not share with the federal government revenues produced from federal lands off their shores. Second, some of them have not learned that offshore oil and gas activity—as demonstrated in the Gulf of Mexico—increases the fish population, including shellfish, and poses no serious threat to the environment when properly supervised.

This war for equitable treatment of the coastal states and for alleviating a critical energy shortage—by giving all coastal states an incentive to encourage greater production from the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States—is not a no-win war.

It can be won through concerted efforts of many concerned citizens led by such organizations as Gov. Edwin Edwards' new Task Force on Offshore Revenue Sharing, by the Committee for A Better Louisiana and by similar groups and agencies.

The cause is just, but winning is not going to be a one-man or one-newspaper job and will not be accomplished by lip service.

Coastal states' representatives should take the position that they have just begun to work—and get working.

[From the Times-Picayune, Aug. 24, 1972]

#### MORE ENERGY AND INCENTIVES

Although it contains no specific mention of states' interests in revenues from adjacent offshore federal lands, there is an indirect cry for justice for coastal states in one of the Republican platform planks.

This plank asserts that avoidance of power shortages calls for "sound policies supporting incentives that will encourage the exploration for, and development of, our fossil fuels. Such policies will buy us the time to develop the sophisticated and complex technologies needed to utilize the exotic energy sources of the future."

In other words, we should produce more oil and gas while we develop atomic and other new sources of energy.

Louisiana produces 25.8 per cent of the fossil fuels now produced in the United States. This includes large volumes obtained from federal lands in the Gulf of Mexico off the state's coast. No oil or gas is produced from United States lands in the Atlantic Ocean.

Atlantic Coast states are discouraging exploration off their shores. They have observed that the federal government has not shared with Louisiana, Texas and California

revenues which it has received from its lands off their coasts. States along the Atlantic Coast have no incentive to encourage offshore production.

The Republican platform points out that "more than half our nation's domestic fossil resources now lie under federal lands." Most of these lands are in the Outer Continental Shelf.

The platform urges that "high priority must be given to the governmental steps necessary to the development of these resources."

A first step, in our opinion, should be for the federal government to share with coastal states revenues from offshore federal lands in the same manner that it shares with inland states revenues from its inland public lands.

#### OFFSHORE REVENUE SHARING MUST IN ENERGY CRISIS—INCENTIVES NEEDED FOR EXPLORATION

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

As The Associated Press reported in The Times-Picayune a week ago, energy crisis has become a household term.

Slowdown in the exploration for domestic oil and gas has increased dependency of the United States on other nations for sources of energy. Gas, the cleanest fuel, is in short supply. Most of the nation's coal supply cannot be used to generate electricity because of stringent air-pollution laws.

Some of the nation's leaders are looking to the Persian Gulf, to Saudi Arabia, to the North Sea and even to new fields on the Ob river in Siberia as the answers to America's prayers for more energy sources.

Because of inherent dangers of dependence on sometimes unfriendly foreigners for the necessities of life, we doubt that foreign oil and gas are the answer to our immediate needs.

More exploration in and production from the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States—including submerged lands off Alaska—offer an easing, if not a solution to our energy problem. We believe that this increased production of oil and gas from our Outer Continental Shelf will be achieved if the Congress will provide an incentive for coastal states to encourage exploration and production.

A readily available incentive, in our opinion, would be sharing of revenues from federal offshore lands with adjacent states in the same manner that revenues from inshore lands are being shared and have been shared for many years with Wyoming, New Mexico, Colorado and other inland states.

As basis of our conclusions, we submit excerpts from written statements and other expressions by persons and organizations whom we consider qualified to speak with authority on subjects which they discuss.

#### ON NEEDS FOR OIL AND GAS IMPORTS

It is a little difficult to consider the future in oil because our predictions in the past have always been so wrong. The Task Force on Energy, which completed its work two years ago, said that in 1980, at a price of \$3.30 (per barrel) in the United States . . . we would be consuming a little over 18 million barrels a day, and we would be producing 13.5 million barrels in the United States. The figure we're using now is generally, I think, 24 million barrels consumed in 1980, with 12 million produced in the United States and 12 million imported, most of which will be coming from the Eastern hemisphere. . . .

I don't think that anybody can argue that our Middle Eastern policy has been successful in turning the Arabs into our friends, or our allies, or that it has made Arab oil secure for the United States. We hear repeated threats from Arabs to cut off oil; there have been at least six since the beginning of this year, and we take them very, very seriously.

The main argument for the oil import program is security . . . The main argument

against the oil import program, and the argument against taking any other measures to increase alternative sources of energy, is the cost. And the argument is that we have cheap foreign oil and this is what we should use.

This chimera of cheap foreign oil is rapidly disappearing, however. We have a schedule of increasing prices in Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries right through 1976. By 1976 we believe that world prices of oil are going to be same as in the United States. That's not far off. And by the end of this decade the price is going to be \$5.—James E. Akins, Director, U.S. State Department, Office of Fuel and Energy Quoted in The Conference Board Record, July, 1972.

#### THE "GRAVE RISK" OF IMPORTS

The United States depends upon petroleum to satisfy as much as three-fourths of its over-all energy needs. And petroleum is the source of energy in shortest supply. In the opinion of some, the domestic shortage is not a reason for concern because, it is claimed, the United States can import all it needs. Under no logical circumstances, however, could nearly enough natural gas be imported. And, even though a sufficient amount of foreign oil conceivably might be brought in, the nation would be taking a grave risk in doing so. To depend upon uncertain foreign sources for such a high proportion of its oil supply would make no more sense than to expect foreign countries to provide for this nation's defense. Not only would the U.S. be in a position of constant weakness, always vulnerable to having a major portion of its oil supply cut off, but it would also suffer from a monumental balance of payments deficit.—Outlook for Energy in the U.S. to 1985. The Chase Manhattan Bank, Energy Economics Division.

#### PREDICAMENT: AVAILABILITY

In the use of our conventional primary energy fuels—oil, natural gas and coal—we are faced with two basic problems. Estimates of our domestic resource base for oil and natural gas—as distinguished from known, proved reserves—appear to be adequate to meet our projected consumption of these fuels well beyond the year 2000. The Geological Survey has estimated that 450 billion barrels of petroleum liquids and 2,100 trillion cubic feet of natural gas are undiscovered but recoverable under current technological conditions. If all this energy were available, it would meet our 1971 needs for these two fuels almost 100 times over.

The predicament is that this energy is not presently available to the consumer. The necessary exploration and development to convert these resources, most of which lie thousands of feet beneath our lands and continental shelves, into proved reserves which can be produced for the consumer have not yet taken place. Proved reserves presently available are only equal to about 10 to 15 per cent of the undiscovered resources. If the energy potential from these natural resources is to be adequately realized by 20th-Century Americans, the efforts of our oil and gas industry must be greatly increased.—The late William T. Pecora, Undersecretary, Department of the Interior.

#### PROSPECTS FOR INCREASED PRODUCTION FROM DOMESTIC SOURCES

A proven way (of avoiding energy shortages), of course, lies in the accelerated development of the oil and gas resources of the Outer Continental Shelf. There are about 800,000 square miles of prospective territory remaining virtually untouched. Even off Louisiana, more than 9 million acres remain to be leased. There is no part of the United States out to 200 meters in depth that current technology cannot develop.—Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior Offshore, The Journal of Ocean Business, April, 1971.

Today, about 17 per cent of our current oil and natural gas production comes from less than two per cent of the offshore areas available for leasing. In terms of its potential for energy in the future, the federal offshore becomes even more significant.—Statement filed July 26, 1972 with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate by the American Petroleum Institute, Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association and Western Oil and Gas Association.

Oil and gas will have to supply the majority of our near-term energy needs. Large quantities of these resources have been found in the public lands and the Outer Continental Shelf, and large undiscovered potential remains.—Aforementioned statement filed July 26, 1972.

All this constant turnover (of the earth's crust) unearths new treasures in iron, manganese and other valuable ores across vast areas of the ocean's bottom, just waiting to be mined if man can achieve the finances and technology to do it.

Along other regions of the ocean floor, most near coast-lines, are rich reservoirs of oil and gas. Some of these have been tapped for years but what has been drawn from beneath the seas is but the tip of the iceberg.—Dr. Melvin Peterson, Chief Project Scientist, Deep Sea Drilling Project, Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

The Sigsbee Knolls are dome-like structures on the smooth floor of the Gulf of Mexico. One of these was drilled and found to contain oil in a "cap rock" that characteristically overlies salt domes. It is hard to estimate the extent of the oil accumulations or the commercial possibilities of the future but the presence of oil at these depths (12,000 feet) may encourage future exploration into deep water. The hole drilled by the Glomar Challenger was filed with cement to ensure that no oil could escape.—University of California—Scripps Institution of Oceanography report on Deep Sea Drilling Project.

#### IN-PLACE POTENTIAL OF SHELF, SLOPE

In 1968, the U.S. Geological Survey made detailed estimates of the in-place oil and gas potential offshore, and the amounts that might be recoverable based on various estimating techniques. Studies by Dr. V. E. McKelvey and co-authors indicate that the total in-place potential of the U.S. Continental Shelf (out to 200-meter water depth) may range between 660 and 780 billion barrels of crude oil and 1,640 to 2,220 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. The total in-place potential of the continental slope (200 to 2,500-meter water depth, immediately beyond the shelf) was estimated at 640 to 800 billion barrels of crude oil and 1,590 to 2,230 trillion cubic feet of gas.—Dr. Thomas D. Barrow, President, Humble Oil and Refining Co.

The Outer Continental Shelves appear to be one of the few possibilities that can make a substantial contribution to relieving U.S. energy shortages while also meeting the tests of fitting into an appropriate time frame, maintaining national security, and avoiding balance of payment problems. Yet, recent decisions under the National Environmental Policy Act and existing government policies have severely restricted or halted exploration and development activities in these key areas. The nation cannot afford to sacrifice the potential resources located in its outer continental shelves, because the consequences of doing so may have regrettable and irreversible effects for the entire nation.—Thornton F. Bradshaw, President, Atlantic Richfield Co.

#### OFFSHORE ENERGY PRODUCTION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Spills from wells and platforms constitute 2.6 per cent of the total gallon volume of all spills... less than oil spills from trucks and trailers and only about one-third as much as spills from railroad tank cars and

engines... Spills from wells and platforms amounted to an average of 13.17 barrels per day (the wells including both onshore and offshore producers) out of average production of 9,200,000 barrels per day.—J. F. Justiss, Jr., Vice-President, Justiss-Mears Oil Co., Inc. Commenting on Environmental Protection Agency report.

I trust that the environmental movement will not be seduced by the heady atmosphere of recent years. It has achieved some notable objectives, but will it now proceed to consolidate gains that have been made and become a durable force within our society? I would hope that strategies will be formulated in terms of longer-run objectives and systematic treatment of the entirety of a policy issue, rather than the pursuit of immediate tactical objectives in the manner of sea lawyers. All this will be necessary if we are adequately to resolve the difficult problem of reconciling the demand for energy utilization with the goal of protecting the environment—recognizing that energy utilization is a principal source of environmental degradation—and if we are to achieve shared national goals in the quest for coherent policies.—James J. Schlesinger, Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, in address to The Conference Board, April, 1972.

The two Gulf Coast states with the most extensive offshore oil production also have the largest shellfish production, according to figures of the National Marine Fisheries Bureau of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Controversy regarding title to or "paramount rights" in offshore lands is almost as old as is recovery of oil and gas from those submerged lands.

California, Texas, Louisiana, Florida and other coastal states have contested in the courts conflicting claims to offshore revenues.

A decision of the United States Supreme Court in 1960 was supposed to have settled this long controversy. It held that Texas and Florida were entitled to "historic boundaries" three leagues (slightly more than ten miles) from their Gulf of Mexico coasts.

Since 1960 no final decision has been reached as to where the Louisiana coast actually lies. Courts and commissioners or masters named by courts still are mulling the matter.

In recent litigation the United States Supreme Court, in dealing with the Submerged Lands Act of 1953, which gave the coastal states submerged lands within their "historic boundaries," said that there was no explicit manner provided by the Congress for the determination of the coast of states bordering the seas. It chose to be guided by the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone adopted by the United Nations Conference at Geneva in 1958, ratified by the United States on March 24, 1961, and effective September 10, 1964, when the requisite number of nations had ratified it.

Mr. Victor A. Sachse, learned Louisiana attorney who long has been active in submerged lands litigation, observed that "in the California case (called the second California case, 1965) the United States objected to consideration of that Convention and said that the Court should restrict itself to what its decision would have been on May 22, 1953, when the Submerged Lands Act was enacted, but the Court rejected that view and adopted the definitions of the Convention for purposes of the Submerged Lands Act."

The effect of that decision is to make the international line described by the Geneva Convention the means of resolving the domestic dispute between the United States and the states which border the sea.

"If the United States succeeds in limiting the territory of the states," Mr. Sachse points out, "the result will be to limit the territory



of the United States and to cast away or into the no-man's-land of the international zones areas that at present no other nation claims.

"With this in mind, the Supreme Court said in the 1969 Louisiana case that it would not allow the United States to distort principles of international law to curtail the territory of the states and concluded this most important phase of its discussion with this most significant statement:

"... The only fair way to apply the Convention's recognition of historic bays in this case, then, is to treat the claim of historic waters (as made by Louisiana) as if it were being made by the national sovereign and opposed by another nation..."

"Louisiana in its legal case speaks not only for itself but for the benefit of the whole nation. . . . This same approach will apply to all of the Atlantic states now in litigation with the United States, and to Alaska now in litigation with the United States," says Mr. Sachse, "and the net result will be that to the extent the United States prevails against the state, American territory will be needlessly curtailed in the resolution of a purely domestic allocation of our natural resources."

Sharing of revenues from offshore federal lands, by law, in the same manner that revenues from inland federal lands are shared offers a solution to a long, agonizing problem. It offers, at the same time, incentives for production of more domestic energy and for narrowing the international dollar gap.

#### CORDELL HULL BIRTHPLACE AND MEMORIAL AT BYRDSTOWN, TENN., HIGHLIGHTS LIFE AND CAREER OF THIS GREAT STATESMAN

#### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Historical Quarterly recently published an article—which I was pleased to write on request concerning my illustrious predecessor and—concerning the Cordell Hull Birthplace and Memorial recently opened near Byrdstown, Tenn., in the heart of Cordell Hull's beloved Upper Cumberland Country.

The opening of the Cordell Hull Birthplace and Memorial was most appropriate in view of the continuing observance of the centennial anniversary of the birthday of this great Tennessean—outstanding statesman, diplomat, and apostle of free trade and world peace.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in the life and career of Cordell Hull, I place the article from the Tennessee Historical Quarterly in the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE CORDELL HULL BIRTHPLACE AND MEMORIAL  
(By JOE L. EVINS)

The Cordell Hull Birthplace and Memorial—just opened to the public this year—nestles in the green foothills of the Cumberland Mountains near Byrdstown in Pickett County (formerly, in Hull's boyhood, a part of Overton County) Tennessee. The opening of the Birthplace and Memorial on State Highway 53 is timely and appropriate in view of the continuing observance of the anniversary of the birthday of a great Tennessee statesman.

Cordell Hull was born on October 2, 1871, in a small log cabin on a mountain ridge

area between the Wolf and Obed Rivers. This cabin has been reconstructed on the foundations of the original building, adhering faithfully to the dimensions and plan of the original cabin and using as many of the original yellow poplar logs as possible. A log cabin museum building has been constructed nearby and in this building interested observers can look back into history through the life and career of Cordell Hull by examining a treasured collection of mementos, photographs, and memorabilia.

The reconstruction and preservation of the Cordell Hull Birthplace has been a most worthwhile project. The late Judge A. F. (Pat) Officer, Sergeant Alvin C. York, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Cordell Hull Memorial Association, and others who assisted in this project deserve commendation and congratulation. The State of Tennessee applied to the National Park Service of the United States Department of the Interior for inclusion of the Hull Birthplace on the National Register of Historic Places, and on May 5, 1972, it was so entered. As congressional representative of the people of this area, I have recommended that this Birthplace and Memorial be named a historic shrine.

From this modest log cabin Cordell Hull, a determined and dedicated young man, went out into the world to make his mark as one of the great Americans of all time. He became judge, congressman, senator, secretary of state, distinguished diplomat, father of the United Nations, author of the "good neighbor policy," apostle of free reciprocal trade, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, advocate and drafter of the nation's first income tax and inheritance tax laws, champion of the "little man," chairman of the Democratic National Committee, an architect of Franklin D. Roosevelt's nomination and election as President, and a man frequently mentioned as a candidate for vice-president and president of the United States.

Cordell Hull has assumed his rightful place in the gallery of famous Tennesseans—which includes Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, and Andrew Johnson. In the footsteps of these great men he fought for justice and for the people in the populist tradition. And more than that, he was among the first to sense the importance of international relationships and the importance of free and reciprocal trade in building trust between nations and in assisting all nations in building a better life for their people.

Cordell Hull's father, William (or "Billy") Hull, was a hardy, resourceful, energetic mountain man who took great pride in the accomplishments of his talented son. William Hull once said:

"Cord wasn't set enough to be a school teacher, wasn't rough enough to be a lumberman, wasn't sociable enough to be a doctor and couldn't holler loud enough to be a preacher. But Cord was a right thorough thinker."

Billy Hull knew his son. "Right thorough thinking" characterizes the life of my famous predecessor from his early youth. He was an avid student, early interested in law; a great believer in consummate research; a voracious reader, a shrewd, innovative debater; and a clear thinker who, as we say in Congress, always "did his homework" and usually achieved his short- and long-term goals through his great knowledge of his subjects and—in his words to me in later years—"through patience and perseverance," the most important qualities of public office. He was always prepared—and never made a statement until he was certain of his facts with supporting documentation.

He obviously took to heart a motto on the wall of one of the first schools he attended—Montevale Academy at Celina—which read: "There is no excellence without great labor."

Friends of Cordell Hull recall that he had

a keen sense of humor as a boy, and was not beyond engaging in boyish pranks. Mrs. H. F. Srygley, daughter of W. L. Brown, a pioneer citizen of Clay County, recalls her family's close association with the Hull boys, especially Cordell and Senadius Selwin (Nade) while they attended school in Celina. She has written me at length regarding various anecdotes and recollections concerning Cordell Hull, which are fascinating but too numerous to be included in this report.

She stresses that much has been written about Judge Hull as an austere statesman, and comments: "A statesman he was, but I remember the human side of him, the kindness, the thoughtfulness and the humor of this man."

Cordell Hull grew up learning the hard lessons of the Cumberland mountains where men advance because of their ability and resourcefulness. He indeed had a marvelous sense of humor and often referred to illustrative incidents and anecdotes with a Tennessee origin and flavor—whether he was talking to Soviet Foreign Commissar Vyacheslav Molotov, British Foreign Minister Anthony Eden, or an old friend from Byrdstown.

Congressman Hull possessed a high-pitched voice, and in his speeches for tariff reductions and reciprocal trade, he frequently advocated trade "h'yar, thar, and everywhar," and at one international conference he was referred to as "h'yar, thar, and everywhar."

In his early youth Cordell Hull began his political career, participating in public debates, campaigning for candidates, including President Grover Cleveland. In 1890 at the age of 18 he was elected chairman of the Democratic Party of Clay County in a party meeting at the Courthouse in Celina.

Many years later when I visited Cordell in his apartment at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, I asked him which, of all his many honors and achievements, he valued most.

He reflected a moment and responded: "I know I should say that raising the morality of international relations was perhaps my greatest achievement. But, to be honest, I must say that being elected chairman of the Democratic Party in Clay County at the age of 18 was my greatest thrill."

At the age of 18 he was also a delegate to the Tennessee State Democratic Convention, and at the age of 21 was elected to the Tennessee General Assembly. He showed up in the House in a striped Prince Albert coat and a large high-crowned hat—and his friends never let him forget it.

In 1903, at the age of 31, he was appointed by Governor James B. Frazier as a circuit court judge for the Upper Cumberland counties and was elected to that office a year later. In 1906 he ran for Congress and won by 15 of 15,000 votes cast.

"I felt I had some ideas and convictions," he recalled later. "Now I was eager to ring them on the anvil of the Nation."

And ring them he did.

Congressman Hull by this time had settled on his special fields of interest—free trade, tariff reduction, taxation, revenue, economics, and finance, although he faithfully represented his district and worked for the development and growth of his beloved Upper Cumberland.

Like Andrew Jackson, Cordell Hull was deeply concerned over concentrations of wealth, political influence, and privilege. He was elected during the administration of the combative President Theodore Roosevelt who was warring against special interests—but Roosevelt did not go far enough to suit Cordell Hull.

In his maiden speech in the House, Hull set the tone of his career and purpose in life. "The trust are entrenched behind the walls of the protective tariff system," he said. "The flag of monopoly has always floated above the ramparts of protection."

During his 21 years in Congress, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Cordell Hull fought successfully for an in-

come tax law as a more equitable distribution of the tax burden, for inheritance laws, for reduced tariffs, for antitrust and anti-monopoly legislation, and for sound methods of financing the Federal Government's operations, including World War I, which were among his other goals and achievements.

In 1914 he was elected Democratic National Committeeman from Tennessee and, in 1921 following his own defeat in the Republican landslide that elected Warren Harding President in 1920, he was named chairman of the Democratic National Committee. He worked hard to strengthen his party, paid off its indebtedness of \$300,000, and resigned in 1924 with a \$30,000 surplus—quite an achievement.

On November 24, 1917, he married a gracious, charming and lovely lady, Miss Francis Witz of Staunton, Virginia, and after a two-day honeymoon was back at work on the Hill. He and his beloved wife Francis were a devoted couple until her death, and he often said, "I am the most fortunate of men."

Following the end of World War I, he battled for approval of President Wilson's Treaty of Versailles by the Senate and, although this battle was lost, the knowledge and experience he gained stood him in good stead when, later as Secretary of State, he laid the groundwork for formation of the United Nations.

Hull was reelected and returned to Congress in 1923. As early as 1924 he figured prominently in speculation on the nomination for the presidency. In 1928 Democrats in the Tennessee General Assembly urged his nomination. He never encouraged such expressions of confidence and support and never actively sought the nomination, although his obvious qualifications for this position were discussed periodically through the years.

In 1930 Congressman Hull became Senator Hull. He was extremely active in national Democratic Party affairs and largely due to his influence the party adopted many of his favorite goals and objectives with reference to free trade, reduction of tariff barriers, and a "Good Neighbor" policy toward Latin America.

He and Franklin D. Roosevelt became good friends. Hull often visited in Roosevelt's Hyde Park home on weekends and Roosevelt's man Louis Howe often used Hull's office in Washington. In the 1932 Democratic Convention Hull played a key role in assuring Roosevelt the nomination. In June of 1932 Hull and Roosevelt toured the Tennessee Valley and discussed the economic problems of the area.

It was also in that month that Roosevelt offered Hull the position of Secretary of State and Hull accepted after reaching an understanding that, as Secretary of State, he would have an important voice in formulating American foreign policy.

With the Nation in the throes of a deep depression and with international relations at a low ebb, Senator Hull had this observation as the new Administration took office: "Prayer—we needed it—opened the ceremonies on Inauguration Day, March 4, 1933."

The new Secretary of State expressed his concern over the state of international diplomacy when he took office. "Trust, candor, law and fair-dealing had been banished from many chancelleries," he recalled in his memoirs. "There was no such thing as a peaceful settlement of disputes between nations."

Secretary Hull took office during one of the most difficult periods in American history. Adolph Hitler was rising to power in Germany, Mussolini was preparing for aggressive adventures in Italy, Japan was biting off more and more of China, and the enigmatic Soviet Union was flexing its communistic muscles.

Throughout much of his 12 years as Secretary of State, he was compelled in his quest for world peace to engage in the con-

tinuing charade of "negotiation" with representatives of the Japanese and German governments while they prepared for war. Representatives of the Japanese government were in Secretary Hull's office when the Japanese military attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and he proceeded to give the cowering delegates a severe "tongue-lashing" for the deception and duplicity of a nation that talked peace and secretly made war.

Secretary Hull was characteristically courtly, diplomatic, courteous and serene—but he could also be blunt, direct, and severe and he shifted his tone and approach as the occasion demanded.

He favored the recognition of Soviet Russia for much the same reasons that President Nixon has initiated a friendlier relationship with Red China. "Two great nations like America and Russia should be on speaking terms," he said.

Once in office Secretary Hull, with President Roosevelt's strong and committed support, went to work in earnest to implement the Good Neighbor policy in Latin America. He attended numerous conferences in South America and in Washington—and he "politicked" for his goals and objectives in Montevideo with the same determination he showed in winning his first election for Congress. He established personal relationships with South American officials and diplomats—and they learned to trust him and his word.

At the same time he supported legislation in Congress to implement his policy and was elated when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was first passed. "My fight of many long years for the reciprocal trade policy and the lowering of trade barriers was won. To say I was delighted is a bald understatement," he recalled in his memoirs.

He became skilled in the international chess game of diplomacy and, in the pre-World War II years, rendered great service by playing nations off against each other to buy time for the Allies and the United States. Following the United States' declaration of war, he was deeply involved in keeping the allies happy in their interrelationships and in damping down the frictions that invariably occurred. He attended the Quebec Conference with President Roosevelt when he met Winston Churchill and startled British Foreign Minister Eden by defining a statesman as "a retired politician, like myself."

On July 23, 1941, he made a major address outlining his concept of a world organization of nations for peace and in 1942 journeyed to Moscow to make his case for such an organization to Premier Stalin and other Soviet officials. He was 72 years old at the time and his health already was beginning to fail.

He was well received by Stalin and they first chatted of rural life in the United States and Russia. Secretary Hull told Stalin that in Tennessee they made rafts by binding them together with hickory wales, and Stalin told Hull that in Russia they used vines to tie the logs together.

During this visit the United States, Russia, England, and China signed the Four Nations Declaration—laying the groundwork for the United Nations. On the same trip Secretary Hull couldn't resist giving a bit of common-sense advice to Soviet Foreign Commissar Molotov.

"After the war," Secretary Hull said, "you can follow isolationism if you want, and gobble up your neighbors. But that will be your undoing. When I was young I knew a bully in Tennessee. He used to get a few things his way by being a bully and bluffing other fellows. But he ended up by not having a friend in the world."

Hull also secured Stalin's agreement for a summit meeting with Roosevelt and Churchill. Hull was a guest of honor at a banquet

given by Stalin in the huge Catherine the Great Hall in Moscow, and Churchill in London at that time affectionately referred to Hull as "that gallant old eagle."

By 1944, his last year as Secretary of State, Secretary Hull had seen the tide turn in the war in favor of the Allies and had seen his dream of a United Nations come to fruition at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference in Washington and at the San Francisco Conference, neither of which he attended for reasons of health. Carlton Savage, one of his close associates at the State Department, gave him daily reports on these conferences.

On November 30, 1944, he retired over the vigorous protests of President Roosevelt. Secretary Hull's strenuous seven-day work week under severe strains over a period of years had taken its toll—he was tired, exhausted, and "a very ill man," in his words.

From the Yalta Conference he received a "get well" telegram from Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin, and other leaders. In 1945 he won the Nobel Peace Prize for his work and dedication for world peace. Judge Bradley McGinnis, longtime friend and associate of Cordell Hull, confided to me on one occasion that, after Cordell Hull had received his notification of the Nobel Peace Prize, he wrote to Judge McGinnis and asked him to advise him whether the cash prize included in the award was tax-exempt. Judge McGinnis was amused that Cordell Hull, who authored the first income tax law, would ask his advice and counsel with respect to an income tax matter.

In his message of acceptance of the Nobel Peace Prize, Hull said, referring to the United Nations:

"I am firmly convinced that with all its imperfections the United Nations organization offers the peace-loving nations of the world, now, a fully workable mechanism which will give them peace, if they want peace."

Following his retirement he received in 1947 from President Truman the Medal of Merit with oak leaf cluster in lieu of a second medal. Truman praised him for "contributing immensely to the Good Neighbor Policy, which was to bear rich fruit in a tragic hour for the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere."

Secretary Hull lived in Washington following his retirement, working on his memoirs with Carlton Savage and enjoying his richly deserved rest and relaxation as much as possible while in poor health. Mrs. Hull died in 1953 and Secretary Hull died in 1955. Both are interred in the Washington Cathedral, where many notables rest.

As Representative of Judge Hull's old District, the author of this article attended the funeral services and was impressed by the large and distinguished gathering of people, especially the delegations from Latin American nations who paid tribute to this great statesman.

In Washington and throughout the world American flags flew at half-mast in honor of the memory of this great, gallant Tennessean who dedicated his life to world peace. President Eisenhower in a proclamation following the death of Secretary Hull praised his "integrity of purpose, his high sense of obligation, and his long and fruitful labors in the cause of peace."

Recently Carlton Savage, long-time associate of Secretary Hull, who had never visited Cordell Hull's beloved Upper Cumberland, accepted my invitation for a visit to Cordell Hull's Birthplace and a tour of Cordell Hull Country. Savage was enthralled as we retraced the progress of Cordell Hull's early youth and career. We visited Byrdstown and the Hull Memorial Birthplace and Memorial, and Savage browsed through mementos as they were being unpacked and displayed under direction of David Hassler of Byrdstown, the curator.

Hassler and Glenn Sells of Byrdstown, who



restored the cabin, explained that the Cordell Hull home had fallen into such a state of disrepair that it was necessary to raze the structure to the foundations and rebuild it completely, using timber from the original home where possible. The cabin consists of a front room, 22 feet by 18 feet, with a loft above and a kitchen in back, measuring 15 feet by 18 feet. Each room has a stone chimney and fireplace. The museum is approximately 30 feet by 60 feet.

Cordell Hull memorabilia in the museum include: citation of the Nobel Peace Prize, various medals from South American countries, civic groups and communities; autographed photographs from President Roosevelt and King George VI; a large porcelain dove from Prime Minister Churchill; white jade figurines from the Chinese Ambassador; many gavels used by Cordell Hull as chairman of the Democratic National Committee; the Hull coat-of-arms; a collection of fans which belonged to Mrs. Hull; an original letter from Thomas Jefferson; honorary degrees from many major universities and colleges in the United States, and a photograph of Sergeant and Mrs. Alvin York, among many other fascinating and interesting mementos.

The late Mrs. Pansy Hill, of Moodyville in Pickett County, is generally given credit for initiating the movement that led to restoration of the Birthplace, and enactment by the Tennessee General Assembly in 1953 of an act establishing the Cordell Hull Memorial Association and providing funds for acquisition of the birthplace and surrounding land, for furnishing the cabin with furniture from the Cordell Hull period, and for restoration of the cabin and construction of the museum.

The original members of the Association, named in the bill drafted by then Representative Robert H. Roberts of Byrdstown, were Sergeant York, Chairman; Judge A. F. Officer, of Livingston, Vice-Chairman; Mrs. Hill, Secretary and Treasurer; Dr. Harry L. Upperman, of Baxter; Luther M. York, of Jamestown; Harmon Overstreet, of Celina; Representative Roberts, now an assistant State Attorney-General; Senator Jared Maddux, of Cookeville; Judge Bradley McGinnis, of Carthage, law partner and longtime friend of Secretary Hull; Senator Solon Fitzpatrick, of Carthage; and Chancellor Edward Turner, of Carthage. Senator Maddux and Senator Fitzpatrick sponsored the bill in the Senate. Named to the board since that time were David Hassler, of Byrdstown, assistant to the Secretary of State of Tennessee; Roy Koger, of Byrdstown; and Mrs. Gwen Mochow, of Byrdstown.

Many of the mementos in the Museum were provided by nieces of Cordell Hull, Mrs. Katherine Hull Ethridge and Mrs. Ruth Schleyer, both of Celina, and Mrs. Elizabeth Uzell, of San Antonio, Texas. Mrs. Ethridge and Mrs. Schleyer are living on Hull Acres, a 525-acre farm owned by Cordell Hull's father on the Cumberland River near Celina. Mrs. Ethridge recalled that young Cordell and his brothers sometimes stayed at this farm while attending school or logging.

With Savage we also visited Lebanon where Cordell Hull received his law degree at Cumberland University, and Carthage, where we saw the Hull homeplace and lunched with some of Secretary Hull's old friends, reminiscing and comparing notes. We also visited Celina, where Cordell Hull attended school and began his law practice, and Gainesboro, Livingston, and Cookeville, all stepping stones in the career of this great judge, legislator, and statesman.

Many monuments honor the memory of Cordell Hull—portraits and busts in some of the courtrooms where he presided as Circuit Judge; busts in the Capitol of the State of Tennessee, the United States Capitol, and in the State Department (moved to a more prominent position at my request as the centennial of Hull's birth was being observed); the Cordell Hull State Office Building in Nashville; the giant Cordell Hull Lock

and Dam near Carthage on the Cumberland River; the Cordell Hull Foundation in New Orleans that assists Latin American students attending American colleges and universities; Cordell Hull Parkway; Cordell Hull Bridge, streets, a motel—and an estimated 100 namesakes—living monuments.

As we traveled through the beautiful countryside and enjoyed the same kind of exuberant hospitality from the people we met that Secretary Hull enjoyed, I chatted with Savage about the man.

"You know, Joe," Savage said, "Mr. Hull had a reputation for being very profane. But the strongest thing I ever heard him say was in reference to those who opposed his programs or to the lunatic fringe. He called them the 'polecat element.'"

On that occasion I recalled an anecdote concerning Secretary Hull's characteristic belief in deliberation before taking a position on a controversial issue.

"Take the term 'horseback opinion,'" I said. "Cordell Hull once told me that a horseback opinion is forming an opinion before you get off your horse—a spur of the moment opinion." Hull never did that—he never made snap judgments.

Another example of his deliberate and diplomatic nature occurred when he was a young member of the Tennessee State Legislature. At exactly 12 noon a colleague of Representative Hull asked him what time it was. Cordell Hull pulled out his pocketwatch, looked at it deliberately, studiously looked at the clock on the wall, slowly looked back at his watch and asked:

"What time does your watch say?"

Savage recalled Secretary Hull's dedication to world peace. "He worked tirelessly for a peace organization that led to creation of the United Nations," he said. "He dedicated his life to peace."

In Livingston we visited with Miss Will Harris, past 90, who served as Hull's personal secretary for almost 50 years. She is a gracious lady who recalls with pride her career with Secretary Hull.

Cordell Hull's father William Hull was "without means" at the time of his marriage. He left his father's farm near Clear Fork River in Fentress County to marry and settle down in a rented cabin—the Cordell Hull birthplace—on a ridge between the Wolf and Obed Rivers. William Hull's family had come from North Carolina—he was the son of Allen B. Hull and Serena Maynard Hull.

Cordell Hull's mother was Elizabeth Riley Hull, daughter of Isaac Riley and Lucy Flowers Riley. Her great-grandfather, James Riley from Virginia, fought in the Revolutionary War. Of Irish descent, her people came from Fauquier County, Virginia, and settled along the western base of the Cumberland Mountains, on both sides of the Tennessee-Kentucky line.

Hull recalled that his father, after renting the farm where he was born, bought a horse on credit for \$50 and at one time had a small still a mile or so from the cabin in Buncomb Cave—as "stilling" was an accepted practice those days.

Cordell was the third of five brothers. He was named after County Judge John M. Cordell, a close friend of his father. The area in the Upper Cumberland where Cordell was born was referred to as the "Mountain Section." Roads were poor and almost impassable in bad weather. To go any distance travelers were forced to cross mountains, hills, rivers, and creeks. Mud was "ankle-deep" in bad weather.

The people in the area were of pure Anglo-Saxon, Revolutionary War stock and were full-blooded Americans. They believed deeply in the teachings of Andrew Jackson, John Sevier, and other great Tennessee patriots and statesmen. Children grew up with the reminder of Jackson's favorite motto: "I love my country better than my life"—and this area willingly sent volunteers to fight the Nation's wars.

During the War Between the States this area was a "no-man's land," subject to raids by roving bands of guerrillas. On one occasion Cordell Hull's father was shot and left dead. Following his recovery and the loss of an eye, he tracked down his assailant and killed him in Kentucky—another then-accepted practice to cure an injustice.

Cordell Hull himself did not remember who owned the cabin where he was born. The Cordell Hull Birthplace and Memorial Association purchased the property from John Frank Amonett and wife on September 7, 1953, who had purchased the property from F. A. Neal on August 28, 1933; Mr. Neal had acquired the property from R. A. Amonett, County Court Clerk of Pickett County, November 9, 1932. A fire in the Pickett County Courthouse destroyed all records prior to that date. Older residents of Pickett County recall that this property was at one time owned by Sam Riley, and later by John Zachery.

When Cordell Hull was four years old, the family moved to a farm which his father purchased on the Obed River, three and one-half miles southwest of the rented cabin. Records show that on October 18, 1875, William Hull purchased 600 acres from Henry W. Harrison and wife for \$3,000, to be paid in eight notes at six percent interest.

It was here that Hull's father got into the logging and timber business, cutting timber and floating it down the Obed and Cumberland Rivers to Nashville for sale. His father began to prosper and brought in a young schoolteacher to teach his children. At night Cordell Hull and his brothers studied by the light of tallow candles made at home.

In the Spring of 1884 the family moved to a larger farm at Willow Grove in Clay County, and his father continued and expanded his profitable timber business. Cordell Hull briefly attended a free school at Willow Grove and a subscription school under Professor John A. Capps at Byrdstown. It was at this time at Byrdstown that Cordell Hull attended his first court session at the age of 14.

It was in 1885 after returning to the Willow Grove School that Cordell became interested in debating. His first debate was a rousing success—he had researched his subject thoroughly, knew every facet and every particle of the issue—and impressed his proud and delighted father with the presentation of his case.

As a result, he was sent to the Montvale Academy at Celina under the tutelage of Professor Joe S. McMillin, brother of then Congressman Benton McMillin, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and an advocate of reduced tariffs and an income tax. Cordell Hull drove Congressman McMillin around during his campaigns in later years, and absorbed his philosophy—which Hull also advocated as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means after his election to Congress.

At the age of 15 Cordell Hull decided to become an attorney and by the age of 16 was "reading law" in the Celina office of John McMillin, another member of the McMillin family.

At the age of 17—in 1888—he campaigned for President Cleveland and made his first political speech at a rally at Willow Grove in Clay County. He concluded his literary schooling at a normal school in Lebanon, Ohio, secured his law degree at Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tennessee, and launched his political career, interrupted only by his service as a captain in the army during the Spanish-American War.

The Cordell Hull Birthplace and Memorial is a fitting tribute to this great statesman and this year has taken its place among the shrines of the giants and greats of Tennessee history. Speaking of democracy, Senator Hull once said:

"Democracy is not a static structure, like a cathedral or a skyscraper. Once erected, it cannot be expected to stand by itself from

generation to generation. It is a living organism, and therefore must be cared for, guarded, nurtured, and guided."

As one examines the life and legend of Cordell Hull, we must recognize his great contributions to preserving, promoting, and perpetuating the high ideals of our great nation.

**ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH OPPOSES WEAKENING OF "DELANEY CLAUSE" ON CANCER-CAUSING FOOD ADDITIVES**

**HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in the second year of my first term in Congress, in 1954, I joined with the distinguished gentleman from New York, our esteemed colleague, Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY, in introducing the legislation which 4 years later became the Food Additives Act of 1958, requiring the pretesting for safety of any ingredients intended to be used in food and prohibiting the use of any food additive which is found to cause cancer in man or in animals. Prior to the passage of this act, food manufacturers were free to use any chemicals they wanted to, unless and until the Government could legally prove they were unsafe. The 1958 act was one of the most important consumer laws of the last generation. I have been trying ever since to enact a similar law on cosmetics.

Congressman DELANEY had been chairman of a select committee in the late forties and early fifties which investigated the health hazards growing out of the unrestricted proliferation of food chemicals intended to lengthen shelf life, improve the appearance of food products, or accomplish other economic objectives which had no relationship to the nutritional quality of the food. It was an outstanding congressional investigation in the consumer field. When I came to Congress in 1953, committed to consumer legislative causes, I was proud to ally myself with JIM DELANEY's efforts to do something about this problem.

**HISTORY OF THE DELANEY CLAUSE**

When the Delaney-Sullivan food additives legislation was first introduced, the food industry opposed it completely. Within a few years, however, as consumer interest mounted on this issue, the food manufacturers became less and less intransigent and finally, out of a genuine fear that the industry might unknowingly be using chemicals which might turn out to be extremely dangerous, there was a general consensus that some legislation should be passed. The industry wanted an exemption for any chemicals then in use. This was unacceptable to Mr. DELANEY and me. The industry also objected to the anticancer clause, which we felt was absolutely essential to the legislation. After prolonged negotiations on this point, our position finally prevailed. The anticancer provision became known as the Delaney Clause in recognition of his pioneering work and effective leadership on this issue.

Over the years since then, Congress-

man DELANEY and I have joined on numerous occasions to defend the Delaney Clause of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act against attempts to weaken this protection to consumers from the use of cancer-inducing substances in food. An extraneous provision of the 1962 Kefauver-Harris Act on drug safety, permitting the continued use of diethylstilbestrol—DES—in animal feeds as a growth hormone, was passed over our vigorous objections. When I offered an amendment to strike this provision, Congressman DELANEY was the only other Member, I believe, to speak in support of my amendment. We were promised at that time that the minute residues of this cancer-causing ingredient showed up in the carcasses of meat animals, the use of DES would immediately be stopped. For some years, there has been evidence of DES residues in the livers of beef cattle and other meat animals fed with this additive, but only now is the Food and Drug Administration taking action to ban DES in animal feeds. Even so, in violation of the law's intent, FDA is permitting the continued use of feeds containing DES until present stocks are used up.

**CYCLAMATES FORCED OFF THE MARKET**

Prior to the FDA order banning further manufacture and sale of DES for animal feeds, the FDA was forced to stop the sale and use of cyclamates in food under the anticancer Delaney Clause. This action, plus the belated decision on DES, have led to new attacks upon the Delaney Clause, including recent testimony by FDA Commissioner Charles C. Edwards indicating the law may be too restrictive.

Mr. Speaker, we should be extremely cautious about any attempt to permit the deliberate introduction of known carcinogenic substances into our food supply. Distinguished cancer specialists from the National Institutes of Health and research institutions have warned us that there is no such thing as a safe level of tolerance for any carcinogenic substance in food. I deeply regret the fact that the artificial sweetener which most diabetics preferred to use over all others was found to be cancer inducing in test animals and therefore had to be banned from food products. The question, of course, is how well diabetics would be served by continued use of a known carcinogen. There was much disappointment expressed by diabetics who wrote to me at the time the ban on the cyclamates was announced, but I do not recall receiving any letters since from diabetics or any other consumers then or since urging that this ingredient be allowed in food now that we know it can cause cancer.

There is no doubt in my mind that as test methods become more sophisticated, other food additives now permitted to be sold and used will run into difficulties under the Delaney Clause.

Hundreds of food additives in use prior to 1958 and temporarily "grandfathered" by the act for continued use as long as they were "generally regarded as safe" will eventually, I hope, be subjected to sufficient testing to determine definitely whether any of them are cancer-inducing. This is what happened with the

cyclamates. They were placed on the "GRAS" list after the 1958 act was passed and their cancer-causing properties were not finally established until just 3 years ago.

**POST-DISPATCH EDITORIAL**

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, traditionally noted for its consumer orientation, discussed the use of carcinogens in food in an editorial which appeared in that newspaper last Saturday. While praising Dr. Edwards' courage in opposing the Nixon administration-supported bill to indemnify the food industry for its losses resulting from the banning of the cyclamates—a bill which 170 of us in the House voted against—the editorial takes issue with the Commissioner of Food and Drugs over the idea of weakening the "Delaney Clause."

The editorial referred to follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 23, 1972]

**ADDITIVE ADVOCATE**

Dr. Charles C. Edwards, commissioner of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, is taking the astonishing position that, because the food industry is making his job harder, Congress should relax his agency's mandate to protect the health of the American public. Testifying before the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, Dr. Edwards called for a softening of the 1958 Delaney Amendment to the Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act requiring the withdrawal from the market of substances found to cause cancer in either animals or humans.

With increasingly sophisticated analytical techniques making it easier to detect harmful substances, Dr. Edwards said a strict interpretation of the law is forcing the withdrawal of many chemicals commonly added to foods, if not the foods themselves. This is what led to the banning three years ago of the artificial sweetener cyclamate. Yet rather than welcoming progress in the effort to protect the public, the Nixon Administration's spokesman is proposing to relax the law in order to please the industry that has a \$500,000,000-a-year stake in additives. About 3000 additives for food or food containers are already federally approved.

As Senator Gaylord Nelson pointed out, the law does not compel the food industry to do something extra but to stop deliberately adding preservatives, sweeteners, coloring and various other additives which are harmful to the consumer. This is not too much to ask of the industry, even if it means eliminating artificial substances that attract the customer but, without his knowledge, threaten his health.

While rightly opposing a House-passed bill that would indemnify cyclamate producers to the extent of about \$500,000,000 for their banned product, Dr. Edwards is in effect saying that similar products should be allowed to stay on the market. If this is the Administration's way of assuaging the pains of a protesting industry, the deleterious implications of the method should not be lost on the general public.

**NEW BOBBY FISCHERS FROM QUEENS?**

**HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we were all fascinated by the recent



world championship chess match in Reykjavik, Iceland. In addition to the drama and interest conveyed to us by the news media, those of us in the New York metropolitan area had the benefit of the superb commentary offered by chess analyst Shelby Lyman on our local educational television station.

Time magazine devoted one of its issues this summer to an interesting study of the personalities of the two players, Bobby Fischer and Boris Spassky. The preparation for this match meant years of training for both of them. Spassky spend several months if not the last few years preparing for the match through physical training comparable to that of an Olympic runner. For Bobby Fischer, this match was the culmination of his complete devotion to the game. Chess playing has been his whole life, both as an occupation and a means of relaxation. Certainly both of these champions have proved that chess is not a sedentary, "soft" form of recreation.

Knowledge of these extraordinary efforts added much excitement to what already is thought of as an intriguing sport. For in chess, one must learn the correct moves and countermoves, right from the first pawn played. While a newcomer to the game must take his time evaluating all possible implications of a play, in due time these actions become a matter of rote knowledge upon which he can instantly rely. Slowly but surely strategies are acquired by which one's chessmen are advanced to produce a checkmate. For the observer, the fascination lies in discerning the elements of a successful game, in being able to put together the threads of a strategy that has prevailed from the start.

I was therefore very pleased to discover that within my own district in Queens there are some potential Bobby Fischers. Joseph Queen, 8 years old, and his brother Alan, 12, are chess champions from Flushing. Their reputation has now spread throughout New York City. In a recent municipal match, Joseph won seven out of nine games while Alan triumphed in eight out of 10. In addition, their sister Ann is now learning to play, at the age of 6. I would like to offer my congratulations to these two young men, and to wish them and their sister the best of luck as they pursue their interest in the game. After all, Bobby Fischer came from Brooklyn; perhaps those of us in Queens may someday point with pride to our own chess champs.

#### RADIO STATIONS WMMM AND WDJF TAKE INITIATIVE IN CAMPAIGN BROADCASTING

### HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the high cost of running for political office. Campaign expenditures, particularly for the electronic media, have grown so rapidly in the past decade

that personal wealth has regrettably become a prime qualification for running for public office in many areas of the country.

It is, therefore, an extremely valuable public service for the electronic media to make free and equal air time available to all candidates for a particular office. This allows the candidates to express their points of view regardless of their financial status. It makes for increased dialog on the issues, and for better informed voters.

I am pleased to report that the management of radio stations WMMM and WDJF in Westport, Conn., have taken just such an initiative with their recent arrangements to make free time available to qualified candidates on a predetermined basis.

Through the allocation of this air time, an action which station WELI in New Haven also took recently, WMMM and WDJF took a significant step forward in public service broadcasting and in improving the quality of our political campaigns. I am pleased to accept this offer and, as I acknowledged in the Record on August 10, the offer of station WELI. I ask all Members to join me in commending these stations for their initiative and their concern for the integrity of the political process.

#### FEDERAL GRANTS, LOANS, AND CONTRACTS IN THE 20TH DISTRICT

### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, taxpayers who live in the 11 counties which make up the 20th Congressional District will be glad to see that some of their hard-earned tax dollars are being returned to them by the Federal Government. In fiscal 1971, the total returned was \$606,736,475. Included are all categories, from social security and veterans benefits to water and sewer project grants to cities. Each county received the following amount for 1971:

Adams	\$42,457,800
Calhoun	4,262,037
Greene	13,730,820
Jersey	8,501,920
Macoupin	29,356,777
Madison	147,012,888
Montgomery	45,377,406
Morgan	20,169,192
Pike	14,467,144
Sangamon	276,957,479
Scott	4,443,012

Following is a listing of major Federal grants, loans, and contracts for each of the 11 counties during 1971-72, the years of the 92d Congress. Where more than one county benefits from a program, the item appears where the primary effect is felt. Payments to individuals are not listed:

#### ADAMS COUNTY

Contract to Quincy Housing Authority by HUD for low-rent housing, \$914,544.

Grant to Quincy by EPA for sewage treatment plant, \$541,156.

Loans to Adams Electrical Co-Operative, Camp Point, by REA for distribution line, \$531,000.

Grants to Quincy College by HEW for National Defense Student Loans, Educational Opportunity Program, Work-Study, laboratory and closed circuit TV equipment, \$423,722.

Loan and \$85,000 grant to Adams County Water District by FHA for new water systems, \$240,000.

Grants to Quincy Public Schools by HEW for Head Start programs, \$229,089.

Contract to Harris Intertype Corporation, Quincy, by GSA for audio recorders and reproducers, \$200,000.

Grant to Quincy Public Schools by Dept. of Labor to train auto mechanics, \$74,197.

Grants to Blessing Hospital, Quincy, by HEW for increased nursing enrollment and nursing student loans, \$43,346.

Contract by U.S. Postal Service for construction of new post office in Golden, \$21,000.

Grant to Quincy Civil Defense Office by Office of Civil Defense for outdoor siren warning system, \$6,107.

#### CALHOUN COUNTY

Contracts by Army Corps of Engineers for Mississippi River bank repairs, \$1,440,952.

Loan and \$18,500 grant to Kampsville by FHA for construction of new sewage system, \$200,000.

Contract to Calhoun County Housing Authority by HUD for property improvement, \$62,848.

Allocation by Army Corps of Engineers for a seepage study in Sny Island Levee Drainage District, \$40,000.

Contract by Army Corps of Engineers for installation of siphon pipe in Sny Basin, \$23,625.

Contract by U.S. Postal Service for construction of new post office in Hamburg, \$17,750.

#### GREENE COUNTY

Grants to White Hall by EPA for construction, additions, and modifications to new sewage treatment plant, \$290,550.

Grant to Greene County Regional Planning Commission by FHA for planning water and waste disposal services, \$10,000.

#### JERSEY COUNTY

Contract to Grafton Boat Company by Army Corps of Engineers for two 40-foot survey boats, \$150,000.

Grants to Principia College by HEW for National Defense Student Loans, \$135,792.

Grants to Jerseyville Industrial Development Commission by Dept. of Commerce for administrative costs for 2 years, \$49,508.

Loan to Nutwood Water District by FHA to build rural community water system, \$35,000.

Grant to Jersey County Regional Planning Commission by FHA for water and sewer plan, \$14,500.

#### MACOUPIN COUNTY

Loan to M.J.M. Electric Cooperative, Carlinville, by REA for distribution line, \$627,000.

Grants to Illinois Valley Economic Development Corporation, Carlinville, by OEO and HEW for family planning services, emergency food and medical services, and Head-start programs, \$358,027.

Grants to Blackburn College, Carlinville, by HEW for National Defense Student Loans and Educational Opportunity Programs, \$105,415.

Contract to Macoupin County Housing Authority by HUD to improve low-rent housing, \$50,500.

#### MADISON COUNTY

Allocation by Army Corps of Engineers for advance engineering to replace Lock and Dam #26 at Alton, \$2,300,000.

Grants to Lewis and Clark Community College, Godfrey, by HEW and Dept. of Jus-

tice for National Defense Student Loans, increased nursing enrollment, Educational Opportunity Program, Work-Study, nursing student loans and scholarships, and Law Enforcement Education Program, \$252,091.

Contract to Alton Housing Authority by HUD for housing improvements, \$177,500.

Grant to Madison County Economic Opportunity Commission, Edwardsville, by OEO for family planning services, \$11,000.

Grant to St. Joseph's Hospital, Alton, by HEW for nursing student scholarships, \$2,352.

#### MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Grant, part of which to be used in Montgomery County to secure employment for 125 persons through CEFS Economic Opportunity Corporation, \$149,400.

Grant to Litchfield by Dept. of Labor for public service jobs, \$36,700.

#### MORGAN COUNTY

Loan to Western Illinois Power Cooperative, Jacksonville, by REA for improvements to Pearl plant, transmission lines, and substations, \$4,187,000.

Grants to MacMurray College, Jacksonville, by HEW and Dept. of Justice for National Defense Student Loans, Work-Study, Educational Opportunity Program, construction of physical education classroom, \$934,741.

Loans and \$253,300 grant to Meredosia by FHA for a new sewer system, \$600,000.

Loan and \$140,000 grant to Murrayville by FHA for modern sewage system, \$270,000.

Grant to Jacksonville Airport Authority by FAA for runway improvements, \$187,600.

Grants to Waverly by EPA for construction of secondary sewage treatment plant, \$110,820.

Grants to Illinois College, Jacksonville, for National Defense Student Loans, Work-Study, and Educational Opportunity Program, \$100,155.

Grant to Woodson by FHA for a rural community water system, \$82,000.

Grant to Jacksonville by HUD for improvements to central business district, \$67,818.

Grant to Jacksonville by EPA for intercepting sewers and new sewage treatment plant, \$28,807.

Grant to Elm City Rehabilitation Center, Jacksonville, by HEW for rehabilitation and facility improvement, \$24,057.

#### PIKE COUNTY

Grant to Pittsfield by FAA for improvements to airport, \$390,240.

Loan and \$45,000 grant to Nebo by FHA for modern sewer system, \$175,000.

Allocation by Army Corps of Engineers for flood control in McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District, \$100,000.

Grants to Pike County Head-Start summer program, \$54,283.

#### SANGAMON COUNTY

Reservation of funds to Springfield by HUD for Eastside urban renewal project, \$8,404,165.

Contracts to Springfield Housing Authority by HUD for modernization of low-rent housing, \$2,477,961.

For land acquisition and \$289,300 for development of Lincoln Home area, \$2,003,000.

Grant to Springfield Sanitary District by EPA for improvements to sewage treatment plant, \$1,938,880.

Grant to Springfield Airport Authority by FAA for improvements to Capital Airport, \$1,354,100.

Contracts to Sangamo Electric Company by GSA for automatic data processing equipment, \$1,143,750.

Contracts to Sangamo Electric Company by HEW for increased enrollment for health professions and start-up assistance, \$867,225.

Contracts by G.S.A. for improvements to Post Office and Courthouse Building, Springfield, \$599,602.

Grants to Springfield and Sangamon County Community Action, Inc., by OEO,

HEW, and Dept. of Labor for neighborhood youth center, emergency food and medical services, Head-Start program, and Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs, \$531,219.

Grants to Sangamon State University, Springfield, by HEW for National Defense Student Loans, Educational Opportunity Program, Work-Study, annual interest, training in health fields, and establishing B.S. program in nursing, \$445,244.

Grant to Springfield Mass Transit District by DOT for improvements and purchasing 5 new buses, \$344,000.

Grants to St. John's Hospital, Springfield, by HEW for increased nursing enrollment, nursing student loans and scholarships training program for family medicine, \$343,987.

Grants to Lincoln Land Community College, Springfield, by HEW and Dept. of Justice for National Defense Student Loans, Educational Opportunity Program, Work-Study, nursing student loans and scholarships, laboratory and other instructional equipment & material, annual interest grant, and Law Enforcement Education Program, \$193,864.

Contract to Allis-Chalmers, Springfield, by GSA for 6 crawler tractors, \$139,170.

Grant to Springfield by Dept. of Labor and HEW for job training, \$117,826.

Grants to Riverton by EPA for sewage treatment works, \$113,040.

Contract to Urban League by Dept. of Labor for training workers in construction fields in Springfield, \$106,390.

Grant to Springfield and Sangamon County Regional Planning Commission by HUD for planning assistance in water and sewage treatment, housing, and public facilities, \$75,000.

Grant to Springfield by HEW for Childhood Lead Poisoning Control Program, \$70,000.

Grant to Land of Lincoln Goodwill Industries, Springfield, by HEW for facility rehabilitation, \$65,855.

Grants to Springfield by Dept. of Labor and HEW for training licensed practical nurses, \$54,782.

Grant to Springfield by HUD for planning, housing, water, and sewage treatment according to 1970 census data, \$25,000.

Grant to Senior Citizens Center of Sangamon County by ACTION to place retired senior citizen volunteers in community service organizations, \$23,440.

Grant to Springfield by HUD for open space land program, \$11,470.

#### SCOTT COUNTY

Loans to Illinois Rural Electric Company, Winchester, by REA for distribution line and system improvements, \$998,000.

Grant to Winchester by EPA for secondary sewage treatment plant, \$50,010.

### HOW TO END DIVIDED GOVERNMENT

#### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor:

How To End Divided Government  
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Isn't it time to end lame, lethargic, and divided government in Washington?

It can be done.

This government is lame and lethargic in

large part because it has been divided government for most of the time the past 20 years. This means a Congress controlled by one party and the presidency controlled by the other.

#### PERPETUAL CONFLICT

Month after month, year after year it produces delay, stalemate, and almost perpetual conflict in nearly everything the president and Congress try to do.

It is a peril to democratic government that more and more voters are distrusting politics and politicians and thereby distrusting democracy itself.

This baleful incubus of divided government can be ended any time the American people see it as desirable to elect a president and a Congress of the same party. It could be ended at a single stroke on Nov. 7.

I am not appealing to anybody to vote for President Nixon. I am not appealing to anybody to vote for Senator McGovern. I do not count it the role of a columnist to tell voters how to vote.

But if you want to put an end to divided government in Washington, here is the way it can be done:

If you are going to vote for George McGovern, vote for a Democratic senator and congressman.

If you are going to vote for Richard Nixon, vote for a Republican senator and congressman.

#### SKEPTICAL OF POLITICS

That will do it and there is good reason to believe that it would bring into being a more coherent, animate, get-things-done government than the U.S. has had most of the time since the end of World War II.

Ending divided government will do more. It would greatly improve the political atmosphere in which government operates—or fails to operate. It would make government more responsive, more responsible and, more important still, more accountable to the voters.

There is plenty of evidence that government is not doing its job adequately and that it's so far behind public opinion that there is little wonder so many voters are skeptical of politics and politicians.

Many times the opinion polls have shown by large majorities the American people want stronger gun-control laws, want the direct election of president and vice-president, approve government reorganization, and back welfare reform.

This democratically controlled Congress doesn't reject the Nixon proposals just as the recalcitrant Republican 80th Congress didn't reject the Truman proposals. They just don't act upon them, or act in a way so dilatory that everything gets worse while divided government is wrangling.

#### ABILITY TO GOVERN

Daniel P. Moynihan, a specialist on urban affairs and a Democrat who as an aide to Nixon for two years, makes this point in an article in Life:

"The House has twice passed welfare reform by resounding majorities. The Senate is yet to vote on the measure. When proposed it was widely declared to be the most important piece of social legislation since the New Deal.

"Such failures suggest to him (President Nixon) that we face a crisis in our ability to govern, that the machinery of government is obsolete."

One thing which makes the machinery of government obsolete is divided government.

That can be ended without passing a single law. It can be done at the ballot box Nov. 7.

If McGovern is to be elected, he deserves a Democratic Congress.

If Nixon is to be elected, he deserves a Republican Congress.

The leadership of Congress and the president should not be pitted against each other.



## EUROPEANS FAVOR NIXON

## HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, an article in today's Washington Post by Hobart Rowen provides an interesting insight into the European view of President Nixon's efforts to control inflation and strengthen the dollar.

The conclusion of European bankers and finance ministers currently meeting in Washington is that under President Nixon's leadership—

The U.S. economy is getting stronger, inflation is coming under control, and in a short period of time, the once weak U.S. dollar could again become the strong currency in the world.

In fact, says Rowen:

The Europeans are downright envious of the way in which the inflation rate here has been slashed in the last year.

A glowing economic forecast by an administration spokesman might be ignored by some as election year hyperbole, but the dispassionate views of European financial experts cannot be so easily dismissed. The Europeans are in an excellent position to put the economic performance of this administration into perspective. Their evaluation could hardly be more favorable.

The article follows:

## EUROPEANS FAVOR NIXON

(By Hobart Rowen)

European bankers and finance ministers are not eligible to vote in American Presidential elections, and that, on the whole, is probably a good thing for Sen. George McGovern.

Although there is hardly a European attending the annual meetings of the World Bank and IMF who didn't spend the better part of the last three and a half years complaining about the U.S. dollar and the "exportation of inflation" from the U.S. to their countries, the European establishment at this point is quite comfortable with Mr. Nixon.

Not the least of their qualms about the Democratic candidate is the fear that Sen. McGovern would give a lower priority to the military defense of Europe. They are well posted on one of the earlier position papers in which McGovern was quite specific on reducing U.S. defense expenditures, and on cutting the number of troops in Europe.

But there is more to it than that. Many of them being politicians themselves, the European money men know that should he be elected, Sen. McGovern would find it necessary to shuck off money of his campaign commitments; there never has been an elected head of State who didn't. So the McGovern attitude on European defense isn't regarded as irreversible.

The obstacle that Sen. McGovern has to overcome in the European mind is that under Mr. Nixon, the U.S. economy is getting stronger, inflation is coming under control, and in a short period of time, the once weak U.S. dollar could again become the strong currency of the world.

So in a practical economic sense—the way they look at it—Mr. Nixon is a success story, and Mr. McGovern is an unknown quantity.

There is almost no real concern about the big deficits in the U.S. domestic budget or in the balance of payments accounts. The European forecast jibes with Mr. Herbert

Stein's: a further U.S. recovery in 1973, even if there are renewed inflationary pressures arising from strong demand.

Europeans are not concerned by the high rate of unemployment, or the welfare "mess," or other domestic issues that have plagued the Nixon administration. Abroad, a 5.5 per cent unemployment rate is merely a helpful tool in trimming back inflation.

In fact, the Europeans are downright envious of the way in which the inflation rate here has been slashed in the last year. Despite the problems that still exist for meat and other food prices, the U.S. consumer price index has risen at a rate of only 3 per cent in the last year.

In Germany the rate of inflation is nearly 6 per cent. In most other countries on the Continent, it is running between 5½ and 7 per cent. In Great Britain, it seems to be in a never-ending 9 to 10 per cent cycle. Among major nations, only Canada has done as well as the United States.

One shrewd Common Market official believes that with this competitive edge in world markets, the U.S. will once again enjoy a trade surplus in a couple of years.

A leading German chemical manufacturer has just informed authorities there that lower American prices will force him to locate plants in the United States in an effort to keep his share of the market.

In short, the United States again looks to Europeans like the economic giant of earlier days whose scope is yet to be challenged by a stronger and more united Europe.

The retirement of John Connally from the U.S. Treasury removed an abrasive element, although Europeans guess he probably would be back in power in a new Nixon term. The President has gone a long way to restore the relationships that Connally had jarred by making good on his promise to present a detailed initiative on monetary reform.

Specifically, Mr. Nixon and Treasury Secretary George Schultz made it clear that there is no hostility to a European economic union, operating largely under its own rules if it wants to.

"When you add it all up," said one European banker, "your country is not only stronger economically and doing a much better job now than we are on inflation, but everything is simmering down. A couple of years ago, you'd turn on a TV set in Europe and see riots in the streets. Not now. So things just seem better and while that may be a superficial view, it's the one that most Europeans get."

There is a footnote: Europeans are less entranced than are most Americans with polls. They expect Mr. Nixon to be re-elected, and approve; but they don't take it for granted. Remember, says one, the Truman-Dewey story in 1948.

## CONGRESSMAN KEMP PAYS TRIBUTE TO THE PEOPLE OF POLAND AND POLISH-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

## HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I mentioned in my speech concerning the October 15 Pulaski Day parade in Buffalo, N.Y., that I would be introducing a resolution in memory of the great Polish patriots, Gen. Casimir Pulaski and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko. Today I am introducing this resolution which pays tribute to Polish-American friendship and which requests the President to issue a procla-

mation designating May 3 of each year as Polish Constitution Day. The resolution also requests the President to invite the people of the United States to observe with proper ceremonies this important event in Polish history.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues and all Americans who have an abiding interest in the historic friendship which has existed between the people of Poland and the people of the United States, I include at this time my complete resolution:

## RESOLUTION

*Resolved*, Whereas Poland ranks among the oldest of European nations and became one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe by incorporating in the 1791 Polish Constitution the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state; and

Whereas the people of Poland have for more than a thousand years endeavored to follow the path of peace and freedom and throughout their history have made substantial political, scientific and cultural contributions to the world; and

Whereas the people of Poland share the same spirit and belief in freedom which inspired the American Revolution and the United States Constitution; and

Whereas, in partial recognition of our Nation's debt to the Polish people, the Ninety-second Congress of these United States of America is considering legislation which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas Presidents of the United States, the Congress, Governors of our major States, and mayors in our largest cities have consistently observed and paid tribute to the indomitable and freedom-loving spirit of the Polish people; and

Whereas the Constitution of Poland, which was adopted May 3, 1791, represented a milestone in the struggle of mankind to establish representative and democratic government with the full protection of law and equal justice extended to all of the people; and

Whereas May 3 also marks the anniversary of the death of the great Polish patriot, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, to whom our Nation owes so much for his assistance during our struggle for independence, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, that the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating May 3 of each year as Polish Constitution Day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies.

## THE ENERGY CRISIS

## HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis is receiving the attention of more and more Americans.

Of utmost importance in meeting this crisis is adequate support of research and development related to the production, transmission, and utilization of energy in all forms.

Recognizing the vital role energy research and development must play, over a year ago I established a task force on energy within the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of

the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Chairing this task force is the only scientist in Congress, MIKE McCORMACK of the State of Washington.

He has done an outstanding job in guiding the work of the task force.

Its report, due later this year, is expected to be a landmark in energy research and development policy formation.

Congressman McCORMACK addressed the 1972 Western States Water and Power Consumers conference in Billings, Mont., earlier this week.

His comments on "New Means of Energy Conversion" are relevant to the concerns which my colleagues share with me in finding viable, long term, as well as short term solutions to the energy crisis.

The address by Congressman McCORMACK contains salient facts of which the American people, especially those of us in Government, should be aware.

They furnish a firm foundation for the coming dialog which will be inevitable as Congress considers the ways and means of meeting the energy crisis for the remainder of this century and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take advantage of this opportunity to share Congressman McCORMACK's ideas with my colleagues, and include his remarks to the 1972 Western States Water and Power Consumers conference at this point in the RECORD:

NEW MEANS OF ENERGY CONVERSION  
(An address by the Honorable MIKE McCORMACK)

Ladies and Gentlemen: This morning I will review several alternate forms of energy conversion that may be available to this country during this century. I will evaluate them and suggest priorities and time-lines for their development. The material from which I will draw comes from the work of the House of Representatives Task Force on Energy, of which I am Chairman. The Task Force on Energy was created by Congressman George Miller, Chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. We were directed to study and report on the research and development requirements associated with national energy needs. During the one year of its existence, the Task Force has conducted a large number of briefings with the best available experts in every field of energy conversion, transmission and conservation. In addition, the Sub-Committee on Science Research and Development, chaired by Congressman John Davis of Georgia, has conducted six days of hearings on the national energy crisis.

No report has yet been published by the Sub-Committee or the Task Force, however, and the opinions I express here today are my own.

During the 20th Century the United States has depended primarily for energy on coal and some coal gas, petroleum and petroleum products, natural gas, hydro-electricity and from the burning of wood. During recent years we have witnessed the beginning of the commercial development of the nuclear electric power industry; and we are all aware of projections which indicate that during the balance of this century a large portion of newly installed electric generation capacity will be powered by nuclear fission.

This is a reasonable point of departure for our projections for the future, and for our establishing priorities for research and development related to alternate forms of energy. Our nation's energy policy must assume an adequate supply of all forms of energy with a minimum impact on the environment

and a maximum concern for conservation of natural resources. Obviously, economic feasibility also will play a major role in selecting any source of energy and any form of conversion.

Today, the major effort in the field of energy conversion is concentrated on the nuclear breeder reactor. Under the direction of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, a well-coordinated, well-conceived breeder program is going forward with all reasonable speed. Certainly, the commitment to have a liquid metal fast breeder demonstration plant in operation as soon as possible after 1980 must be the focus of our present efforts. In order to provide an adequate supply of fissionable material, it is obviously essential to an overall energy policy for this nation that the breeder program succeed. In addition to the commendable emphasis on the liquid metal fast breeder reactor (LMFBR) program, we should, I believe, be directing additional attention to alternate breeder programs such as the gas-cooled fast breeder reactor and the molten salt breeder. As much as we must rely on the LMFBR, prudence dictates that we should not place our exclusive commitment on one single course of action in a matter of such importance to our nation.

I think it is important for us to keep our perspective with respect to nuclear energy. We have turned to fission because it is attainable, and because it is the only sure source of electric energy that will provide us with the amount of electricity that this nation will need during the next 20 to 30 years, at a cost we can afford to pay.

However, we should not be oblivious to problems associated with the massive use of nuclear fission. Most important of these is the management and storage of radioactive wastes. I have no doubt that we will develop satisfactory and secure methods for the storage of such wastes. Nevertheless, they are a legacy which we leave to future generations. The obligations and hazards associated with the perpetual care of massive quantities of radioactive materials should not be, I believe, bequeathed to future generations if there are equally attractive means of converting other sources of energy to usable forms. Therefore, I consider it incumbent on this nation to vigorously pursue research and development related to other sources of energy. Before discussing alternate sources of energy, it is appropriate to consider the use of fossil fuels and the role they will play in providing for the nation's needs during the balance of this century.

By any projection, however conservative, we will have consumed essentially all our natural gas resource before the end of this century. In addition, unless we can somehow perform the almost miraculous feat of converting our transportation system away from petroleum-fueled engines within the very near future, virtually all of our domestic oil resource will also be consumed before the year 2000. Of particular concern is the fact that the amount of petroleum available for electric energy production in the near future will be insignificant compared to the demand.

I will not, in this discussion, consider present or future demands for energy for transportation. It may be sufficient to comment that we consume more energy in burning petroleum products for transportation than we consume from all sources to produce electricity. In that respect, it may be interesting to observe that the Department of Interior assumes that in the year 1985, even with the North Slope of Alaska in production, we will be importing 23% of our oil from the Eastern Hemisphere, 8% from Canada, and 13% from South America. When one considers that both Western Europe and Japan also depend upon petroleum from the same exhaustible supply in the politically

unstable Middle East for most of their energy, one can begin to comprehend the blood-chilling implications of our depending on imports of more than six million barrels per day from this source, to say nothing of the impact of such imports on our economy and our trade balance. This is, to me, one of the major elements of our energy crisis.

The exhaustion of petroleum and natural gas, tragic in itself, leads to the necessity of placing heavy emphasis on a program for converting our major remaining form of fossil fuel, coal, into usable gaseous and liquid forms. Even with a successful breeder program; coal gasification is the only way to meet this nation's energy demands during this century and at the same time impose reasonable modifications on the existing industrial complex. Gasification offers a significant environmental advantage over the direct combustion of coal by removing virtually all sulfur, arsenic, mercury, radioactive contaminants and noncombustible material before the fuel is burned.

However, there is a much more compelling reason for coal gasification. This nation faces a critical shortage of natural gas in the very near future. It is my personal belief that attempts to import natural gas or to depend upon new gas fields being discovered within the territorial limits of the United States are temporary at best, and uncertain at worst. This nation is served by an underground network of arteries providing gas to industry, business, public buildings, and private homes. It is essential that we keep gas flowing in these pipelines. For this reason the gasification of coal, which is fundamentally a developmental problem rather than one involving basic research, must have the same priority and operate on essentially the same time-line as the breeder program.

We must have economically feasible, large scale coal gasification demonstration plants in operation by 1980. We must have a number of such plants in commercial operation before 1990. Our program must be such that we will not at any time be at the mercy of foreign military or economic pressures with respect to our energy resource requirements.

Even assuming the success of the breeder reactor program and a program for coal gasification on the timelines that I have recommended, this nation should establish as a matter of policy that as much of its energy as possible will, in the future, be obtained from non-exhaustible and essentially non-polluting sources. Such a policy should be implemented as soon as is economically and technologically feasible to do so.

The first such alternate source is solar energy. Work by Dr. and Mrs. Aden Meinel of the University of Arizona, and others, indicates that it may be possible to build large electric generating plants powered by solar energy collected in "solar farms" located in the deserts of the Southwest. The concepts involved in such a system are quite simple and lend themselves to a broad spectrum of comparatively inexpensive experiments to determine economic and technical feasibility.

The benefits of solar energy are obvious. Feasibility studies can be carried out much more quickly and inexpensively than comparable research and development in, for instance, nuclear energy. It may not be possible to build a full scale demonstration plant producing electricity from solar energy by 1980, but we should explore the many technological options related to solar energy conversion as rapidly as possible. Our goal should be the production of economically competitive solar electric energy in large blocks by the mid-1980's.

Another attractive source of energy for conversion to electricity is geothermal energy. Here again, we may be dealing with a potentially inexhaustible supply of essentially non-polluting energy. Geothermal energy includes dry steam such as is presently being tapped



at Geyser, California and converted to electricity, and the hot underground salt brines near the Salton Sea. It also includes the energy that may be derived directly from high temperature dry rock formations lying deep below the surface of the earth in any one of hundreds of locations in this country or elsewhere. In this instance, as in terrestrial solar energy research, relatively inexpensive research and development may be adequate to demonstrate the economic feasibility of converting geothermal energy to electricity. One intriguing aspect of geothermal energy is that, assuming that it is feasible at all, it may be practical to build comparatively small generating plants near load centers such as small and medium-sized towns, and thus reduce the dependence on long transmission lines.

I believe that our national energy policy should establish the same priorities and time-lines for research and development for terrestrial solar and geothermal energy as I have previously outlined for the breeder program and for coal gasification. Such a research and development effort, involving all of these sources of energy and means of conversion, and having them available by the mid-1980's if they are feasible, is well within this nation's economic and technical capability.

There are two other sources of energy which may be available by about the end of this century. The first of these is satellite solar energy. In this instance, colossal satellites will be stationed in synchronous orbit, converting solar heat to electricity with solar panels which are conceived to be many square miles in area. The energy would be transmitted to earth as a focused beam of microwaves, and converted to usable electricity at receptor stations adjacent to load centers. Preliminary feasibility studies for satellite solar energy are already being carried out by a group of major American corporations, funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Satellite solar energy seems, if one may coin a pun, to be "pretty far out". However true this may seem, such a proposal is completely in context with the magnitude of energy demands and their costs in dollars which will be facing this nation and this world by the year 2000. Physical studies to determine the technical feasibility of satellite solar energy can and should be undertaken in the near future. However, it will take the balance of this century, even with an aggressive research and development program, before a demonstration facility, hopefully producing competitively priced electricity, can be in operation. Among other problems with this concept is the present cost of solar cells and the obvious need to find some mechanism to mass produce solar panels at a very small fraction of their present cost. Obviously, the solar satellite energy program will be heavily dependant on the space shuttle.

The second long range project that offers so much hope for the human race is controlled thermonuclear fusion. There, indeed, may lie the ultimate source of energy for all mankind, with a virtually unlimited supply of fuel in the heavy hydrogen that is a part of all the water on earth. Fusion research has been aggressively pursued for many years, and substantial progress has been made. There is every reason to believe that we will ultimately succeed in producing economically competitive fusion electricity in vast quantities.

Nevertheless, his promise should not lead us to expecting too much, too soon. Unless there are totally unforeseen breakthroughs, it is unlikely that we can anticipate any electric production from nuclear fusion much before the year 2000. Neither should we ignore the fact that the cost will certainly be many billions of dollars. Fusion electricity will be

worth all the time and money we will spend on it. I am optimistic that it will ultimately be obtained. However, we cannot today anticipate that it will be available before the year 2000.

In my remarks today, I have discussed several alternate sources of energy and means of converting them to usable forms. Time does not allowed a detailed discussion of the vast spectrum of research and development projects that must be carried out to make the use of energy in these various forms available to us.

We will need a national power grid and long distance direct-current transmission lines. Extensive research and development will be required. The promise of low-loss cryogenic and superconducting transmission lines, and the possible storage of huge amounts of electricity in superconducting systems must be explored. Fuel cells and magnetohydrodynamics may offer great efficiency and flexibility. Materials testing for every type of energy conversion and transmission are critically important, and will be extravagantly expensive and time consuming.

The pollution free burning of all municipal sewage and solid wastes to produce electricity appears attractive for serious research and development.

Energy sources such as the tides, the thermal gradients in our oceans, and the wind may be practical on a limited basis. Continued research and development on oil-shale and tar-sands is certainly in order. Studies on secondary and tertiary recovery of oil and gas holds promise.

In the field of energy conservation, land use policies, zoning, and the construction of domed cities where the use of private automobiles is forbidden, may prove to be practical.

All of these areas of research and development—and many others—will be of great value to our Nation. They must be pursued in an orderly manner, with adequate attention given to national priorities, required lead-times, costs, and potential benefits.

This will not occur by accident. It must be planned according to a national energy policy. It must be under the administrative review of a single agency. It must be adequately funded.

Developing a National Energy Policy is a matter of utmost urgency. The energy crisis grows more acute with each passing day. There are few more important matters facing our nation.

To summarize, this nation cannot afford to proceed into the balance of the 20th Century with a comprehensive and organized National Energy Policy—one that will provide for maximum continuity of supply and optimum use of the fossil fuels upon which we now depend, one that will insure the continued orderly development of our nuclear options and, one that will feature an urgent and intensive campaign to develop inexhaustible and non-polluting sources of energy for the future.

This will require a radical departure from our current national policies and programs with respect to energy resource development. It will require formation of a new federal administrative agency to formulate and direct such a national policy—an agency that will seek the appropriate funding and oversee the programs that are required.

It is clear that the scope of our research and development effort must be greatly expanded and its magnitude greatly increased. We must firmly establish that programs leading to demonstration plants for coal gasification, terrestrial solar energy and geothermal energy have the same priorities and be on the same time-line as those for the nuclear breeder reactor.

On a longer time scale, but still by the year 2000, we should have demonstration plants to establish the technical and eco-

nomie feasibility of almost perfect sources of energy—satellite solar and controlled thermonuclear fusion.

Even while developing these major new energy resources, we must simultaneously pursue extensive work in many less costly but equally important areas. These efforts must be directed toward the goal of providing the energy that is needed at a low price, and doing so from essentially inexhaustible and non-polluting sources, consistent with our philosophy of protecting our environment and conserving our national resources. This program is well within our nation's economic and technological capabilities today.

Failure to act now on this critical national problem will only result in the need for crash programs in the future with their attendant inefficiencies and skyrocketing costs.

It cannot be overemphasized that this nation is facing a real energy crisis, and that nothing less than new directions, new administrative agencies and greatly increased national effort will suffice to protect us from serious problems in the future.

H.R. 16742, LONG OVERDUE

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon be considering H.R. 16742 recently reported to the House by the House Committee on Internal Security. The September 27, 1972, edition of the Evening Star and Daily News contained an excellent article by noted columnist David Lawrence as to the need for H.R. 16742, which I commend for reading by the Members:

VIET WAR BILL THAT WAS OVERDUE  
(By David Lawrence)

At last a committee of Congress has taken a step to stop Americans from dealing with the enemies of the United States in the midst of a war.

The House Internal Security Committee has approved a bill which would prohibit any citizen of this country from traveling to nations engaged in armed conflict with the United States unless authorized by the President after he had determined whether the trip was in the national interest. Violators would be subject to a prison sentence, a fine, or both.

The action by the committee, which would be followed soon by passage in the House and Senate, is aimed at those who have been in communication with officials in North Vietnam and who have been told by their friends or misguided advisers that it is proper to go there. Unquestionably North Vietnam has used innocent persons as instruments for its propaganda and has convinced some members of the families of prisoners of war that there was nothing improper about their trips.

Richard H. Ichord, Democrat of Missouri, who is chairman of the House Internal Security Committee, has expressed the hope that passage of the bill would "stem the venomous flow of statements emanating from the mouths of American citizens on the soil of the enemy." While the measure is aimed at the activists in the anti-war groups, it could be an obstacle to further traveling to North Vietnam by relatives of prisoners of war.

The Hanoi government arranged for some relatives of prisoners to come to North Vietnam and secured statements which are filled with unwitting propaganda that the visiting individuals probably thought would do no

harm but might secure the release of the prisoners. The Communists, however, through their news agency spread the comments throughout the world and quote Americans as criticizing their own government.

The propaganda machine of the Communists, moreover, has had opportunities to use the names of prominent Americans who have visited there and openly condemned their own country. The effort to divide American public opinion by the use of propaganda has been going on for some time, but it has not been until recently that so many opportunities were afforded the North Vietnamese to get the benefit of interviews with well-known Americans. All this has produced resentment in Congress and hence the bill was approved by the committee after a brief hearing.

To denounce the United States while a prisoner under compulsion in Hanoi would be one thing, but some visitors have returned to America and continued their defense of North Vietnam with arguments supporting the military adversary of their own country in a war that has been going on for several years. This has rarely occurred in previous conflicts.

It is surprising that Congress has not moved on this issue before. For the impression conveyed by those Americans who have deliberately gone to North Vietnam, talked with officials there about the problem of the prisoners or other matters related to the war and then gave interviews with adverse comments about their own government is something that has stirred up a lot of ill-feeling throughout the nation as well as in Congress.

It is questionable whether all this will help the release of the prisoners when the negotiations in Paris are resumed in earnest. Hanoi has mistakenly assumed that the American people were swinging away from the administration and would not be willing to continue the war, but the South Vietnamese are still growing stronger and the advisory aid given by the United States and its air power will be available if any new offensives are started against South Vietnam.

#### SECRETARY VOLPE SPEAKS ON TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

#### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, September 25, 1972, the Secretary of Transportation, John A. Volpe, made an important address to the Washington Concrete Paving Association and affiliated groups at the Olympic Hotel in Seattle. What the Secretary stressed in his speech is that we must not be complacent because our highway system is the envy of the rest of the world, but rather we must look ahead in our transportation planning. The Secretary called for mobility and pointed out that the biggest problem facing the city is urban transportation.

Mr. Speaker, because Secretary Volpe's message delivered in Seattle touches on matters which are common problems in practically every congressional district, under unanimous consent, I am including it at this point in the RECORD:

#### VOLPE'S TRANSPORTATION MESSAGE

Because you are primarily construction people here tonight—highway builders and members of the Associated General Contractors—and because this just happens to be National Highway Week—let me begin by re-inforcing a point or two.

As I told the American Transit Association this morning—here in this same ballroom—our Nation's highways are essential to our commerce and indispensable to the movement of people and products. Our highway system is the envy of the world. It is the thread that ties our cities and states together, the network that gives Americans mobility never dreamed of in previous generations.

Our highway system makes it possible for people who cherish the outdoor life to live as much as 50 miles away from their jobs. It enables youngsters to appreciate the scope and the breadth of this great land. It allows produce from Washington state to appear in Chicago supermarkets. It has tied our Nation together—not just our cities and states. It has given us a cohesiveness that helps keep us a strong and determined people.

Yet as we enjoy the benefits of this program—we must also keep an eye to the future. We must make ready now for the events that lie ahead—just as an Olympic competitor spends weeks and months in a rigorous training for that one exulting moment of truth in the spotlight of the arena.

The one brief transportation message I bring to you tonight is that we cannot—we must not—stand still in our tracks, running in place, and say, "Don't rock the boat; don't change". Because, my friends, we live in times of change. We live in an era where complacency is the sure road to disaster. Satchel Paige said it best: "Never look back—someone may be catching up on you".

In President Nixon's words, "If we are to keep our country from falling behind the times, we must keep well ahead of events in our transportation planning."

Let me assure you that in this Administration, transportation means "mobility" and mobility requires that we develop and improve all modes so each will be able to serve the purpose for which it was designed and is best suited. And when it comes to traffic in congested areas, let's face it—bumper to bumper cars just aren't the answer!

There is much work to be done and the challenge of urban transportation takes high priority.

At present, more than 70 percent of our population live on only 2 percent of the land. Or, phrased in another way, nearly 80 percent of our people live in metropolitan areas. This means concentration and too often—congestion.

I remember one particularly strong and succinct statement of this urban problem. It went as follows: "The single greatest problem facing the city today is transportation in all its aspects. This includes roads, traffic flow, intersection congestion, pedestrian movement, parking and pollution..."

That quote comes from a report entitled "The Emerging Downtown". It was based on a study done right here in Seattle, so you see I'm not talking in broad generalities.

I'm talking about your city—about King County—about this whole Pacific Northwest megalopolis.

I was tremendously pleased by the outcome of the referendum here in King County last week. That 3/10 of a cent sales tax—which will provide the \$96 million needed to set up a county-wide bus mass transit system—will probably be the best 3/10 of a cent the people of this area have even invested in anything! I'm serious! Without it, you would see your city slowly strangle and die. You are limited here by your geography—yet the very assets of that geography (the harbor, the Sound, the clean air, the compactness of the center city core) would be worth far less if you were forced to devote inordinate amounts of space to transportation facilities.

By providing a county-wide system that will include express buses, exclusive bus lanes, extensive fringe parking areas—along with new vehicles that have carpeted floors, pastel colors, low-emission engines, comfortable seats, air conditioning, and so forth—you will be providing Seattle's commuters with an attractive alternative.

And when commuters—who use those cars only twice a day—avoid the congestion and use public transportation, you'll find that those freeways are going to be free indeed. Free and open for the 60 mile-an-hour traffic for which they were designed!

That's what I'd call a logical approach to good urban transportation, and I am delighted that the voters of King County agree!

Now there may be those of you who don't think bus rapid transit will ever work—no matter what improvements are made. Well, I beg to differ. In 1969, bus commuters from suburban Virginia came into Washington, D.C. on the same congested freeway that the automobiles used. And the bus company carried about 4,000 passengers a day. My Department financed an experimental exclusive bus lane down the median strip of that highway. Traveling time for bus riders was cut—in some cases—from as much as an hour down to as little as 15 minutes! And as of last month there are now 151 buses using that exclusive lane every rush hour—and they carry 17,000 passengers a day, which is more than the number of commuters who use that highway in their automobiles!

These are new buses—comfortable and convenient—and commuters from Northern Virginia have never had it so good. So we know it will work, and we look forward to working with the Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle as this project gets underway.

My friends—there is one other point I would like to make here tonight. There has been considerable interest, nationwide, in this Administration's support of proposals to make money from the Highway Trust Fund available for uses other than the design and construction of highways.

Let me lay out the facts, so you'll have the story straight. The measure we support—which has already passed the Senate by a substantial margin and is due for consideration in the House—sets aside a portion of highway revenues. That portion amounts to \$800 million. It is earmarked for urban areas—and it is earmarked for transportation. It is not earmarked for buses, or for rapid rail transit or for people movers, monorails, busways or highways. That decision, my friends, will be up to you.

This Administration wants local decisions made by local people. You know what your needs are—and you know what the answers to those needs should be. And if the people of this area want to use their share of that fund entirely for highways—that legislation says "OK"—it's your decision. If you want to use it all for transit, that's OK too. Or a 50-50 mix, or a 70-30 mix. It's your business—because, after all, it's your money.

That's what this Legislation calls for—and I hope that you agree that such an approach is fair, is appropriate and is in the spirit of a free society. To my way of thinking this isn't a "raid" on the highway fund—rather it's a ray of hope for improved mobility for all Americans!

All in all, I am convinced that we have made sound progress.

I am convinced we shall be even more effective in the future. We have, under President Nixon, picked up momentum these past four years. There are some who are urging that we stand still—or even go backwards—return to old ways. I for my part want none of it. I believe in progress. I believe we have an obligation. I believe we also have an obligation to make this world ready for the young people who will inherit this Nation. And I accept that obligation.



CONGRESSMAN DOMINICK V. DANIELS RAPS SO-CALLED POLISH JOKE—"POLES ARE GOOD CITIZENS," DANIELS SAYS

**HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS**  
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Edward S. Warlikowski, president of the Polish American Progress Association of Jersey City, N.J., sent a most important letter to various television stations and media. The letter in question deals with so-called Polish jokes which are most demeaning to persons of Polish ancestry. Although I am not Polish I can recall an era when this kind of humor was considered funny and acceptable. Today it is not. Yet, there are still comedians who make a living demeaning ethnic groups. For reasons that are not at all clear to me Poles seem to be top target for such comics. Just why this is so is baffling because I am at a loss to name a single ethnic group that is more distinguished as good citizens than our fellow citizens of Polish extraction.

Mr. Speaker, Poles are justly outraged at this never-ending attack upon their heritage. I share their sense of outrage and I ask that Mr. Warlikowski's very much to the point letter follow my remarks in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

POLISH AMERICAN  
PROGRESS ASSOCIATION,  
Jersey City, N.J., September 20, 1972.

Subject: Demeaning ethnic jokes.

1. The TV networks have a responsibility not to turn the strong forces of television into an instrument of debasement. Recent so-called jokes on some TV networks have used the Americans of Polish Heritage as the scape-goat for a stream of demeaning slurs.

2. These practices of promoting hostility of one ethnic group of Americans against other groups of ethnic Americans can lead to serious consequences. Continuance of these slurs will create frustrations which in turn can lead to burning hatred against the perpetrators.

3. We recall a man named Adolph Hitler also baited an ethnic minority during his rise to power. This "baiting" accelerated into the most devastating murder of humanity the "human" race could conceive.

4. We do not believe a licensed media such as TV has included in their license, the right to demean an ethnic group. You have a right to free speech provided you do not abridge our right of dignity.

5. The entire world will soon be celebrating the 500th Anniversary of the birth of that Great Polish Astronomer Mikolaj Kopernik. It would be an unfortunate collision if the Polish Community, in honoring Kopernik, had to resort to "activist" means in quelling the slurs against the character or intelligence of people of Poland or their American descendants.

6. We solicit your support in subscribing to a broadcast standard that does not single-out an ethnic group and bait them into an attitude of racial or religious hatred.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD WARLIKOWSKI,  
President.

VALLEJO ROTARY TO RESCUE

**HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in an age when newspaper headlines report global skyjackings, big power confrontations, and strained relationships between international neighbors, it is heartening to hear about locally initiated programs of international goodwill.

Such a program has been initiated in California by my good friend Everett Rolff, past president and active member of the Vallejo Rotary Club. With the aid of the Rotary Club of northern California, Mr. Rolff and others succeeded in raising \$10,000 to aid a children's library in the small Mexican village of Patzcuaro. Previously, the library was housed in an abandoned convent, and contained only those few books donated by American residents.

Today, however, the children of Patzcuaro have a new library which contains a healthy collection of books printed in both Spanish and English, and facilities for craft activities.

This is foreign aid at its best. The people of Patzcuaro gained a library, and the Rotarians of northern California were able to experience the tremendous satisfaction that can only come from involvement in such a program.

At this point in the RECORD I insert the Vallejo Times-Herald article by Marion Devlin, entitled "Dream Realized for Patzcuaro":

DREAM REALIZED FOR PATZCUARO  
(By Jan Stockstill)

Hands across the sea? No, not in this case. More like hearts across the border.

The story started in the historic town of Patzcuaro, Mexico, where Everett Rolff, past president and active member of the Vallejo Rotary Club, has been a frequent visitor. And the story's end reflects a cosmopolitan effort made by Northern California children's library in the small Mexican village.

Rolff first saw the possibilities of the project in 1965, when Patzcuaro's children's library was housed in an abandoned convent.

"The only books in the building were donated by retired American residents," he explained. Soon the convent was no longer available, and a local banker lent a small storeroom for the library.

"The plans to provide a new library for the youngsters were initiated by Mr. and Mrs. Hugo Van Arx," Rolff said. Van Arx has retired in the Mexican town, once the capital of the Terascan Indians, from his duties as business manager of a national magazine.

Finally a plan for a new building was approved, whereby the community would raise one-third of the funds, with government assistance acquired for the remaining two-thirds.

The Vallejo Rotary Club, acting on Rolff's suggestion, decided to provide equipment for the new library's office, using funds from a well-received International Gourmet Dinner.

The dinners have continued for the last four years, with representatives from local ethnic groups, including Filipino, Greek, German, Guamanian, Hebrew, Mexican, Nor-

wegian, American, and Portuguese, preparing specialty dishes from their countries.

Vallejoans soon learned that the event is an outstanding experience in good eating and a yearly highlight in Rotary activities. The most recent local dinner was held at Dan Foley Cultural Center in April with Jerry Nickolatos as general chairman.

But Vallejo wasn't the only community arranging such an event. Rotary District Governor Ross Becker grew interested in the Mexican children's library and established the project district-wide. Forty-two clubs, from Mt. Shasta to Berkeley, participated, each group staging an international dinner. The \$10,000 raised from the district efforts was earmarked to establish a trust fund for Biblioteca Infantil, the newly-built library and cultural center for children in Patzcuaro.

So it was with pride and pleasure that Rolff returned to the village in Mexico this year. He and current District Governor Ross Lawler made the trip to present the \$10,000 check to Dr. Jose Miguel Rizo, Rotary district governor in Mexico, to be turned over to library trustees.

Rolff notes that Dr. Rizo is acquainted with descendants of the Vallejo family that settled our own California territory.

"Mention Vallejo in Patzcuaro and the citizens will greet you warmly," Rolff said.

During their stay, Mr. and Mrs. Rolff toured the beautiful new library building and he visited with the Patzcuaro children, reading to them in both Spanish and English. The building not only houses books printed in both languages, but also features facilities for craft activities.

Historic Patzcuaro ("Place of Stones") lies approximately 240 miles west of Mexico City, near Morelia. These stones or foundations were named "Petatzecua" by the Terascans who found them at the sites of ruined temples of an earlier civilization.

According to Rolff, the traveler approaching from the north skirts farm and grazing land along the shores of Lake Patzcuaro for a short distance before entering the town limits. The highway then becomes tree-lined Avenida de las Americas, which leads gradually uphill for about two miles toward the tiled roofs and cobbled streets on steeper slopes at the center of town. Here, al centro, the visitor encounters colonial Patzcuaro with its picturesque squares, churches, mansions, and fountains, built between 1521 and 1810, many of which are still in use.

The climate of Patzcuaro is temperate, he reports, and its days are comfortably warm during all four seasons. During the rainy season, which begins in May and ends in October, wet afternoons are perfect for visits to historic buildings, the Museum of Popular Arts, and various workshops that produce the handicrafts for which the village is noted.

Rainy days are ideal, too, for a visit to Biblioteca Infantil, supported through efforts of California ethnic groups who joined together with Rotarians in a program of American goodwill and fellowship toward Mexican neighbors.

DR. URBANSKI MARKS 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF TEACHING

**HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate Dr. Edmund S. Urbanski a distinguished

Polish scholar upon his celebrating the 30th anniversary of his university teaching career.

Dr. Urbanski has established himself as an outstanding professor and author, who should be acclaimed not only by his own Polish people but by the entire world of culture and literature. Having given nearly a third of a century to the humanities of the entire world, we should take a small part out of our life to honor him for his contribution to world culture and for his scholarly articles which have been published in all parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, in order that my colleagues in this House of Representatives will have a broader knowledge of Dr. Urbanski's accomplishments, I wish to bring to their attention an article which appeared in the *Zgoda*, the official publication of the Polish National Alliance in the United States of North America, the largest fraternal organization of people of Polish extraction, which was issued on Saturday, July 15, 1972.

I know that it will be of interest to all the Members of the House, and I insert it as part of my remarks.

The matter referred to above follows:

DR. URBANSKI—30 YEARS OF TEACHING

WASHINGTON.—Dr. Edmund Stephen Urbanski, Professor of Spanish American literature and civilization at Howard University is this year observing the thirtieth anniversary of his university teaching career. From 1942 to 1945 he taught Polish language and culture at the National University of Mexico, thereby establishing the only chair of its kind in Latin America. Deeply interested in the New World's prehistory, he served as an assistant to the Norwegian archeologist Ola Apenes, in uncovering the Aztec ruins in the Texcoco region's Chimalhuacan. This anthropological interest inspired further studies of the Maya, Zapotec, and Inca civilizations at their archaeological sites, and led to his later involvement in cultural anthropology.

In 1946 Dr. Urbanski moved to the United States, where he switched from Slavic to Hispanic Area Studies. Since then, he has been teaching Spanish-American culture and literature at various universities, as well as engaging in extensive research and travel to Spanish-speaking nations. While a Faculty member at John Carroll University, he established the Polish Club, and at Western Illinois University the Spanish Club. In addition to his educational and scholarly activities, Prof. Urbanski served as a Consultant to the Peace Corps' Latin American Training Program and to the NDEA Spanish Institute in Kentucky. Since 1965 he has been a Visiting Lecturer at the Inter-American Defense College in Washington, D.C., and in recent years Consultant on Latin American scholarships to Canada Council. During his foreign journeys Dr. Urbanski served also as a guest lecturer in Argentina, Guatemala, Ecuador, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Spain and Holland.

Dr. Urbanski studied the Humanities in Poland, Sweden, Mexico, Spain, Peru and the United States. He received his M.A. degree in Latin American History and Doctorate in Hispanic Letters from the National University of Mexico, and a Diploma in Hispanic culture from the University of Barcelona. He is the author of five books in Spanish, one in English and one in Polish. He has also written over fifty essays and scholarly articles on Indianist and Hispanic subjects, which were published in Europe, Canada, Latin America, and the United States. Most of his publications are indexed by bibliographical journals in both continents.

This scholar's recent book on Anglo-American and Spanish-American civilizations set something of a record, being commented upon in sixteen American and European countries. Dr. Urbanski maintains an independence of criterion, which is not swayed by either temporary political conjunctures or by the author's personal fascination by this troubled part of the New World. His approach is always humanistic. Because of this approach, free of cultural and racial bias, the Columbian school, Dr. Ramiro Lagos, considers Urbanski the most "Hispanoamericanized" North American author. The U.S. Hispanist, Dr. Richard F. Allen, states that Urbanski's essays constitute "a pioneering work in comparative culture", in which he "revises many outmoded concepts of traditional evaluation, thus bridging the past with our atomic age." The Peruvian anthropologist, Dr. Manuel M. Valle, calls Urbanski an "erudite humanist, who deals with complex Americanist topics without academic Byzantinism, which still pervades some authors, whether Hispanic or Anglo-saxon."

#### RESOLUTION CONDEMNING TERRORIST KILLING

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the killing of 11 Israeli Olympic athletes by terrorists was a barbaric act which shocked every civilized person.

It was an act of such depravity that men and women all over the world paused to mourn the dead men and to express their anger at the murders.

In Philadelphia, the city council passed a resolution condemning the killings.

At this time I enter into the RECORD this resolution:

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST KILLING OF 11 MEMBERS OF THE ISRAELI OLYMPIC TEAM PARTICIPATING IN THE XX OLYMPIAD AT MUNICH, AND CALLING FOR THE ISOLATION OF THOSE COUNTRIES WHICH AID OR SUPPORT PERPETRATORS OF SUCH BARBARIC ACTS ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

Whereas, The fanatical and deadly assault on Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics by Palestinian terrorists on September 5, 1972, not only desecrated the Olympic concept of brotherhood but also the elementary basics of humanity; and

Whereas, Philadelphia joins the world community in mourning the loss of Israel's athletes and extends its deepest sympathy to the people of Israel and to the families of those so tragically lost; and

Whereas, Civilized people everywhere must resolutely determine that a common and united way must be and should be found to prevent any recurrence of such an inhuman visitation of brutal piracy and murder upon any group of innocent persons assembled peacefully anywhere in the world; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby condemn the terrorist killing of eleven members of the Israeli Olympic Team at Munich and urge the isolation of those countries which aid or support perpetrators of such barbaric raids.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Congressional delegation from Pennsylvania, the United States Am-

bassador to the United Nations, and the Consul General of Israel in Philadelphia as evidence of the sentiments of this legislative body.

#### CONGRESSMAN WYDLER CON- DEMNS TERRORISM

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the world has become increasingly aware of the horrors of terrorism. No matter where that is taking place, whether in Northern Ireland, at Munich at the Olympic games, in diplomatic mails, or in the hamlets in South Vietnam, those who practice terrorism for terrorism's sake are increasingly being condemned by the world community. I am personally delighted that the United States is taking the lead in the United Nations to bring the subject of terrorism up for world scrutiny and debate and in focusing attention on terrorism and injustice in all its facets. I have spoken out on this subject over the past few months and have been asked by many to repeat these words and my positions.

The articles are as follows:

WYDLER CABLES PRIME MINISTER GOLDA MEIR

Congressman John W. Wydlar (R-Nassau County) announced today, Sept. 6, that he has sent a telegram to the Prime Minister of Israel, Golda Meir, condemning the wanton murder of eleven Israeli citizens who were attending the Olympic Games as part of the Israeli team.

"It is incredible that such an act took place in surroundings dedicated to world peace and understanding," Wydlar said, "but it is indicative of the tortured and twisted minds that are at work in trying to settle political questions by violence and murder."

The text of the telegram follows:

"SEPTEMBER 6, 1972.

"Hon. GOLDA MEIR,  
"Prime Minister of Israel,  
"Ramat Aviv, Israel.

"DEAR MRS. MEIR: As a member of the United States Congress, I would like to express to you my horror and shock at the murder of eleven innocent citizens of Israel who were part of your team at the Olympic Games.

"I know I speak for the people of Long Island, who I represent in Congress, regardless of their religion. I hope this incident will serve to alert all countries to the need for world condemnation of those who violate every civilized rule of conduct in their dealings with others.

"I want you to know that you have my deepest sympathy in the loss you and your nation have suffered.

"Very truly yours,

JOHN W. WYDLER,  
"Member of Congress."

WYDLER RESOLUTION CONDEMNS SOVIET UNION  
FOR EMIGRATION RANSOM

Congressman John W. Wydlar (R-Nassau County) introduced a resolution on September 7th condemning the Soviet Union "for its policy of demanding a ransom from educated Jews who want to emigrate to Israel."

Wydlar said the resolution states:

"That the government and leaders of the Soviet Union should be condemned for creat-



ing a class of slaves in the 20th Century by forcing thousands of people to live and work in a country which they want to leave, because they do not have the money to ransom themselves into freedom."

Wylder said the resolution was introduced on September 7th because it was the last day Congress was in session before Rosh Hashonah, the Jewish New Year, which begins Friday night.

"This is a time for remembering the past year and of hope for the coming year," Wylder stated, "But for the Jews in the Soviet Union the only hope they have is that world opinion will force the Russians to set them free."

Wylder said the Russians' new policy places a price on the head of every Jew with an advanced education who wants to emigrate to Israel. The reports vary but the ransom appears to be from \$5,000 for a graduate of a teachers college to \$25,000 for a person with the equivalent of a PH. D.

"This action is the same as Hitler's barbarism of trading Jews for trucks and Castro's demands of ransom for the prisoners captured at the Bay of Pigs," Wylder declared.

Wylder said the resolution will put the Soviet leaders on notice that they cannot continue to persecute the Russian Jews without being censured and scorned for their acts.

#### WYDLER COMMENDS AMBASSADOR BUSH FOR VETO

Congressman John W. Wylder (R-Nassau County) has introduced a House Resolution today, Sept. 13, commending Ambassador George Bush for vetoing a resolution in the United Nations which condemned Israel for reprisals without recognizing Arab terrorism in Munich.

"I believe President Nixon and Ambassador Bush have performed an important public service not only for our country, but for the world," Congressman Wylder said. "It is time to recognize the presence of terrorism and to take a stand. The United Nations should cease its two-face procedure of deploring reprisals and ignoring the facts which brought them into being. Terrorism, whether in Northern Ireland, the captured cities of South Vietnam, or in Munich, must be dealt with on an international basis of condemnation."

"The veto by Ambassador Bush indicated the Nixon Administration is changing American policy in this regard and, if backed by world opinion, could make it possible to bring about peace in the Middle East."

The text of the resolution follows:

"Whereas, the violence in the Middle East is inextricably tied to the massacre in Munich on September 5, and the terrorism at Lod Airport.

"Whereas, the world must recognize this link and react fully to both forms of violence.

"Whereas the United States has always used its veto power sparingly, and did, in this case, endeavor to achieve a compromise in order to avoid veto, be it hereby

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives, that the House fully supports the decision of the United States delegation to the United Nations to veto a resolution that would have called for the immediate cessation of all 'military operation' in the Middle East without relating the Israeli attacks of the last four days to the terrorist attacks that took eleven Israeli lives in Munich and twenty-six at Lod, and be it further,

"Resolved, that the House of Representatives commends the courageous and eloquent statement of our Ambassador, George Bush."

#### WYDLER DENOUNCES PRESIDENT AMIN'S ANTI-SEMITIC REMARKS

Congressman John W. Wylder (R-Nassau County) announced Sept. 20 his support for

an amendment to the Foreign Aid Bill, coming to the Floor of the House for a vote this week, which would prohibit the use of any funds for aid to the government of Uganda.

In announcing his support for the amendment, Congressman Wylder said, "President Amin has stated that 55,000 unwanted Asians must get out of Uganda at once and that any staying after 90 days would be rounded up and put in concentration camps. This is a case of pure racism in its worst form."

In addition, President Amin has sent messages to the Secretary of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, and Premier Golda Meir of Israel endorsing Hitler's slaughter of 6 million Jews. If President Amin is sane, his actions and words are repulsive to all of civilized mankind. Our country should be sending him no aid of any sort.

The Wylder sponsored amendment would cut off any aid to President Amin and to Uganda. This past year the United States contributed \$2.14 million in technical assistance grants to Uganda and is requesting \$2.53 million for fiscal year 1973.

"In my judgment," Wylder concluded, "the amendment should be adopted by an overwhelming vote. We should not be in the position of sending aid to a man who supports and sponsors racist policies of the worst sort."

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

#### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the 92d Congress I have introduced 98 bills and resolutions thus far. Many of the proposals they contain have received legislative consideration and several are now law. Below I list those of major interest. Copies and explanations are available upon request:

H.R. 3117, to establish the Lincoln Home National Historic Site in Springfield. Enacted into law.

H.R. 45, to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. Passed the House.

H.R. 177, to provide health care benefits for all Americans. Hearings held by the Ways and Means Committee.

House Joint Resolution 1, to require Presidential reports to Congress any time armed U.S. troops are moved to foreign territory. Passed the House.

H.R. 4237, to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps in time of war. Enacted into law.

House Joint Resolution 900, to create an Atlantic Union delegation. Reported by the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

H.R. 4451, to provide for a scheduled end of the military draft. New draft law calls for zero draft by June 1973.

H.R. 5450, to provide for automatic cost-of-living increases for social security recipients. Passed the House.

H.R. 5499, to provide for an increase in the outside earnings limitation for social security recipients to \$3,000. A lower increase passed the House.

H.R. 5099, to allow an income tax credit for contributions to colleges and universities.

H.R. 4220, to protect free-roaming

horses and burros on public lands. Enacted into law.

H.R. 6233, to authorize the White House Conference on Education.

House Concurrent Resolution 247, to provide for unconditional large-scale repatriation of enemy prisoners-of-war. Cosponsored by 57 Representatives and passed unanimously by the House.

H.R. 7665, to prohibit judges from receiving compensation other than for the performance of their judicial duties and to provide for the disclosure of financial information.

H.R. 8592, to allow a credit against income taxes for expenses of higher education.

H.R. 9213, to provide treatment for servicemen addicted to drugs. Passed the House.

H.R. 9569, to provide additional compensation to POW's because of their incarceration. Cosponsored by 37 Representatives.

House Concurrent Resolution 374, calling for humane treatment and release of U.S. POW's held by North Vietnam. Passed the House.

H.R. 10076, Romania Trade Relations Act. Endorsed by the President.

H.R. 10077, East-West Trade Relations Act.

H.R. 10128, to provide for continuation of investment tax credits for small businesses.

House Concurrent Resolution 387, to provide for a moratorium on killing of all species of whale, porpoise, and dolphin. Passed the House.

House Resolution 634, urging the President to press for U.S. agricultural trade rights with the European Economic Community.

H.R. 11640, to allow senior citizens a credit against Federal income taxes for local real property taxes incurred. Cosponsored by 38 Representatives.

House Concurrent Resolution 471, to seek relief from restrictions on Soviet Jews. Passed the House.

H.R. 12692, to provide a fair and effective means for settlement of emergency labor disputes. Hearings held by Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

H.R. 13942, to exempt small businessmen from OSHA. Incorporated into HEW-Labor appropriations bill. Passed the House and Senate.

H.R. 14447, to make use of firearms to commit a felony a Federal crime where such use violates State law. Similar provision included in Senate-passed gun control measure.

H.R. 14860, to return celebration of Memorial Day and Veterans' Day to original dates.

House Resolution 1020, to provide for a House-authorized Federal budget. Ways and Means Committee recently reported a Federal spending ceiling.

H.R. 15030, to provide FHA loan guarantees to nursing homes for fire safety equipment. Contained in Omnibus Housing bill passed by Banking and Currency Committee.

H.R. 15031, to provide that nursing homes must comply with fire safety standards.

## McGOVERN FOR PRESIDENT

## HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read the endorsement given today by the New York Times to the presidential candidacy of Senator GEORGE McGOVERN. I would like to share with my colleagues the reasons stated by the Times for supporting Senator McGOVERN and rejecting 4 more years for the present administration:

## THE NEXT 4 YEARS

In less than six weeks, we, the American people, will be choosing the President and Vice President of the United States for the next four years. But we will be doing more than that; we will be determining whether we want this country to continue along the course it has been taking during the past four years, or whether we want to restore to American political life its traditional values of democratic liberalism and social concern.

In an America striving to realize its own vision of equality and liberty under the rule of law, the Presidency requires particular qualities of character, leadership and moral force that transcend the narrow bounds of personal ambition and of party politics. It requires a perception of the things that are wrong with America—politically, socially, economically, morally—as well as the things that are right; and a sense of priorities that gives precedence to human needs and public integrity over the panoply of wealth and the arrogance of power.

The New York Times urges the election of George McGovern for President of the United States. We believe that Senator McGovern's approach to public questions, his humanitarian philosophy and humane scale of values, his courage and his forthrightness can offer a new kind of leadership in American political life. We believe he can restore a sense of purpose to the American people as a whole, a sense of participation to their component parts and a sense of integrity to their Government.

In these respects, it seems to us, the Presidency of Richard M. Nixon has largely failed.

Mr. Nixon has indeed had his spectacular triumphs; and this newspaper has never hesitated to applaud the accomplishments of the President and his Administration when we thought that he was serving the best interests of the American people, even when in doing so he was adopting policies that he had spent a lifetime in opposing. But despite his best efforts—in regard to China, the Soviet Union, economic controls and so on—Mr. Nixon has failed both in principle and in practice in other areas of public policy even more vital than those in which he has scored his successes.

Not only has Mr. Nixon failed to carry out his explicit pledge to end the Vietnam conflict, on which he won the election by a hair's breadth four years ago; he has pursued a policy that appears to move in one direction while actually moving in another. Constantly emphasizing the winding down of the war and the withdrawal of American troops, Mr. Nixon has nevertheless enlarged the scope of hostilities, undertaken the biggest bombing campaign in history and committed American prestige to an increasingly authoritarian regime in Saigon.

The Vietnam war is but one area where President Nixon has failed either to carry out his pledge or to give the nation the moral and political leadership that would indeed unite us—as he promised to do four years

ago. This Administration appears to be without basic philosophy, without deeply held values, an Administration whose guiding principle is expediency and whose overriding purpose is to remain in office.

The pursuit of excellent has been subordinated to pursuit of the next election, as evidenced by some of Mr. Nixon's appointments in such ultra-sensitive areas of Government as the Department of Justice and the Supreme Court. In many of its social, economic and fiscal policies; in lax standards of probity and truthfulness in Government; in favoritism toward special interests; in its addition to secrecy; in its disregard of civil liberties and constitutional rights, the Nixon Administration has been a failure.

President Nixon has shown himself willing to exacerbate America's racial divisions for purely political purposes; he has countenanced and encouraged an ominous erosion of individual rights and First Amendment freedoms, and has demonstrated his indifference to such dangers by deliberately selecting Spiro T. Agnew as his potential successor to the Presidency. Protected by the White House curtain, he has stood above the political battle as the odor of corruption and of sleazy campaign practices rises above the Washington battlefield.

A McGovern administration, The Times believes, would reverse the unmistakable drift in Washington away from government of, by and for the people. It is undeniable that since his nomination Senator McGovern has been on the defensive, partly because of the Eagleton episode, partly because of ill-considered comments on specific points that he has subsequently modified or corrected, and partly because of the confused management of his own campaign. But on his record, and on what he has consistently stood for in his years of public office—a consistency in striking contrast to that of his opponent—it is clear that Mr. McGovern will fight for effective and necessary reforms in American social, political and economic institutions.

What this election comes down to is a decision on the direction in which the United States is going to move for the next four years.

Are we going to continue to pursue a foreign policy that, for all its success in certain areas, is essentially based on military supremacy, on a strident nationalism and on a cynical power game that could alienate this country from substantial segments of the international community?

Are we going to continue to pursue a domestic policy that, in its fundamentals, is contemptuous of civil liberties, oblivious of deep social conflicts and racial and economic cleavages in the cities of America, and oriented toward that very "military-industrial complex" against which President Eisenhower perceptively warned us so many years ago?

On virtually every major issue from the war to taxes, from education to environment, from civil liberties to national defense, Mr. McGovern—faltering though many of his statements have been—seems to us to be moving with the right priorities, with faith in the common man, and within the democratic framework. While this newspaper does not necessarily accept his program in every detail as he has thus far outlined it or as the Democratic platform has structured it, we are convinced that the direction of American policy in the next four years would be in safer hands under a McGovern-Shriver administration than under the present regime.

There can be no doubt that Mr. McGovern is now far behind in the Presidential race. But if he succeeds in these next few weeks in getting his basic philosophy of democratic government across to the electorate, a philosophy that rejects the meretricious appeal of his opponents, Senator McGovern may yet touch a chord in the American voter that

will respond to his own practical vision of an American society that cares and an American democracy that works.

## CANADA AND THE TERRORISM QUESTION

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, terrorism—assassinations, kidnapping of officials, violence, and bombing—is well known to our neighbor to the north, Canada, where not 2 years ago that Government was compelled to suspend constitutional liberties to halt subversion. I called this to the attention of our colleagues in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 28, pages 38252-38353.

So we should not be surprised to see that our Canadian friends have spoken out in the U.N. debating society against terrorism in the world. But Americans will be surprised to learn that the Canadian spokesman approves of terrorism in Africa against stable, recognized countries and coddles Communist nations to whom terrorism is a legitimate art of change.

The people and Governments of Rhodesia, South Africa, Angola, and Mozambique have long fought and condemned the violence of terrorists within their borders. This same terrorism was and is condoned by most of the U.N. members who now give lip service to outlawing terrorism, so long as they exclude those terrorists who meet with their approval.

Thus, we now find even a double standard toward terrorism. According to Canada, there are to be good terrorists and bad terrorists. It seems to depend upon whose oxen are being gored.

I insert a related newsclipping along with a portion of my remarks from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 19, 1970:

[From the Evening Star and Daily News, Sept. 28, 1972]

## CANADA ASKS U.N. TO FIGHT TERRORISM

UNITED NATIONS.—Mitchell Sharp, the Canadian external affairs minister, called today for United Nations action against growing international terrorism and said "there can be no truce with terror."

Sharp applauded Secretary General Kurt Waldheim for bringing the question of terror before the General Assembly, but he did not specifically mention the proposal by U.S. Secretary of State William P. Rogers for a new treaty covering terrorism.

Opponents of the move appear to have delayed until at least late November consideration of the U.S. proposal in the assembly's legal committee to which it was referred for preliminary debate.

"The Canadian government understands all too well the agonizing choices governments face when called upon to deal with a sudden nightmare of violence," Sharp said.

## NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROLS

Sharp said disarmament agreements already reached between the United States and the Soviet Union gave the world the right to expect that they will open the way to more far-reaching control of armaments, including nuclear weapons.



He welcomed the presence of Communist China in the United Nations and noted that relations between Peking and Washington and between China and Japan have "witnessed dramatic improvement."

He said it was "no longer visionary" to conceive that the Security Council might now function as it was intended—"by consensus of the permanent members and of the United Nations as a whole, through co-operation rather than confrontation."

Sharp said the most serious challenge to human rights lay in Africa.

"In South Africa," he said, "the very system of apartheid does violence to the concepts embodied by the international community in the covenants on human rights."

#### TERRORISM ON AGENDA

The General Assembly's legal committee voted late yesterday to put the terrorism item sixth on its agenda.

As the committee's agenda stood, debate on an antiterrorism treaty would follow discussion of the report of a special committee on the question of defining aggression.

Diplomatic study groups have been trying to define aggression since it was first taken up by the League of Nations and for the past 27 years of the United Nations.

Diplomatic experts predicted that the difficulties encountered in defining aggression would crop up anew. What one side to a dispute calls terrorism, the other often calls heroism.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Nov. 19, 1970]

#### CANADIAN DILEMMA UNDER TRUDEAU

(By Hon. John R. Rarick, of Louisiana, in the House of Representatives, Nov. 19, 1970)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on October 16, Mr. Trudeau of Canada, and his party in power, invoked wartime measures and suspended constitutional government, reducing Canada to the extraordinary state of martial law.

The wartime measures include censorship and control of all news and reporting. Yet, the communications media of the world has proven itself most understanding, patient, and tolerant toward Mr. Trudeau and his situation in Canada.

Imagine the reaction had such extraordinary suppression occurred under the parties in power in Greece, South Africa, Portugal, Rhodesia, Free China, or even in South Vietnam. We never would have gotten it off the front page.

The American people must start seeking answers to questions. Canada is not on the other side of the world. Why are some things newsworthy while conversely other similar incidents receive little or no coverage?

#### THE ECONOMY IS LOOKING UP IN CENTRAL KANSAS

#### HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, as our country continues the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy, the economic indicators at the local level are becoming more and more encouraging. With the Speaker's permission, I am inserting a recent editorial which appeared in the Newton Kansan:

#### MORE EVIDENCE OF BOOMING ECONOMY

Evidences of the booming economy in Harvey County continue to surface.

The latest is the announcement by the

State Department of Revenue that sales tax collections in the county last month were about 50 per cent higher than during the same month a year ago.

That's quite a jump in one year, and you can't blame all of it on inflation. Prices didn't rise nearly that much during the past year.

This comes on the heels of the program instituted by the Newton Chamber of Commerce to sponsor a job fair here seeking employees for local business and industry.

The C. of C. says that the unemployment rate in Harvey County is just 2 per cent, and that's getting unemployment down to the rock bottom. The employment security office here says that many of those on their list of job seekers are persons who must choose their work because of physical disabilities or because they must choose their hours of work because of personal situations.

Filling some or all of the 450 job openings that the C. of C. has found will mean that much more of a boost to the local economy.

#### REGISTER AND VOTE, IT IS THE LEAST YOU CAN DO

#### HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I reported the results of my 1972 legislative questionnaire to the citizens of my district. The overwhelming response I received was a strong indication that second district citizens desire to have a voice in how their Government operates. I am extremely proud that I represent a district where the citizens believe in taking an active part in the democratic process.

At this time, I would like to share an editorial from the September 22, 1972, edition of the Knoxville Journal. This editorial reminds us all that the democratic process can only be preserved if each citizen exercises his right and obligation to register and vote:

#### REGISTER AND VOTE, IT IS THE LEAST YOU CAN DO

This year, as perhaps never before, the responsibilities of being an American citizen dictate that all eligible persons do their duty and vote.

Why is 1972 different? Because of the so-called "youth vote?" No, we do not buy the myth that newly enfranchised 18-to-20-year-olds will function as a monolithic bloc at the polls.

The greatest hazard, as we see it, stems from a combination of the usual election day apathy and the voting power of the country's radical elements, which we believe will vote as a bloc and in perhaps their full potential.

America's "average" citizens unfortunately have not been overly faithful about doing their share to make America work. Seldom have more than 60 per cent bothered to go to the polls on previous election days, even when presidents were being chosen.

No one really knows what the radical minority will do. It is known, however, that four years ago this element was trying its best to tear the country apart with violent demonstrations, bombings and other terrorist style activities. It also is known that many of these groups have left the streets in favor of the ballot box. They have been successful in a number of areas in electing persons from their ranks to local offices.

The radical, would-be revolutionary ele-

ment clearly constitutes only a minority of the voting public—unless too many decent, right-thinking Americans fail to vote.

Can the radical element elect a president? A senator? Or perhaps state legislators? We hope not. But, then, this year already has produced political developments which no one dreamed could possibly occur.

To be able to vote you must be properly registered. Only two weeks remain for voter registration prior to the November election. October 7 is the last day.

In Knox County the Election Commission office is in the lower level of the Courthouse. Hours are 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 a.m. Monday through Friday. On the Saturdays of September 30 and October 7 the office will be open from 8 a.m. to noon.

Register and vote. It's the least you can do for your country.

#### THE PROTECTION OF PRISONERS' RIGHTS

#### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I introduced legislation—the Prisoner Rights Act—designed to provide for certain fundamental principles in the treatment of Federal prisoners and the protection of the basic rights of these prisoners.

This measure addresses itself to the primary causes of the 13 major prison disturbances which occurred in this country last year—the deep sentiment among the prisoners that their rights were being violated and that crimes had been committed against them. In most instances the prisoners were unable to seek a redress of grievances in a peaceful and positive manner and the ensuing outbreaks were the desperate efforts by inmates to achieve a decent standard of survival, to secure those basic rights of human dignity and just treatment. Although a man may be sent to prison, he is not stripped of certain basic rights and we have an obligation to insure that prisoners have the full protection of our laws and legal processes.

Today I am reintroducing the Prisoner Rights Act with 21 of our colleagues as cosponsors. Because of the urgent need for such legislation and the fact that a thorough and penetrating investigation into current conditions in the Nation's prisons is long overdue, I am hopeful the Judiciary Committee will schedule hearings on this bill early in the next Congress. Also, in the weeks ahead I will be communicating with various State legislative committees and private organizations concerned with penal reform to urge the enactment of similar legislation at the State level.

Since introducing the original measure on September 13, I have received support from many quarters, including groups such as the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and the National Association for Justice. Support has also come from a distinguished member of the New York State Supreme Court, Hon. Thomas Russel Jones. I believe what Justice Jones has stated in a recent letter to me deserves full and

careful consideration by our colleagues and I present it herewith for inclusion in the Record.

Furthermore, the following Members have joined as cosponsors of the prisoner rights bill: BELLA S. ABZUG, Democrat of New York; ALPHONZO BELL, Republican, of California; SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, Democrat of New York; WILLIAM CLAY, Democrat of Missouri; JOHN CONYERS, Jr., Democrat of Michigan; RONALD V. DELLUMS, Democrat of California; CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., Democrat of Michigan; DONALD M. FRAZER, Democrat of Minnesota; SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican of New York; MICHAEL HARRINGTON, Democrat of Massachusetts; AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, Democrat of California; HENRY HELSTOSKI, Democrat of New Jersey; RALPH H. METCALFE, Democrat of Illinois; PARREN J. MITCHELL, Democrat of Maryland; ROBERT N. C. NIX, Democrat of Pennsylvania; CHARLES B. RANGEL, Democrat of New York; THOMAS M. REES, Democrat of California; EDWARD R. ROYBAL, Democrat of California; BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat of New York; JAMES H. SCHEUER, Democrat of New York; and LOUIS STOKES, Democrat of Ohio.

The letter from Justice Jones follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE  
STATE OF NEW YORK,

Brooklyn, N.Y., September 14, 1972.

Hon. HERMAN BADILLO,  
Congressional Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERMAN: Your announced Bill of Rights for Federal Prisoners represents an important advance in the national efforts to insure that human rights are accorded to the poor, blacks and Puerto Ricans who fill the prisons all over America. May I suggest that your bill be expanded to include prisoners on parole and on probation. Often prisoners are arbitrarily remanded to prison on the most flimsy grounds and without adequate investigation or hearings. Moreover, my own research reveals that there are hundreds of occupations closed to felons which virtually guarantee that they will never work again!

I recommend that you use your influence to have the New York State Legislature follow the proposals in the Bill which you have introduced, i.e. a New York State "Prisoners' Rights Act."

Finally, when and if hearings are scheduled on your bill, consider me as one who ought to testify about the realities of the justice system and its consequences for the poor.

Very truly yours,

TOM JONES.

#### HOW THE U.S. COLLECTS FOREIGN DEBTS AND LOSES MONEY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, there is little wonder why this country of ours is bordering on bankruptcy. The present administration's thrust is on lending but with no idea how to go about collecting our debts.

Egypt is a case in point. According to reports under an agreement between the two countries signed last January, Egypt

is paying off its 5-year-old \$85-million debt to the United States at the rate of \$11,700,000, plus interest, every 6 months. But the agreement says that with every payment Egypt gets back 95 percent—\$11,070,000—of the installment in a new loan for agricultural products.

Using a normal rate of 5 percent, interest on a debt of \$85,000,000 would come to roughly \$4,250,000 yearly, which would be \$2,125,000 over a period of 6 months. According to the reports, Egypt is actually making a payment of \$630,000 on its debt. This figure to be approximately \$1,495,000 less than the interest on the original loan; or, to put it bluntly, Egypt's actual debt to the United States is increasing as a result of this diplomatic loan repayment agreement.

Too bad the U.S. taxpayers cannot be put in charge of collecting our bills. They might even like some of these soft loans for Americans.

A related news clipping follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 28, 1972]  
UNITED STATES AND EGYPT REACH ACCORD IN  
CREDIT DEAL

The United States is advancing credit of \$11,070,000 to Egypt to buy American agricultural commodities after Egypt was prodded into paying the second installment on its American debts, U.S. government officials said yesterday.

Under an agreement between the two countries signed last January, Egypt is paying off its five-year-old \$85-million debt to the United States at the rate \$11,700,000, plus interest, every six months.

But the agreement says that with every payment Egypt gets back 95 per cent—\$11,070,000—of the installment in a new loan for agricultural products.

#### HEADS OF NINE UNIONS ENDORSE PRESIDENT

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this is truly the year of the political conscience.

Who would have predicted a year ago that heads of labor unions and labor unions themselves would be endorsing President Nixon for reelection for 4 more years. A few days ago, the heads of nine building and construction unions, representing almost 2 million workers endorsed President Nixon for reelection.

There were three reasons for this: First, the positions and policies of the candidate of the Democratic party wholly unacceptable. Second, in a joint statement, the nine union leaders cited President Nixon's foreign policy, including his efforts to bring an honorable end to the war in Vietnam. Third, they said "the President's belief in the dignity of honest work and his opposition to policies which would sap and undermine the fundamental strength of American character" coincided with their views.

I think all of us will have to admit that these are good and overpowering reasons for being under the Republican umbrella in this election.

These reasons of union leaders have

in no way derogated or cast aspersions on the nominee of the Democratic Party. They have simply given positive reasons as to why the President is entitled to 4 more years in the White House.

I attach herewith the article by Philip Shabecoff from the New York Times of Wednesday, September 27 which I am sure many of my colleagues will want to read:

HEADS OF NINE UNIONS ENDORSE PRESIDENT  
(By Philip Shabecoff)

WASHINGTON, Sept. 26.—The Presidents of nine building and construction unions representing 1.7 million workers endorsed President Nixon for re-election today, saying that they found "the positions and policies of the candidate of the Democratic party wholly unacceptable."

The endorsements were personal and did not commit their unions to campaign for the President. Moreover, eight other construction union presidents with a membership of 2 million declined today to make an endorsement although invited to do so.

But the support for the Republican President represented a break with tradition by the A.F.L.-C.I.O. unions and a major defection from their traditional support of the Democratic party.

The political decision by these union leaders was not unexpected. They represent the relatively conservative "hard hat" unions that have taken a relatively militant position on the Vietnam war and have otherwise been sympathetic to President Nixon's policies.

The way was cleared for the union leaders to endorse Mr. Nixon when the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations voted last July to keep the federation neutral in the Presidential campaign and left members unions free to endorse whom they chose.

BY PAPERWORKERS' HEAD

Joseph Tonelli, the president of the United Paperworkers International Union, another A.F.L.-C.I.O. affiliate, also announced his endorsement of President Nixon today. The union has 315,000 members, a number of whom are Canadians.

Yesterday, Thomas W. Gleason, president of the 115,000-member International Longshoremen's Union, announced his support of Mr. Nixon, the first head of a major A.F.L.-C.I.O. affiliate to do so.

Earlier, six other unions had come out for the re-election of the President, including the two million-member International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the nation's biggest union.

About 40 unions or their leaders have announced their support of Senator George McGovern, the Democratic nominee which account for roughly half of organized labor's total membership of some 18 to 19 million workers.

The following are the names of the construction union presidents who endorsed President Nixon today.

Peter Fosco, Laborers International Union of North America, with 600,000 members.

Hunter P. Wharton, International Union of Operating Engineers, 400,000 members.

Martin J. Ward, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada, 300,000 members.

John H. Lyons, International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers, 180,000 members.

Thomas F. Murphy, Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers International Union of America, 165,000 members.

John T. Power, Operating Plasterers and Cement Masons International Union, 80,000 members.

Andrew T. Haas, International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers, 20,000 members.



Wylie Lawhead, International Association of Marble, Slate and Stone Polishers, Rubbers and Sawyers, Tile Helpers and Finishers, Marble Setters Helpers, Marble Mosaic and Terrazzo Workers Helpers, 9,000 members.

In a joint statement, the nine union chiefs cited President Nixon's foreign policy, including his efforts to bring "an honorable end to the war in Vietnam," among the reasons for their endorsement.

"Moreover," they said, "the President's belief in the dignity of honest work and his opposition to policies which would sap and undermine the fundamental strength of

American character, coincides with our view that it is only by honoring those who work that America can remain the kind of nation we wish to pass on to our children and grandchildren."

These union leaders are understood to be happy with the Construction Industry Stabilization Committee, which has imposed wage restraints in their industry but not so strenuously or arbitrarily as has the Pay Board in other industries.

Earlier today the union leaders were received by President Nixon at the White House. They were accompanied by Frank Bo-

nadio, president of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the A.F.L.-C.I.O., even though the department has declared itself neutral in keeping with the policy of the federation's Executive Council.

The presidents of the two largest construction unions, Charles Pillard of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and William Sidell of the Carpenters Union, did not endorse the President, Frank Raftery, president of the Painters Union, and Edward Carlough of the Sheetmetal Workers, head two other large unions that withheld their endorsement.

## SENATE—Friday, September 29, 1972

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

### PRAYER

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

O God, we lift our hearts to Thee in gratitude for life and health, for work to do and strength with which to do it, for love and friendship, for the goodness and mercy that daily follows us, for the beauty and wonder of Thy creation, and for all things just and pure and true. We thank Thee for this Nation, its history, and its place in the present age. Assist us ever to live in the spirit of thanksgiving and to serve Thee and our fellow citizens gladly all our days.

We commit the Members of this body and all who assist them to Thy keeping. Guide them to consummate the legislation most beneficial to the Nation and its people at this time. Watch over them until the coming of the perfect order of Thy kingdom. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 28, 1972, be dispensed with.

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

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD at this point when he introduced S. 4046 are printed in the Routine Morning Business section of the RECORD under Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.)

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the distinguished minority leader desire recognition?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I reserve my time.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the nominations on the calendar.

### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations on the District of Columbia Council.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

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

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

### THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION—A FORM OF URBAN BLIGHT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, during this period I shall address myself to urban problems and the response of this administration to those problems. My short statement is entitled "The Nixon Administration—A Form of Urban Blight."

Mr. President, more than 70 percent of our Nation's citizens now live in urban

areas, and the multitude of problems which beset our cities must of necessity be of concern to any principled candidate for high public office.

I mention this because the Republican candidate for President, who also happens to be the incumbent, has over the past several years demonstrated not only a lack of concern, but, in fact, a callous disregard for the needs of our urban areas.

The incumbent, despite the enormous positive powers of the office he has held for the past several years, has used his position instead to strangle the most vitally important of urban programs.

Let me cite a few examples.

Recognizing that the disposal of waste products has become one of the most critical urban problems, Congress authorized and appropriated \$1.65 billion in fiscal year 1972 for the construction of sewage treatment facilities.

Members of both parties endorsed this measure as a positive step toward abating water pollution.

Richard Nixon, however, took it upon himself to withhold 65 percent of the funds he was directed to allocate for this purpose.

Of the \$1.65 billion that should have gone into the construction of sewage treatment facilities, a full \$1.073 billion was not spent.

Mr. Nixon's parsimony will cost us all dearly in the long run. Unless their sewage treatment facilities are improved, our cities and suburbs will be left to stagnate.

We will pay for Mr. Nixon's ill-conceived economy not in dollars but in foul-smelling rivers unfit for urban recreation needs, and reservoirs with undrinkable water.

We will pay in lakes which are filled with scum unfit to swim in, and ultimately we will pay in oceans that cannot support any form of life.

This is supposed to be fiscal responsibility.

Richard Nixon's record on mass transportation in our urban areas is equally deplorable.

Over the last 2 years \$500 million in funds authorized and appropriated by Congress under the Urban Mass Transit Assistance Act of 1970 have been frozen by Mr. Nixon.

On November 7, 1971, 35 Senators, including both the distinguished minority leader (Mr. SCOTT) and the distinguished minority whip (Mr. GRIFFIN), joined me in urging Mr. Nixon to allocate speedily